

PAUL'S USE OF CULTIC LANGUAGE IN ROMANS
An Exegetical Study of Major Texts in Romans
Which Employ Cultic Language
in a Non-literal Way

A THESIS
SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
IN THE DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL STUDIES
THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD

by

DAVID LINDSAY OLFORD

FEBRUARY, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

i

PREFACE	viii
DECLARATION	ix
SUMMARY	x
ABBREVIATIONS	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
<u>Footnotes</u>	5

PART ONE

8

AN ASSESSMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DISCUSSION OF
PAUL'S USE OF CULTIC LANGUAGE
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE STUDY OF
CULTIC LANGUAGE IN ROMANS
(1910 TO 1983)

CHAPTER I: FOUNDATIONAL STUDIES IN NEW TESTAMENT CULTIC LANGUAGE: THE STUDIES OF OTTO SCHMITZ AND HANS WENSCHKEWITZ	9
A. <u>Otto Schmitz and the Non-literal Use of Cultic Language</u>	9
1. Schmitz's Perspective and Thesis	9
2. Schmitz's Description of Paul's Use of Cultic Language	10
3. Evaluation	12
4. Conclusion	16
B. <u>Hans Wenschkewitz and the "Spiritualization" of the Cult</u>	17
1. Wenschkewitz's Perspective and Thesis	17
2. Wenschkewitz's Description of Paul's Use of Cultic Language	19
3. Evaluation	21
4. Conclusion	24
<u>Excursus 1: Metaphor and Metaphorical</u>	25
<u>Excursus 2: Spiritualization and Interiorization</u>	27
<u>Footnotes</u>	31
CHAPTER II: PAUL'S CULTIC LANGUAGE AND THE JEWISH CULTUS: HISTORICAL QUESTIONS	38
A. <u>A Preliminary Concern: the Nature of Paul's Cultic Language</u>	38
1. Paul's Cultic Language as an Aspect of Early Apologetic: C. F. D. Moule's Thesis and Argument	38

a) <u>Moule's thesis and argument</u>	38
b) <u>Moule's subsidiary argument concerning Paul</u>	39
c) <u>Evaluation</u>	39
d) <u>Conclusion</u>	41
2. Paul's Cultic Language as a Part of Eschatological Realization of the Cult: Konrad Weiss' Thesis and Argument	42
a) <u>Weiss' understanding of Paul's spiritualization of the cult</u>	42
b) <u>The implications for a historical perspective</u>	43
c) <u>Evaluation</u>	44
d) <u>Conclusion</u>	46
B. <u>An Attempt at Historical Reconstruction: Ambiguities and Implications</u>	47
1. W. D. Davies' Perspective in <u>The Gospel and the Land</u>	47
2. <u>Evaluation and Conclusion</u>	49
C. <u>Paul and the Temple: The Views of Frances Young and Martin Hengel</u>	49
1. Young's Historical Framework	49
2. Hengel's Historical Framework	51
3. Evaluation and Conclusion	53
D. <u>Summary and Conclusions: From Schmitz to Hengel</u>	54
<u>Footnotes</u>	59
CHAPTER III: PAUL'S CULTIC LANGUAGE AND HIS THEOLOGY: THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS	65
A. <u>The Sacrifice of Christ and the Christian</u>	65
1. Philipp Seidensticker's <u>Lebendiges Opfer (Rom 12:1)</u>	65
a) <u>Seidensticker's theological perspective</u>	65
b) <u>Evaluation and conclusions</u>	68
2. Raymond Corriveau's <u>The Liturgy of Life</u>	71
a) <u>Corriveau's theological perspective</u>	71
b) <u>Evaluation and conclusions</u>	73
3. R. J. Daly's Perspective on "The Pauline Theology of Sacrifice"	74
a) <u>Daly's Perspective</u>	74
b) <u>Evaluation</u>	77

4.	<u>Tibor Horvath's The Sacrificial Interpretation of Jesus's Achievement in the New Testament</u>	79
	a) <u>Horvath's perspective</u>	79
	b) <u>Evaluation</u>	81
5.	S. W. Sykes: a Bi-focal View of Sacrifice	83
	a) <u>Sykes' Perspective</u>	83
	b) <u>Evaluation</u>	86
B.	<u>The Priesthood of Paul</u>	88
1.	Denis' "La Fonction Apostolique et La Liturgie Nouvelle en Esprit"	89
	a) <u>Denis' perspective</u>	89
	b) <u>Evaluation</u>	92
2.	Heinrich Schlier's "Die 'Liturgie' des apostolischen Evangeliums (Rom 15, 14-21)"	95
	a) <u>Schlier's perspective</u>	95
	b) <u>Evaluation</u>	96
C.	<u>Summary and Conclusions</u>	98
	<u>Footnotes</u>	103

PART TWO 115

AN EXEGETICAL ASSESSMENT OF PAUL'S USE OF
CULTIC LANGUAGE IN MAJOR TEXTS IN ROMANS

CHAPTER I:	ROMANS AND CULTIC LANGUAGE	116
A.	<u>Introduction</u>	116
B.	<u>The Purpose of Romans</u>	119
1.	The Occasion of Writing	119
2.	The Intended Function of the Letter	121
3.	Factors Affecting the Content of the Letter	124
C.	<u>The Structure of Romans and Cultic Language</u>	129
1.	The Basic Structure of the Letter	129
2.	Cultic Language and the Basic Structure of the Letter	130
3.	Cultic Language and Paul's Argument	132
4.	Cultic Language and the Purpose of Romans	135
	<u>Footnotes</u>	136

CHAPTER II: CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR 143

THE GOSPEL: I. ROMANS 3:25

A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	143
----	----------------------------------	-----

B.	<u>Romans 3:21-26 Within Romans</u>	145
C.	<u>The Thesis of 3:21-26 and the Place of 3:25a Within it</u>	148
1.	Romans 3:21-24	148
2.	Romans 3:25-26	151
D.	<u>The Meaning of ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι .</u>	154
1.	The Words and Their Meaning in Context: Initial Observations	154
2.	ἱλαστήριον : Used with Reference to the Place of Atonement in the Old Testament Cultus; Preliminary Observations	159
3.	ἱλαστήριον : Used with Reference to the Place of Atonement in the OT Cultus; Defended and Explained	165
a)	<u>Leon Morris' Argument Against a "Mercy Seat" Interpretation</u>	165
b)	<u>Leon Morris' Argument for a "Means of Atonement Interpretation and Responses</u>	169
4.	A Clarification of Interpretation	176
E.	<u>Further Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Rom 3:25</u>	178
1.	Concerning the Metaphorical Nature of the Cultic Language	178
2.	Concerning Possible Implications in Regard to the Cultus Itself	181
3.	Concerning the Gospel, and Gospel Ministry	185
	<u>Excursus 1: The Use of Traditional Material in Romans 3:24-26</u>	187
1.	The Recent Discussion	187
2.	A Suggestion for Exegesis in Context	189
	<u>Excursus 2: Αἷμα in Paul (Outside of Romans) and in the New Testament</u>	193
	<u>Footnotes</u>	199
	CHAPTER III: CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL: II. ROMANS 5:9	214
A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	214
B.	<u>The Context</u>	214
1.	Romans 5:1-11 Within Romans	215
2.	Romans 5:1-11: The Context of 5:9	216
C.	<u>Δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ in 5:9</u>	219

D.	<u>The Implications of the Use of Cultic Language in 5:9</u>	225
	<u>Footnotes</u>	229
CHAPTER IV:	CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL: III. ROMANS 8:3	233
A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	233
B.	<u>The Context</u>	234
C.	<u>Περὶ ἁμαρτίας</u>	235
	1. Paul's Use of <u>περὶ ἁμαρτίας</u>	235
	2. LXX Occurrences of <u>περὶ ἁμαρτίας</u>	237
	3. Philo's Use of <u>περὶ ἁμαρτίας</u>	239
	4. The NT Evidence Outside of Paul's Writings	239
	a) <u>Hebrews</u>	240
	b) <u>1 Peter</u>	241
	c) <u>The Johannine Material</u>	241
	5. Preliminary Conclusions	243
D.	<u>Περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3</u>	243
E.	<u>Further Implications of Cultic Language Within This Context</u>	254
	1. Ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας	255
	2. κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί	256
	3. ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νομοῦ πληρωθῆ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σὰρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα	258
F.	<u>Conclusions in Light of Rom 3:25, 5:9, and 8:3</u>	264
	<u>Footnotes</u>	268
CHAPTER V:	CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL: IV. ROMANS 11:16A	280
A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	280
B.	<u>The Context: Romans 9-11</u>	281
C.	<u>The OT Background Most Appropriate for Understanding the Metaphor</u>	282
D.	<u>Paul's Use of ἀπαρχή and ἀπαρχή in 11:16</u>	284
	1. Used in Reference to the Spirit	284
	2. Used in Reference to Christians	284
	3. Used in Reference to Christ	285
	4. The Distinctiveness of 11:16a	285
E.	<u>Romans 11:16a in Context</u>	286
	1. Paul's Argument	286

2.	The <i>ρίζη</i> - κλάδος Metaphor	287
3.	'Απειρη' and the Meaning of the Metaphor in 11:16a	290
F.	<u>Conclusion</u>	296
	<u>Footnotes</u>	297
CHAPTER VI:	CULTIC LANGUAGE INTRODUCING THE ETHICS OF THE GOSPEL: ROMANS 12:1-2	301
A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	301
B.	<u>The Context: Paraenesis in Romans</u>	304
C.	<u>Exegesis of 12:1-2</u>	308
1.	Παρακαλῶ, οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρητῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ.	308
2.	Παραστήσατε τὰ σῶματά ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν ἐνάρεστον τῷ Θεῷ,	313
3.	Τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν	324
4.	Rom 12:2	331
D.	<u>Conclusion: Cultic Language, Paraenesis, and Baptism</u>	334
Excursus:	<u>Λογικὴ Λατρεία and the Possible Back- ground of Paul's Cultic Language in Rom 12:1</u>	338
	<u>Footnotes</u>	344
CHAPTER VII:	CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL: ROMANS 15:16	356
A.	<u>Summary of Interpretation</u>	356
B.	<u>The Immediate Context</u>	359
C.	<u>Cultic Language in 15:16</u>	362
1.	Εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ. . .	362
2.	Εἰς τὰ ἔθνη	368
3.	Ἰφρουροῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ	370
4.	The εἶναι Clause	374
5.	Ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν	377
6.	τῶν ἔθνῶν	380
7.	Conclusions Concerning	384
D.	<u>Possible Reasons for Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans 15:16</u>	387
1.	The Cultic Minister as a Natural Self- Description	387
2.	The Collection Project and Rom 15:16	388
3.	The Possible Relevance of Isaiah 66:20 and/or the Pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Jerusalem	394
4.	Paul's Self-Description in Rom 15:16 as Understandable Within the Closing Section	402

of the Letter and in the Light of the Apologetic for Paul's Mission Implicit and Explicit in the Letter.

E. <u>Conclusion: Cultic Language and Paul's Ministry</u>	408
<u>Excursus: The Eschatological Priesthood to the Gentiles and the Testament of Levi</u>	410
<u>Footnotes</u>	413
PART THREE	
431	
CONCLUSIONS	
A. <u>Basic Conclusions</u>	432
B. <u>Historical Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans</u>	435
C. <u>Theological Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans</u>	441
1. Cultic Language in the Apologetic for the Gospel	441
2. Cultic Language and Ethics in Romans	443
3. Cultic Language in the Description of Apostolic Ministry	445
D. <u>Final Comments: Cultic Language in Romans</u>	446
<u>Excursus: Cultic Language and Theology Today</u>	449
<u>Footnotes</u>	452
BIBLIOGRAPHY	456

PREFACE

I want to use this preface to thank those who have encouraged me in this work and have been instrumental in one way or another in getting this thesis 'on paper'.

Thanks is due, first of all, to my supervisors the Rev. Dr. David Hill and the Rev. Dr. Bruce Chilton. I am thankful not only for their supervision of this work, but for their teaching and encouragement along the way. I need also to thank the whole department of Biblical Studies at Sheffield University (lecturers, staff, and students) for being the friendly and stimulating environment which nurtured my ideas from the beginning. Over the last 2+ years I have enjoyed the support of Dr. Murray Harris and the Tyndale House 'family' in Cambridge. Again the encouragement and academic interaction has meant a great deal.

I want also to thank those, starting with my own parents, who provided financial help during the time that this thesis represents. The ORS Committee provided the ORS - Fees Support Scheme Award for (1981-1982), and the Tyndale House Council provided grants covering (1982-1984). Special thanks is due to Mrs. Adelaide Dobson whose sacrificial giving at the outset of this endeavor was and has been a reminder of the grace of God.

Thanks and recognition are both due to a number of people who helped with matters of foreign language translation at different times along the way, particularly the following: The Rev. Dr. G. R. Sattler, Dr. H. P. Dressler, Miss K. Bower, Mr. K. Vanhoozer, Mr. V. P. Long, Mrs. O. Chilton, Mrs. F. Rouanet-Démocrate, and Mr. U. Wippermann.

The Rev. Dr. G. R. Sattler and Mrs. J. Babb-Sattler are also to be thanked for their hospitality which enabled me to stay in Marburg, West Germany, on two separate occasions. Mr. M. Thompson is to be thanked for proof-reading sections of the work and Mrs. Iris Hunter for her thorough proofreading during the past two weeks.

My sincere thanks is stated here for all the friends who have made this task possible, and have given so much to me over the last few years, especially Dr. C. C. Broyles, Dr. J. McGregor, and Miss M. Diffenderfer.

Lastly, and most importantly I want to thank my family, and especially my mother and father for their support in every way. I can only say that the very love of God has been expressed in their continued 'involvement' in my life.

DECLARATION

This thesis represents my own work and does not contain work that I have done for any other degree. Having benefitted from the work of others so much, I am only too happy to allow others to copy this thesis "in whole or in part without further reference to the author" (BS 4821:1972, p. 8).

SUMMARY

PAUL'S USE OF CULTIC LANGUAGE IN ROMANS An Exegetical Study of Major Texts in Romans Which Employ Cultic Language in a Non-literal Way

by
DAVID LINDSAY OLFORD

In this study cultic language used in Romans will be viewed as an aspect of the letter as a whole.

In Part One we survey foundational studies concerned with Paul's use of cultic language (chapter I) and assess contributions to the discussion of historical and theological questions that are relevant to this thesis (chapters II and III). By means of this survey we state the need for the exegetical method of this study and we justify Romans as the text for our exegeses.

In Part Two we present our exegeses based on the suggestion that cultic language is significant to the argument (3:25, 5:9, 8:3), and structure (12:1, 15:16, [1:9]) of the letter (Chapter I). Paul uses cultic language in 1:(16)18-11:36 to explain his gospel, and to defend his thesis that the gospel is the power of God (chapters II [3:25], III [5:9], IV [8:3], V [11:16a]). (Chapter V also illustrates Paul's ability to use cultic language without explanation, and without direct connection to other cultic images in the letter). Paul, furthermore, uses cultic language to introduce his ethical directives (Chapter VI [12:1]). Here, the apostolic 'priestly' exhorter calls for the community sacrifice of obedience which is the authentic worship of those justified by faith and baptized with Christ. Paul also uses cultic language to describe his ministry which acts as a rationale for his manner in writing (Chapter VII [15:16]). Paul is the priestly minister bringing about the acceptable offering of the Gentiles.

In Part Three we conclude our study by emphasizing that although Paul has not directed a polemic against the Temple nor consciously unified a 'Christian cultus', his cultic language functions to authenticate and illustrate his claim that the gospel is the power of God resulting in salvation, and in this way he defends his own ministry.

ABBREVIATIONS

BAG	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich, <u>Greek-English Lexicon</u>
BDF	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, R. W. Funk, <u>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</u>
<u>BJRL</u>	<u>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</u>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
<u>BThB</u>	<u>Biblical Theological Bulletin</u>
<u>CBQ</u>	<u>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</u>
<u>EJ</u>	C. Roth, G. Wigoder, <u>Encyclopaedia Judaica</u>
EKK	Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament
<u>EncBib</u>	T. K. Cheyne, J. S. Black (eds.), <u>Encyclopaedia Biblica</u>
<u>EvQ</u>	<u>Evangelical Quarterly</u>
<u>EvT</u>	<u>Evangelische Theologie</u>
<u>ExpTim</u>	<u>Expository Times</u>
<u>FRLANT</u>	<u>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</u>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HR	E. Hatch, H. A. Redpath, <u>Concordance to the Septuagint</u>
<u>HTR</u>	<u>Harvard Theological Review</u>
<u>ICC</u>	<u>International Critical Commentary</u>
<u>IDB</u>	G. A. Buttrick (ed.), <u>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</u>
<u>Int</u>	<u>Interpretation</u>
<u>JBL</u>	<u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u>
<u>JETS</u>	<u>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</u>
<u>JJS</u>	<u>Journal of Jewish Studies</u>
<u>JSNT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</u>
<u>JSS</u>	<u>Journal of Semitic Studies</u>
<u>JTS</u>	<u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>
KEK	H. A. W. Meyer's Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar
LSMJ	Liddell-Scott-McKenzie-Jones, <u>Greek-English Lexicon</u>
LXX	Septuagint
MG	W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden, <u>Concordance to the Greek Testament</u>
N-A 26	K. Aland, <u>et. al.</u> , <u>Novum Testamentum Graece</u>
NCB	New Century Bible
NICNT	New International Commentary of the New Testament
NICOT	New International Commentary of the Old Testament
<u>NIDNTTh</u>	C. Brown, <u>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology</u>
NIV	New International Version
<u>NovT</u>	<u>Novum Testamentum</u>
<u>NTS</u>	<u>New Testament Studies</u>
<u>PFay</u>	Grenfell, Hunt, and Hogarth <u>Fayûm Towns and Their Papyri</u>
RB	Revue Biblique
<u>RHPR</u>	<u>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</u>
<u>RSPTh</u>	<u>Revue des sciences philosophiques et theologiques</u>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
<u>RTR</u>	<u>Reformed Theological Review</u>
SB	Strack-Billerbeck, <u>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</u>

<u>SBLDS</u>	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
<u>SBLMS</u>	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
<u>SCS</u>	Septuagint and Cognate Studies
<u>SJLA</u>	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<u>SJTh</u>	<u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>
<u>SNTS</u>	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<u>SRS</u>	L. Sabourin, S. Lyonnet, <u>Sin</u> , <u>Redemption</u> , <u>and Sacrifice</u>
<u>ST</u>	<u>Studia Theologica</u>
<u>SUNT</u>	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
<u>TCGNT</u>	B. M. Metzger, <u>Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament</u>
<u>TDNT</u>	G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (eds.), <u>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</u>
<u>ThQ</u>	<u>Theologische Quartalschrift</u>
<u>TLZ</u>	<u>Theologische Literaturzeitung</u>
<u>TNTC</u>	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries
<u>TOTC</u>	Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries
<u>TWOT</u>	R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer Jr., B. K. Waltke, <u>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</u>
<u>TynBul</u>	<u>Tyndale Bulletin</u>
<u>TZ</u>	<u>Theologische Zeitschrift</u>
<u>UBS</u>	United Bible Societies <u>Greek New Testament</u>
<u>VGNT</u>	J. H. Moulton, G. Milligan, <u>Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</u>
<u>VT</u>	<u>Vetus Testamentum</u>
<u>WMZANT</u>	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
<u>WTJ</u>	<u>Westminster Theological Journal</u>
<u>WUNT</u>	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<u>ZNW</u>	<u>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</u>

We have attempted to indicate specific pages within a source by using p. or pp. If page numbers are not preceded by p. or pp. then the whole article, book, or section indicated is being referred to. The abbreviations used for Biblical books and other primary sources conform in general to the abbreviations in the Society of Biblical Literature's Member's Handbook 1980, pp. 86-90.

INTRODUCTION

Cultic language is of interest to this student because of its prominence in the New Testament (NT).¹ Cultic language appears in such a variety of contexts and is used in such differing ways that its meaning is not always clear and its significance is sometimes difficult to assess. Cultic language is also of interest because it provides for study a possible relationship between early Judaism and Christianity. Jewish institutions, and especially the cultus, played a major role in the development of Christian thought. Language associated with the cultus is an example of Jewish ritual² and general religious vocabulary that gained expression in a Christian context. This we note, while recognising that certain uses of cultic language may not be distinctively Jewish, and may or may not convey Jewish cultic ideas.

Paul's use of cultic language merits our attention because of his relevance to the concerns mentioned above. First of all, Paul uses cultic language and concepts sufficiently often to say that they are a part of the expression of his thought.³ Secondly, Paul was a Jew and a Christian. He wrote at a time when the cultus was in operation, and there had not been a definitive break between Judaism and Christianity. Furthermore, Paul

sought for unity between the growing Gentile church and the foundational Jewish-Christian 'remnant' and community (Rom 11:5-6, 15:7-13). Thus, Paul, a man grounded in Judaism,⁴ involved in the Christian mission to the Gentiles, and concerned with Jew-Gentile relations, is a user of cultic language particularly worthy of study.

This thesis is concerned with cultic language in Paul's letter addressed to the saints in Rome. The subject of cultic language in Romans does not just represent a sub-section of the broader subject of Paul's use of cultic language; it merits attention because of certain distinctive points that we will note. This thesis will attempt to present an argument for the significance of the cultic language in Romans, particularly when viewed within the letter as a whole. We suggest that the letter presents Paul as the priestly apostle (15:16 and 1:9),⁵ and he is the one who calls forth the sacrifice of Christian obedience that is authentic worship (12:1). This sacrifice, in at least a general sense, is the response due to the gospel which Paul presents as God's power resulting in salvation. An argument can be made furthermore for the possible presence of cultic language within Paul's gospel as presented in Romans (3:25, 5:9, 8:3), language that supports Paul's apologetic for justification by faith. At the same time, it seems that Paul did not use cultic language in Romans as a polemic against the Temple nor did he use cultic language as the conscious expression of a Christian cultus as such. The cultic language was used in varying ways as an aspect of Paul's apologetic for gospel and mission. Paul's apologetic thrust in the letter,

therefore, is a unifying element in his use of cultic language, and thus diversity in use must be noted also.

In Romans Paul presents his gospel and apostleship for Jew and Gentile (note 1:16, 11:13,14, 15:8,9), and this is done in a more deliberate fashion than in other Pauline letters. Therefore, Paul's different uses of cultic language within a document like Romans are an important source for study as the study of the early relationship between Judaism and Christianity continues.

Our procedure in the main section of this thesis will be to study the relevant texts in Romans, texts such as Rom 3:25, 5:9, 8:3, (11:16), 12:1, and 15:16.⁶ In the exegeses we seek to interpret the cultic language that may be used, to view what role it may have had in Paul's thought in these texts, and to suggest why Paul could have used cultic language in such ways at these points in the letter. The sections of our exegeses are based on the structure of Romans itself, but they also are parallel with the three-fold division offered in Heinrich Schlier's description of Paul's concept of sacrifice.⁷

Our conclusions will seek to draw together the findings of our exegeses, stating more fully the thesis we have suggested above. Also, implications both historical and theological will be suggested, especially in view of the issues raised by previous studies. In this way we hope to emphasize the importance of Romans for the study of Paul's use of cultic language and we hope to contribute to the discussion of historical and theological issues that pertain to Paul's use of cultic language. Although Paul's use of cultic language has received much attention

in past studies, we are not aware of any study that has sought to view these possible 'cultic' texts in Romans having the purpose and structure of the letter in mind and with the specific aim of viewing their role in the letter as a whole. Thus, we believe that such an undertaking can add to the further study of Paul's cultic language and related issues.

This study is clearly dependent on much previous work, especially work concerning Paul's use of cultic language. Thus, we begin with a survey of previous discussions of issues, historical and theological, that are relevant to this study. The survey is written to indicate the need for the scope and exegetical approach of this study, and it will provide particular concerns for the exegeses that follow it.

Footnotes

¹To present our definition of 'cultic language' we must present our definition of sacrifice.

We begin with Roland de Vaux's "provisory definition": "sacrifice is any offering, animal or vegetable, which is wholly or partially destroyed upon the altar as a token of homage to God" (Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, translated by John McHugh [London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1961], p. 415. Frances Young points out that the offerings were not always "of food", and she begins with an even more general definition, "it [sacrifice] covers all forms of offering to the gods" (Sacrifice and the Death of Christ [London: SPCK, 1975], p. 22). For our purposes, sacrifice refers to the object presented or the activity of presenting or offering something ritually in such a way that the object moves "from the common into the religious domain" (J. H. M. Beattie, "On Understanding Sacrifice", in Sacrifice, edited by M. F. C. Bourdillon, and Meyer Fortes, [London: Academic Press, 1980] 29-44, p. 29, quoting from H. Hubert and M. Mauss, Sacrifice, Its Nature and Function translated by W. D. Halls [London: Cohen and West, 1964], p. 9). Usually part of the process is the killing (if animal) and/or the burning and/or the ritual eating of the sacrificial object; this is the actual external ritual that the offerer enters into himself or by way of a representative in a ritually prescribed way. (Having said this the diversity of sacrificial objects and procedures makes it difficult to state details that are common to all sacrifices.) For a sacrificial act to take place there is usually a prescribed place (altar), and a recognized procedure often carried out by someone assuming a ritually prescribed role (official priest or not). This is what we have in mind when we refer to the literal use of the word 'sacrifice'.

Sacrificial activity, especially within a religious tradition of a definable group (as the Jews), is often part of the "external rites and ceremonies" of "a particular form or system of religious worship" (Oxford English Dictionary, vol. 2, C [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933], p. 1246). This larger framework is the cult or cultus of the religious tradition. R. de Vaux defines cult as "all those acts by which communities or individuals give outward expression to their religious life, by which they seek and achieve contact with God" (Ancient Israel, p. 271). These acts, together with appropriate personnel performing in the appropriate place or places, form a cultus or cultic institution. This cultus provides the necessary place, personnel, and prescriptions for ritual activity that surround the activity of sacrifice, assuming that we are speaking of a sacrificial cultus. We use the word 'cultic' to refer to that which pertains to the cultus, and because we are concerned with the ancient world (especially the Jewish cultus), we are speaking of a sacrificial cult or cultus (cult or cultus can be used interchangeably, although cultus connotes more to us the idea of an established institution, and is thus almost a technical term).

Thus, we view language that refers to temples,

priests, and sacrifices as cultic language. For our purposes, cultic language has a broader field of reference than sacrificial language: 'sacrificial' is semantically narrower than 'cultic'. We have chosen to speak of Paul's use of 'cultic language' because some of the words we are interested in will not be sacrificial words, strictly speaking. One could argue that priests, festivals, and temples are a part of sacrificial terminology, but we prefer to place them under the category of 'cultic', and to use 'sacrificial' in the narrower sense explained above. We use the word 'language' in the phrase 'cultic language' to suggest words that are appropriate to a literal cultic setting, rather than definite technical terms. Non-literal cultic language, in general, is cultic language that is not used to refer to actual cultic personnel, places, activities, or objects. In other words, it is language that still may convey some significant aspect of cultic meaning, either technical or general, although it is now used in a non-cultic context.

²We view what is cultic as an aspect of what is ritual, although ritual activity may or may not be associated with a cultic system or institution. Jonathan Z. Smith defines ritual as:

"a means of performing the way things ought to be in conscious tension to the way things are in such a way that this ritualized perfection is recollected in the ordinary, uncontrolled, course of things" ("The Bare Facts of Ritual", History of Religion 20 [1980] 112-127, [p. 125]). This description speaks of the patterning of behaviour, which though it may not be directly associated with a cultus, is essential to man's expression of beliefs, especially within a community experience. This is significant in our work in that we are not addressing all the issues of ritual or ritual language within Romans. For example, we place circumcision in this category. It is ritual activity, but priests and altar were not involved. Strictly speaking, it was not part of the cultic institution. Words that convey cultic ideas are a subset semantically of words which convey ritual ideas.

³Note, for example, these definite uses of cultic language: 1 Cor 3:16-17, 5:7-8, 6:19, 9:13, 10:18; 2 Cor 6:16; Rom 9:4, 11:16, 12:1, 15:16; Phil 2:17, 4:18; Eph 2:21, 5:2. Even if only some texts are considered, which have uses of $\kappa\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha$ and other possible cultic words, the number of relevant texts increases (e.g., 1 Cor 10:16, 11:25; 2 Cor 5:21; Rom 1:9, 3:25, 5:9, 8:3; Col 1:20; Eph 1:7, 2:13). We are not considering in this thesis the general permeation of cultic ideas although this seems likely to us, nor do we consider the uses of prepositions, such as $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$, that may have a cultic aspect to their meaning in certain contexts (e.g., $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ in 1 Thess 5:10; Gal 1:4, 2:20; 1 Cor 11:24, 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14-15 as in 5:21; Rom 5:6-8?, 8:32; Eph 5:25 as in 5:2; Tit 2:14).

⁴The nature of Paul's pre-Christian Judaism is not an easy matter to uncover, despite the glimpses Paul gives us by way of reflection on his past in Judaism (Gal

1:13-14; Rom 11:1; Phil 3:4-6; 1 Tim 1:13), and the evidence of Acts (8:1-4, 9:1-2, 22:3-5, 23:6, 26:4-11 ff., also of interest are statements in 24:14-21). It will not be our purpose to add to the picture of Paul's pre-Christian Judaism, but to note how Paul would seek either to unify or set in opposition the gospel and Judaism with the use of cultic language. Although we would label Paul Pharisaic, we realize that evidence for pre-70 Pharisaism is limited and difficult to assess, not only from the Rabbis, but from other sources. Jacob Neusner, in The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees Before 70: Part III Conclusions (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), speaks of the evidence from the Rabbis as giving "a very sketchy account of the life of Pharisaism during less than the last century of its existence before 70", p. 319. This is clearly not an area of competence for this student, and conclusions in this area will be dependent on the work of others.

⁵1:9 is included here although its cultic significance is particularly suggested in the light of 12:1 and 15:16 which follow it (being a general word for worship). We do not deal extensively with 1:9 (as will be indicated below [note 6]), but the use of *λατρεύω* in 1:9 is significant in the light of our suggestion that there may be a cultic structure or framework to the letter.

⁶Of these texts, Rom 3:25, 8:3, 12:1, and 15:16 receive the most attention. 5:9 is significant primarily in relation to 3:25, and although 11:16 is relevant to our thesis it is studied primarily for the sake of completeness. 1:9 will not receive separate treatment in this study. It will be mentioned in our introductory chapter to the exegeses (Part 2 Chapter 1), and in the section on Romans 15:16 (Part 2 Chapter 7). The prominence of the cultic language in 12:1 and 15:16 is clear, and points by way of contrast to the other texts that we consider. We recognise that one needs to argue for the cultic significance of the language in such texts as 3:25, 5:9, 8:3, and even 11:16.

⁷The sections of our exegesis are: 1) cultic language in the apologetic for the gospel (Part 2 chapters 2-5), 2) cultic language introducing the ethics of the gospel (part 2 chapter 6), and 3) cultic language in the description of the apostolic ministry of the gospel (Part 2 Chapter 7). Heinrich Schlier's study, significant for the structuring of this thesis, is "Die 'Liturgie' des apostolischen Evangeliums (Rom 15, 14-21)" in Martyria, Leiturgia, Diakonia: Festschrift für Hermann Volk (Edited by O. Semmelrath, R. Haubot, K. Rahner [Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1968], 247-259). Schlier views the sacrifice of Christ, the sacrificial service of the gospel, and the obedience of faith as the expression of the grace of God that can be understood sacrificially (p. 256).

PART ONE

AN ASSESSMENT OF CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DISCUSSION OF
PAUL'S USE OF CULTIC LANGUAGE
WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE STUDY OF
CULTIC LANGUAGE IN ROMANS
(1910 TO 1983)

CHAPTER I

FOUNDATIONAL STUDIES IN NEW TESTAMENT CULTIC LANGUAGE:

THE STUDIES OF

OTTO SCHMITZ AND HANS WENSCHKEWITZ

A. Otto Schmitz and the Non-Literal Use of Cultic Language

1. Schmitz's Perspective and Thesis

Otto Schmitz's Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments¹ was intended as a study of comparative religious history, rather than a study in dogmatics.² Schmitz evaluated the uses of sacrificial statements or expressions in the NT,³ primarily concerned with the death of Jesus, against the background of a post-exilic Judaism which had lost the original significance of its traditional cultus along with the naive cultic ideas originally associated with it.⁴ Schmitz's thesis was that the NT on the whole gives evidence of pre-reflective, unsystematic, and non-literal uses of sacrificial language, reflecting a cult-free piety.⁵ This is affirmed in contrast to Judaism, and in opposition to Paul Fiebig's short monograph which suggested that the NT authors viewed the blood of Jesus as sacrificial blood in the most literal sense.⁶ Contrary to Fiebig, Schmitz believed that there was nothing literal in the use of such sacrificial language. It was used to give

expression to a religious experience that had not made subjective-objective distinctions. Sacrificial language was used because cults and cultic ideas were familiar. Such language was used naturally and without reflection in the ancient world.⁷

Paul is central to Schmitz's thesis.⁸ Paul is the supreme example from the NT of one whose religious experience is pre-reflective and intuitive. Paul's uses of sacrificial language are not systematic, literal, or central to his thought, but express part of his religious experience, which is centred around community fellowship with the crucified-risen Christ. Paul's sacrificial language is not used to describe the death of Christ as an objective literal substitutionary sacrifice, but rather it is used to express the experience of salvation through the crucified-risen mediator between God and man.

2. Schmitz's Description of Paul's Use of Cultic Language

Schmitz's discussion of Pauline sacrificial language begins with the Lord's supper (1 Cor 11:23-25). Schmitz views ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι in 1 Cor 11:25 as indicative of the death of Christ, in parallel with the blood of the covenant-establishing sacrifice in Exodus 24. The death of Christ establishes the community of Christ, a fellowship that can be designated as "Blutsgemeinschaft".⁹ Schmitz integrates this concept with the perspective of G. A. Deissmann concerning the community's fellowship with the risen Christ.¹⁰ He does this by arguing that Paul draws no real distinction between the Christ of history and the risen Lord (Rom 6:8, Phil 2:7, 1 Cor 1:22, Gal 2:20).¹¹ For Schmitz, ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι is a

substitute expression for the exalted Christ in his characteristic state as the crucified one.¹² Thus, fellowship is identified with the risen Christ, whose death was sacrificial in the sense that it established or ratified a covenant.

Schmitz argues similarly in his discussion of 1 Cor 10:16-20. Fellowship with $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ and $\sigma\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\mu\alpha$ are concrete expressions for fellowship with the exalted Christ who was crucified. The sacrificial aspect of $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ is at the level of tertium comparationis. In this context the term "tertium comparationis" is used to suggest that $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ is a symbol of the crucified-exalted Christ, a symbol used because the blood of Christ's crucifixion has sacrificial connotations.¹³

This interpretation of $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ is continued in Schmitz's discussion of Rom 3:25 and 5:9. There is no question about the sacrificial connotations of these texts, but the sacrificial ideas are one step removed (as a tertium comparationis). The idea of communion with the crucified-exalted Christ, whose death is figuratively referred to by $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$, is emphasized.¹⁴

After discussing three other $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ texts,¹⁵ Schmitz summarizes his understanding of $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$. Although $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ does connote "the completely general idea of the working of atonement", this is so because of its role as a concrete designation for the exalted Christ.¹⁶ In short, despite sacrificial connotations, $\alpha\iota\tilde{\nu}\mu\alpha$ texts do not reveal a realistic understanding of Christ's death as a sacrifice, nor do they intentionally compare Christ's death to sacrifice.¹⁷ Schmitz argues similarly concerning

1 Cor 5:7 and Eph. 5:2.¹⁸ Both texts lack vicarious sacrificial thought. They are not formally allegorical, and contain only casual comparisons with sacrificial connotations at the level of the tertium comparationis.

Schmitz's conclusion, that sacrifice is not central to Paul's piety or thought,¹⁹ is affirmed because of the very scarcity of evidence that sacrifice was central to Paul's thought or was significant in Paul's pre-Christian Judaism.²⁰ (This is affirmed against the emphasis on sacrifice in Paul's thought presented by A. Ritschl and H. J. Holtzmann.)²¹ Paul's few symbolic uses of sacrificial language to characterize the death of Christ are not of primary importance, and his uses of sacrificial language to refer to himself and his ministry argue against the centrality of sacrifice in Paul's thought (Phil 2:17, 2 Tim 4:6, Rom 15:16).²² These latter texts illustrate the diversity and casualness of Paul's use of sacrificial language, along with Phil 4:18 and Rom 12:1.²³ Schmitz briefly concludes his treatment of Paul by referring to other texts that have cultic associations, and he mentions the possible importance of ideas connected with $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ as $\nu\alpha\omicron\varsigma$.²⁴

3. Evaluation²⁵

There are certain aspects of Schmitz's work that seem valid. First, his emphasis on the familiarity of cultic practice and ideas, especially after the exile and through the NT era, seems fair in view of his compilation of numerous uses of cultic language. Secondly, the importance he gives to the diversity of use of such language is well supported. Thirdly, Schmitz's denial of the literal

mechanistic interpretation of blood, and his criticism of Paul Fiebig's division drawn between cultic and ethical seem well supported by the thorough presentation of evidence throughout his study.²⁶ Lastly, Schmitz's suggestion that sacrificial language is transferred to and affirms the death of Jesus as being the death of the mediator between God and man, especially in a judgment-grace context, seems a valuable alternative to Fiebig's position, at least as a statement of general perspective. These aspects of Schmitz's argument, which are supported by the evidence from Paul's letters, are helpful for further study. This is so, even if one finds it misleading that Schmitz's thesis centred on the significant lack of emphasis on sacrificial thought in "late Judaism" and the NT, and even if one finds it unhelpful that Schmitz is primarily concerned to deny the clear expression of vicarious and substitutionary sacrificial thought in "late Judaism" and the NT. These conclusions were stated against systematic studies that highlighted sacrifice, and against a literal and mechanical view of substitutionary sacrifice, while they supported Schmitz's somewhat evaluative perspective on the pre-reflective intuitive nature of NT religion. Thus, these conclusions are limited in their relevance, and need qualification on account of a number of weaknesses in Schmitz's argument, weaknesses we now consider.

(1) Schmitz's uniform understanding of $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ texts seems forced. Our concern here is not primarily with Schmitz's understanding of $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ in 1 Cor 11:23-25 or 1 Cor 10:16-20, but the way he transfers meaning from

these texts to other texts. A move from pastoral teaching concerning the Corinthians and their celebration of the Lord's supper (1 Cor 10:16-20, 11:23-25) to gospel apologetic (Rom 3:25, 5:9) needs to be done carefully.²⁷ The idea that $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ has taken on the specific nuance that Schmitz suggests, and that this is transferred from text to text without change of nuance seems to put too much stress on the quasi-technical role of the word $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$. Schmitz's uniform understanding of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ as a substitute word for the crucified-exalted Christ has hindered his appreciation of the diversity of texts, which does not allow for the continuous meaning of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ that Schmitz's suggests. In such texts as Rom 3:25 and 5:9 one should allow for a different emphasis than in 1 Cor 10:16-20, and one even needs to be cautious when viewing together 1 Cor 10:16-20 and 1 Cor 11:23-25, because of the change in subject matter within the letter and the obvious presentation of traditional material in 1 Cor 11:23-25. Furthermore, Schmitz's concern to erase any objective-subjective dichotomy in NT religious experience has led him to de-emphasize the correlation between the sacrificial flavour of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ and the objective death of Christ. One need not assume, however, that there was a lack of understanding concerning an objective salvation act, even if present religious experience in the NT is mystical in some respects. Thus at times the sacrificial connotations of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ may be significant in pointing to an understanding of that objective death of Jesus.

(2) Schmitz's appeal to the tertium comparationis is too mechanical; it leaves connotations and

metaphorical descriptions as incidental to a text. (For our understanding of "metaphor" and "metaphorical" see excursus 1 at the end of the chapter). Schmitz is often satisfied to leave sacrificial ideas in the background, because they are not the emphasis of a text (e. g., Rom 3:25, 5:9, 8:3; 1 Cor 5:7; Eph 5:2). However, as I. A. Richards has stated, "vehicle and tenor in co-operation give a meaning of more varied powers than can be ascribed to either".²⁸ Even if sacrificial connotations are described as one step removed in the "vehicle" used, this still may affect what the author intended to convey, and therefore needs to be emphasized.

(3) Schmitz's discussion of sacrificial language that does not refer to the death of Christ primarily functions to prove the lack of importance of sacrificial language that does refer to the death of Christ. This discussion also supports his view concerning the lack of vicarious sacrificial thought in Paul. We would suggest, though, that such texts as Phil 2:17, 4:18, and Rom 12:1, and 15:16 need not de-emphasize the significance of the description of Jesus' death in sacrificial language. The availability, familiarity, and diverse use of cultic language does not necessarily contribute to this aspect of Schmitz's argument. Furthermore, a treatment of these texts that regarded the cultic language within them as more significant would have helped to present a clearer picture of Paul's use of cultic language.²⁹

(4) Schmitz's appeal to the scarcity of symbolic or metaphorical uses of sacrificial language needs to be questioned. He seems to deny the centrality of sacrifice

on quantitative grounds, which is joined to his denial of sacrifice's importance on systematic or theological grounds. Certainly Paul has a variety of images, metaphors, and language worlds that he uses. Cultic language is not always prominent. Even so, what one needs to assess is what type of language Paul uses when he is expressing central concerns, or when he structures his argument. This assessment is more important than quantitative counts alone. We will be suggesting below that Romans illustrates the importance of cultic language for what Paul is seeking to communicate in that letter. A thorough study would then need to place Romans alongside other Pauline letters to make a thorough comparison and contrast.

(5) Lastly, Schmitz's argument concerning the lack of evidence that Paul was concerned with the cult in his pre-Christian life is forced. Not only is this a dangerous argument from silence, Romans 9:4 may suggest the contrary. Even if the cult was viewed within the context of Torah-obedience, and was distant to many Jews, this does not mean that the cult was of little importance to the racial identity and religious life and understanding of first-century Judaism (as a whole).

4. Conclusion

The narrowness of Schmitz's thesis hindered his assessment of the data, and left many questions unanswered. His denial of a literal interpretation of the blood of Jesus as part of the mechanism of a vicarious substitutionary sacrificial death has left much of the vast amount of material compiled without intrinsic

significance.³⁰ Its main function was to argue for this significant but narrowly conceived thesis. Schmitz is important for our study in that he does indicate the need to recognise the non-literal aspect of the use of much cultic language. In that sense Schmitz's study is foundational for future study, including Hans Wenschkewitz's significant study that we will consider next. At the same time, his study indicates that a more careful assessment of the non-literal use and nature of cultic language was needed. It was not adequate to deny a mechanical literalism and to leave numerous uses of cultic language under the label of the expression of intuitive religious experience.³¹

B. Hans Wenschkewitz and the "Spiritualization"
of the Cult

1. Wenschkewitz's Perspective and Thesis

Hans Wenschkewitz's "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester, und Opfer im Neuen Testament" is a thorough study of the uses of cultic language in the NT.³² Wenschkewitz's concern was to trace the spiritualization of the cult in the NT as it was affected by its environment, including early Judaism ("late Judaism" is Wenschkewitz's term), Hellenistic Judaism, the Stoa, and Rabbinica. (For a discussion of the term "spiritualization" see Excursus 2 of this chapter). Wenschkewitz emphasized both the unique elements within the writings of various NT authors, and those elements that stem from Jesus and flow through each strand of the NT material.

Wenschkewitz's work presents numerous conclusions

concerning the NT data. We will restrict our focus to his thesis concerning Paul. Paul spiritualized the cult for Christianity;³³ he did not originate the process, nor much of the content, but he made a clear formulation of the spiritualized cult. This transferred use of cultic words is expressed most clearly in *λογικὴ λατρεία*, which conceptually expresses three things: (1) "the sacrifice of Christ is the last sacrifice in the cultic sense"; (2) there is no temple in Christianity, for the community is the temple by means of the Spirit's presence; (3) there is no more priesthood, but each person is a priest who can bring himself to God as a sacrifice.³⁴ Paul is a witness to the movement of Christianity into the Greek world, adopting Greek thought, and adapting it.

Wenschkewitz is careful in his assessment of Paul's use of cultic language. Paul's use of sacrificial ideas to explain the death of Christ is not an innovation, but a continuation of Christian tradition. Paul's spiritualization of temple and sacrifice in general does have a Greek element, probably stoic, mediated to Paul through mystic influences.³⁵ This spiritualization however was modified in a Jewish and particularly Christian way. The two primary evidences of this are the high estimation of corporeality and the application of the temple concept or idea to the church.³⁶ Wenschkewitz sees Paul's description of his apostolic role in priestly terms as Pauline, thus not directly dependent on any source.³⁷ Therefore, Paul's adapting and creativity is emphasized as much as his adopting of particular uses of cultic language.

Wenschkewitz suggests that although the early

Palestinian church may have experienced tension in its relation to the cultus, Paul caught hold of the gospel's challenge to the cultus and expressed it in opposition to the Judaizers.³⁸ Paul spiritualized the cultus in a Gentile environment. On the general level, spiritualization of the cult served two needs in the churches of the NT period. First, it satisfied the need of Christian piety.³⁹ Secondly, the spiritualization of the cult served the apologetic need of clarifying the nature of early Christianity; it was a religion without any temple, priesthood, or sacrifice, a phenomenon that needed explanation and defence in the Gentile world.⁴⁰

2. Wenschkewitz's Description of Paul's Use of Cultic Language

Wenschkewitz begins by noting Paul's background as a Jew who worshipped at the Temple,⁴¹ and then discusses Paul's temple language.⁴² The latter is not tied to Jesus, but is a result of Paul's own Christ and Spirit mysticism.⁴³ Although the temple spiritualization has similarities with Philo and the Stoa, Paul breaks with them in his concept of temple as community,⁴⁴ since their notions were individualistic.

Wenschkewitz's discussion of the concept of sacrifice in Paul is treated under two categories: (1) in reference to Christ, and (2) in general form.⁴⁵ The first two texts dealt with under (1) are 1 Cor 5:7, and Rom 8:3, which are handled similarly to Otto Schmitz's treatment.⁴⁶ His main focus under (1) is Rom 3:24-25. Here he stresses both the subjective (*διὰ πίστεως*), and the objective (*ἱλαστήριον*) aspects of the atonement.⁴⁷ Rom 5:9 is seen as having a

sacrificial meaning as do numerous other texts.⁴⁸

Wenschkewitz treats as important the use of ὑπέρ in relation to the death of Christ,⁴⁹ although the ὑπέρ (possibly) (παράδωκε) construction has sacrificial connotations that are of secondary significance. Then he considers the Lord's supper passages, suggesting their secondary place in Paul's thought, having similarities to realistic and mystical sacramental thought of the time.⁵⁰ He makes clear his disagreement with Schmitz at this point, stating that a text such as Rom 3:25 should be the starting point for discussion of Pauline cultic language, and not the Lord's supper.⁵¹ Wenschkewitz concludes that sacrificial thought is central in Paul's explanation of the death of Christ, but not sufficient since Paul uses various other images.⁵² Paul is not the originator of such usage of cultic language. It is already traditional, and this helps to explain why sacrificial thought is often close at hand in Paul's teaching.⁵³

Wenschkewitz then discusses category (2), the general use of sacrificial thought. Rom 12:1-2 closely parallels Hellenistic and especially Philonic thought.⁵⁴ At the same time, the concept in the text is not derived from the Old Testament (OT), or early Judaism, nor is it part of Paul's temple language. The phrase λογικὴ λατρεία is central to the text, which speaks of an offering and the priest at the same time.⁵⁵ It is Paul's particular concept in the use of λογικὴ λατρεία and his positive use of σῶμα that are distinctive, as can be seen in comparison to Epictetus's negative use of σωματίον, and Philo's emphasis on the mind. Another distinctive aspect of

Paul's thought is seen in Phil 2:17 and Rom 15:15-16, where apostleship is described cultically.⁵⁶ This is significant, since Wenschkewitz designates so much of Paul's material as either traditional, or having a strong Hellenistic flavour. Lastly, Wenschkewitz notes the Rabbinic flavour of Phil 4:18-19, but suggests that this is not crucial to Paul's thought in general.⁵⁷

3. Evaluation

Wenschkewitz moved beyond the concern of Schmitz, and addressed more adequately the uses of cultic language in the NT. His emphasis on the Hellenistic background of spiritualization may have been assisted by an "anti-material bias" as R. J. Daly has suggested,⁵⁸ although it seems adequate to see this as a matter of emphasis.⁵⁹ He does allow for the influence of various sources on Paul's use of cultic language. In this respect, Wenschkewitz's work is more helpful than Schmitz's in suggesting the origins of and various influences upon Paul's use of cultic language. By doing this, Wenschkewitz more clearly shows the distinctiveness of the transference of the cultic language to the work of Christ, while revealing parallels, dependency, and uniqueness in other aspects of the use of cultic language. Wenschkewitz's idea that the use of cultic language within Christian thought satisfied the needs of piety is probably valid, but this should be seen as a natural development (Schmitz), within which there may be examples of programmatic or polemical texts. Wenschkewitz's suggestion concerning the apologetic strength of this spiritualization will be considered below when we assess C. F. D. Moule's more specific presentation

of this idea.⁶⁰

It is questionable that λογικὴ λατρεία means all that Wenschkewitz suggests that it means,⁶¹ when it is used in Rom 12:1.⁶² Wenschkewitz brings together various points concerning the spiritualization of the cult in Paul with the help of the phrase λογικὴ λατρεία. As soon as a Pauline phrase is extracted from its context, and used as a comprehensive label (in this case for the spiritualization of the cult) then the danger is that we lose sight of Paul's emphasis in the text. It does not seem that Paul used λογικὴ λατρεία with all of his cultic thought in mind. There is no proof in Wenschkewitz's work that Paul consciously brought together his cultic concepts at this point.⁶³ When one keeps in mind Wenschkewitz's analysis of Paul's use of tradition, his adapting of Hellenistic thought, and his own unique expressions, which all contribute to the picture of Paul's spiritualization of cultic concepts, the likelihood is that such a spiritualization was not a unified effort or process. Therefore, the burden of proof is on those that would seek to unify various uses of cultic language. If one wanted to consider the possibility of a comprehensive Pauline spiritualization of cultic ideas, this would need to be seen as Paul's intention or at least consistent with Paul's intention in a particular text, argument or correspondence. It is best if one can see a structure of argument or presentation that will allow for the legitimate joining of cultic images, rather than just putting diverse texts together. This, Wenschkewitz does not do, despite the value of his work.

Wenschkewitz's historical reconstruction is cautious, and allows for Paul's place in a development that ended after his time in a complete break with the Jerusalem Temple.⁶⁴ The suggestion that the early Palestinian church remained bound to the Law and Temple may be too general, and an overstatement, but we recognise that the burden of proof is on those who would suggest otherwise. Wenschkewitz's suggestion is that the earliest church did not work out the implications of the death of Jesus in a way that necessitated a break with the cultus. There may have been little commitment to the cultus, as can be seen already by the apostolic decree, but it is principally by Paul that freedom from the cultus was explicated. It took a specific polemical situation, the challenge of the Judaizers, to bring this to expression, but even so Paul does not reject the Law or Temple by arguing for the sacrificial nature of the death of Christ. In relation to this issue, Wenschkewitz stresses that Paul's cultic language occurred within a Gentile setting. Thus, Paul's transference of temple and cultic ideas to the church is not to be equated with Stephen's anti-Temple polemic in Acts 7, the meaning of which Wenschkewitz believes is unresolved.⁶⁵ In principle, Paul's spiritualization moves beyond the statements in Stephen's speech. Paul's development, though, is not polemical in the same way, since it took place in the Gentile world. It is to Wenschkewitz's credit that he attempted to present a historical picture of the break with the cult, rather than a theological one. Also, he rightly focused on the atonement in relation to this issue, and did not over-interpret other

non-literal uses of cultic language.

A question remaining from Wenschkewitz's work is that if Paul does use traditional material, especially concerning the death of Christ, may this material have been formulated outside of Paul's conflict with the Judaizers, if indeed this is the impetus behind Paul's usage?⁶⁶ The implications of such traditional material need to be considered further, and why Paul used the material he did.

In general, Paul presented a cult-free gospel to the Gentiles, while not insisting on the rejection of the Law and cult by Jews. Paul himself was involved in cultic practice, and did not challenge it directly in Jewish contexts.⁶⁷ Thus, Paul did use cultic language in a spiritualized way, although it is not entirely clear how this challenged the cultus, if it did at all. Few would question this general picture, and the ambiguities that Wenschkewitz was content to leave in the historical picture are still with us, needing further consideration. This remains the starting point for further discussion concerning Paul and the cult.

4. Conclusion

Wenschkewitz set the stage for the further study of NT cultic language. He addressed historical and theological questions that continued to be of significance in subsequent studies. This was true, specifically, for his study of Paul. He placed Paul within a historical framework, noting the early churches' relationships to Temple, Law, and Judaism. At the same time, Wenschkewitz's sought to indicate the centrality of sacrifice to Paul's thought (theology).

Our division between history and theology is artificial, but it will be helpful to retain it for the presentation of subsequent studies. We will consider, firstly, the possibility of gaining information concerning Paul's attitude towards the Jewish cultus from his use of cultic language (which we are viewing as a historical issue because of its implications).⁶⁸ Then we will consider, secondly, attempts to deal with the place of cultic language within Paul's thought, especially studies concerned with sacrificial or cultic aspects of Paul's theology (which we are viewing as a theological issue because of its implications).⁶⁹ This survey will function further to illustrate the need for the exegeses that follow, providing issues for exegesis of cultic texts in Romans.

Excursus 1: Metaphor and Metaphorical

Our understanding of metaphor is an eclectic one that begins with Aristotle's "general definition that, 'metaphor is the application to one thing of the name belonging to another thing'".⁷⁰ G. B. Caird speaks of metaphor as an implicit comparison,⁷¹ and as "a means of proceeding from the known to the unknown".⁷² Metaphor provides "a means of extending language beyond its accustomed tracks"⁷³ and indeed may be recognised by the tension thus produced. The nature of this tension has been the source of much discussion, especially concerning the new meaning that is created or produced.⁷⁴ The important point is that in the comparison implicit in the metaphor there is expressed a new meaning that is more

than the sum of its parts.

We speak of metaphor and metaphorical language when the language used seems to involve semantic tension; when a "vehicle" and "tenor" are in use.⁷⁵ The naming or describing of something (vehicle) by means of viewing that something in relation to something else (tenor) with which it is not usually or actually associated causes this semantic tension. Consequently, metaphor "raises the potential for new meaning",⁷⁶ and "is a means of modifying the tradition".⁷⁷ Such language provides a new way of looking at something because of the implicit image used, or implicit comparison. Therefore one needs to distinguish between 'metaphorical language' and language that is completely traditional (what Owen Barfield calls "altered literal meaning").⁷⁸ It may be that Paul adopts traditional language or uses language that is not strictly speaking metaphorical, but through creative adapting or his particular emphasis the language may have a metaphorical quality. This may be the case especially when God is spoken of, or the role of Christ. Furthermore, even if an explicit metaphor is not presented or developed, it may be helpful to note metaphorical aspects of the language used.

H. W. Attridge, presenting descriptive categories for cultic language, speaks (secondly) of the "metaphorical application of cultic terms to non-cultic activity".⁷⁹ In this case, non-cultic activity, people or objects are described in a cultic way. The cultic language has a vehicle role in such a situation. This is a use of cultic language that we will see in Romans. This differs

from what Attridge terms the "symbolic interpretations of traditional cult", since in the latter case the cult is actually being talked about and has more than a vehicle role.⁸⁰ (As far as we can tell Paul does not present any 'symbolic interpretations of traditional cult' in Romans.) Attridge uses another category which is slightly different from the "metaphorical application of cultic terms to non-cultic activity" (p. 147), which we mention to note a matter of distinction. This category, his third, is "the application of cultic terms to non-traditional ritual activity".⁸¹ Here the cultic term is used in another ritual context, which may provide a different vehicle-tenor relationship than when cultic language is used in conjunction with clearly non-cultic, non-ritual activity. Such distinctions will have to be brought out in the exegesis of individual texts, since any further clarification will depend upon the actual words and sentences.

Excursus 2: Spiritualization and Interiorization

The word 'spiritualization' has often been used in the discussion of NT cultic language, especially because of Hans Wenschkewitz's "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament". Wenschkewitz prefers Spiritualisierung to the more evaluative word Vergeistigung.⁸² From Wenschkewitz's introduction it is clear that Spiritualisierung is a broad term, which includes a reflective and a naive sort of spiritualization.⁸³ Thus, the idea of spiritualization as Wenschkewitz used it and as is commonly used is a broad phenomenon, and inclusive of many differing uses of cultic

language.

H. J. Hermisson indicates that his study of the spiritualization of the cult in the OT, which centres on the loosening of cultic language and ideas from the cult phenomenon itself, involves more than the study of the transferred use of cultic words.⁸⁴ Hermisson states that he needs to speak generally on occasions when he refers to a spiritualization of the cultus.⁸⁵ This seems to be the case because he recognises that broader historical concerns are included within such a concept as the spiritualization of the cultus and the phenomena it often refers to. One needs, therefore, to be careful when evaluating linguistic evidence in relation to the idea of the spiritualization of the cult, since the linguistic evidence is part of broader phenomena. It seems to be in the very nature of cultic activity and language (not to mention rituals and associated language) that there is a permeating of other aspects of worship and life with cultic words and concepts. Thus there is what might be called a "tendency towards spiritualizing", which has been viewed as "independent of historical conditions".⁸⁶ The dividing lines between (1) the natural extension of language, (2) a tendency towards spiritualization that may be common to much religious experience, and (3) specific historical events and persons that affect change in religious ideas and practices are hard to draw. The concept of the spiritualization, which can be invoked in relation to these different phenomena mentioned above, needs further clarification when reference is made to the use of language.⁸⁷ In short, we are saying that the term

'spiritualization' is not a particularly helpful one for describing the use of cultic language, except when speaking of the non-literal use of cultic language in the broadest sense. R. J. Daly states that 'spiritualization' is a "term so open to different and even opposing meanings that it can hardly be defined adequately, let alone be represented by a few synonyms".⁸⁸ When the word is used in this thesis without qualification, it will be used in the most general sense of the phenomenon of cultic language being used in non-literal ways.

Another term that is used in the discussion of ritual and cultic language is "interiorization".⁸⁹ It is a term, generally speaking, that will not be used in this thesis, but it deserves to be mentioned because of what it seeks to describe. It involves the new application of language of symbolic behaviour or ritual (sacrifice) without assuming the rejection or denial of the origin of the transferred symbolism. The emphasis is on the personal inner appropriation of such symbols, and in this sense traditional or older ritual practice is substituted for, through and in personal experience.

Examples of interiorization can be seen in the experience of disciplines in religious asceticism, when such disciplines are expressed in sacrificial or cultic language. Mircea Eliade says, concerning Yoga and asceticism, that "physiological functions take the place of libations and ritual objects", and in this sense there is an "inner sacrifice".⁹⁰ There is in such cases the interiorization of symbolism, indeed the interiorization of the meaning of an outward cultic ritual. The

interiorization of a symbol does not ruin or discredit it, but continues "it in a new way".⁹¹ An explicit case of the interiorization of 'sacrifice' is referred to by R. D. Hecht in reference to b. Ber. 17a; R. Shesheth's closing prayer of his fast equates the fast with sacrifice: "may it be thy will to account my fat and blood which have been diminished as if I had offered them before Thee on the altar, and do Thou favour me".⁹² Hecht suggests that such interiorization takes place because of historical events, such as the destruction of the Jewish cultus in Jerusalem, or through "the critique of sacrifice itself".⁹³ Substitutions for sacrifice are experienced "through other forms of symbolic behaviour", which take on sacrificial symbolism.⁹⁴ Thus, although there is continuity with sacrificial ideas expressed in such a use of language, there is also a definite change in the actual referents of the sacrificial language to internal and personal bodily matters.

Like spiritualization, interiorization is a difficult word to use in describing language uses. Although certain Pauline uses of cultic language in Romans may suggest interiorization (esp. Rom 12:1-2, also 1:9), these need further description in terms of the nature of Paul's self-description and the nature of Paul's community exhortation. Therefore, "interiorization" is not in and of itself a helpful term to use concerning these Pauline uses of cultic language.⁹⁵ We will avoid using the term in general, although the concept is a significant one to keep in mind.

Footnotes

¹The full title of Otto Schmitz's work is: Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments: Eine Untersuchung ihres geschichtlichen Verhältnisses (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1910). Originally it was the author's thesis, Berlin, 1908.

²Ibid., p. 2.

³Schmitz uses the term Opferaussagen, which can be translated in various ways: sacrificial statements, assertions, expressions. Because it is a general term, reflecting a variety of possible meanings, we will speak of "sacrificial language" as being roughly equivalent to what Schmitz means by Opferaussagen.

⁴For Schmitz's conclusions on "late Judaism" or post-exilic Judaism, see Die Opferanschauung, pp. 189-193.

⁵Ibid., pp. 300-318 for conclusion. Schmitz does see a tendency towards more "realistic" and reflective uses of sacrificial language in Hebrews (pp. 316-318). It is unlikely that the break with the cultus and cultic thought was as clear as Schmitz suggests (pp. 300-301).

⁶Paul W. J. Fiebig, Jesu Blut ein Geheimnis?, Vol. 14 of Die Lebensfragen 28 Vols., edited by H. Weinel (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1904-1920), Vol. 14 published in 1906. Fiebig argued that the NT understanding of the blood of Jesus was that it was functionally and literally sacrificial blood (pp. 51-59). Fiebig viewed this understanding as inadequate for his own day, and preferred an exemplary understanding of Jesus' death (pp. 60-77).

⁷Otto Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, conclusion is on pp. 301-318. Argument against Fiebig is on pp. 303-314.

⁸Ibid., pp. 213-235. One can see from the conclusion how central Paul is to Schmitz's thesis (pp. 301-318).

⁹Ibid., p. 214.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 214-215 especially, but this influences his whole discussion of $\alpha\iota\tau\alpha$ texts (pp. 213-227). He is mainly dependent on G. A. Deissmann, Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu" (Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892).

¹¹Otto Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 214-215.

¹²Ibid., p. 215.

¹³Ibid., pp. 216-220. In this section, Schmitz is challenging Wilhelm Heitmüller's realistic interpretation of communion with the deity, found in Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus: Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903).

¹⁴Otto Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 220-224. It is interesting to see the difference between Schmitz's perspective, and that of Eugenius Krol in "De sacrificiis Iudaicis quid senserit S. Paulus", Verbum Domini 14 (1934), 296-305, (p. 305). Whereas Schmitz distinguishes the sacrificial from mystical union, Krol sees union and covenant ideas as central to Paul's use of sacrificial language. It is no wonder then that Krol views the sacrifice of the cross as central to Paul's thought, whereas Schmitz de-emphasizes the role of sacrifice, preferring the concept of fellowship with the crucified-exalted Christ.

¹⁵Otto Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 224-226; Eph 2:13, 1:7; Col 1:20. These texts, and others with , are referred to by Schmitz as "Blutstellen".

¹⁶Ibid., p. 226.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 226, "absichtliche Vergleichung".

¹⁸Ibid., pp. 227-228. Rom 8:3 is not considered as significant, since Schmitz does not think that "sin-offering" is referred to.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 229.

²⁰This is logical for Schmitz in light of his conclusions concerning post-exilic Judaism, which are that the cultus lost its central place in the religion, and that cultic ideas were not central to the religious experience of Judaism.

²¹Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung., pp. 229-230. See Albrecht Ritschl, Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung 3 Vols. (Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1874), vol. 2, pp. 215-231, and Heinrich Julius Holtzmann, Lehrbuch der Neutestament Theologie 2 Vols. (Freiburg/Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1897), vol. 2, pp. 102-104.

²²Otto Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 231-233.

²³Ibid., pp. 233-235.

²⁴Ibid., p. 235; texts mentioned are Phil 2:15, 3:3; Rom 8:23, 11:26 (undoubtedly meaning 11:16), 16:5; 1 Cor 15:20, 16:15; 2 Thess 2:13. $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ as $\nu\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ is referred to in 2 Cor 6:16 and 1 Cor 6:19.

²⁵Schmitz's preference for primitiveness in religious experience ensures negative assessment of "late Judaism" and the "post-New Testament" early church. This perspective hindered an unbiased assessment of the evidence, since both phenomena reflected a type of piety with an internal contradiction. These are major factors that one must keep in mind when evaluating Schmitz's total contribution. Our concern here is to focus on his description of Paul's use of cultic language,

and we will only deal with the broader issues as they are relevant. For Schmitz's perspective on "late Judaism" and sacrifice see Die Opferanschauung, pp. 189-195.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 306-311.

²⁷Hans Wenschkewitz saw Schmitz's movement from the Lord's supper to other passages as a methodological error; "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament", Angelos 4 (Leipzig, 1932), 6-166 (p. 123). Our concern is not so much with Schmitz's starting place as with his transference of meaning from text to text. In fact, we do not agree with his specific development of the "Blutsgemeinschaft" idea even in that context, but that is not our point here.

²⁸Ivor Armstrong Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric (London: OUP, 1936), p. 100. See excursus 1 of this chapter for further discussion of metaphor, pp. 25-27.

²⁹Note that Schmitz deals with a number of these texts after he has stated his conclusion, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 231-235. Although he treats such texts at length, he only considers them as important witnesses to Paul's casual use of the language, further revealing the lack of centrality of sacrifice in Paul's thought.

³⁰Ibid., p. 231.

³¹Schmitz's study is still among the most thorough of its kind.

³²Robert J. Daly speaks of it as "the very work still regarded by most as the authoritative study of the concept"; the concept being spiritualization, the spiritualization specifically of the cult (The Origin of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice [London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd, 1978], p. 8).

³³It is left to Hebrews to describe the work of Christ explicitly in terms of priesthood, something Paul did not do; "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 130-131.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 130-131. Wenschkewitz's distinction between the sacrifice of Christ and that of the Christian is similar to that made by Eberhard Jüngel in "The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ as sacramentum et exemplum", Diakonie Sondernummer 5 (Mai 1981), 7-21 (p. 14). "The category of the offering with the death offering of Jesus Christ has lost its cultic place in life. The term sacrifice becomes a metaphor". Jungel continues, "the term sacrifice in its metaphorical sense, and with it the whole terminology is very useful for distinguishing the Christian life". Jungel's "metaphorical sense" is not far from Wenschkewitz's perspective on the spiritualization of the Christian's sacrifice in light of the sacrifice of Christ.

³⁵Hans Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 130.

What this could mean is another matter.

³⁶Ibid., p. 130. ³⁷Ibid., p. 130.

³⁸Ibid., p. 163.

³⁹Ibid., p. 164. This is stated generally, and does not reflect the need for extensive allegorical or complicated interpretations of the cult in Christian terms.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 164. This suggestion is taken further and in a different direction by C. F. D. Moule in "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament", JTS NS 1 (1950) 29-41.

⁴¹Hans Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 110-111.

⁴²Where Schmitz finishes without much comment, $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ as $\nu\lambda\omicron\varsigma$, Wenschkewitz begins.

⁴³Ibid., p. 115.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 112. The lack of Qumranic material at the time of writing dates this part of the work, although his conclusions may stand.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 116. ⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 116-118.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 119. Something we will note, although we will stress different implications.

⁴⁸Ibid., Rom 5:9, p. 119; Col 1:20, pp. 119-120; Eph 1:7, p. 120; Eph 2:13, pp. 120-121; Acts 20:28, p. 121; 1 Cor 11:25 f., 1 Cor 10:16, pp. 121-123.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 124; e.g., Rom 4:25, 5:6,8, 8:32, 14:15; 2 Cor 5:14,15,21; Gal 1:4, 2:20; Eph 5:25; 1 Thess 5:10.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 122. ⁵¹Ibid., p. 123.

⁵²Ibid., pp. 124-125; other images used include ransom (Gal 3:13, 4:5; 1 Cor 6:20, 7:23), uses of $\alpha\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, reconciliation (2 Cor 5:18-20; Rom 5:10; Col 1:20-23; Eph 2:16), agreement of peace (Eph 2:15), and eradication of enmity (Eph 2:16), and the mystery religions concept of dying and rising with Christ, Rom 6:4 ff., 2 Cor 6:4.

⁵³Ibid., p. 125. ⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 125-127.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 127, n. 4. ⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 127-129.

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 129-130.

⁵⁸Daly, Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 8.

⁵⁹Hans-Jürgen Hermisson has sought to trace the spiritualization of cultic ideas in the OT in Sprache und Ritus im Altisraelitischen Kult: Zur "Spiritualisierung"

der Kultusbegriffe im Alten Testament, WMZANT 19, (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965).

⁶⁰Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice".

⁶¹Hans Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 130-131.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 125-127 where Wenschkewitz deals with Rom 12:1.

⁶³Rom 12:1 often and understandably becomes the centre of discussion concerning Christian sacrifice, as will be shown below. An example of this, in a study that parades texts and is primarily descriptive, is the statement of Everett Ferguson, "Rom 12.1 catches up and unites all of these ideas and serves as the most comprehensive and challenging statement of the Christian conception of sacrifice", in "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment", Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung: II. Principat, vol. 23, part 2, Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Verhältnis zu Römischen Staat und Heidnischer Religion [Forts.]), ed. Wolfgang Haase, (Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1980), 1151-1189 (p. 1165).

⁶⁴Hans Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 163.

⁶⁵Alan Cole, speaking of "the Seven", suggests that "individuals" within the early church "seemed to have grasped" some of the implications of Jesus' suggestive actions and words concerning the Temple that would later lead to a break with Temple and Judaism. The church as a whole, though, did not seek or welcome such a break in the earliest period; The New Temple: A Study of the Origins of the Catechetical 'Form' of the Church in the New Testament, Tyndale monographs, (London: Tyndale Press, 1950), p. 30.

⁶⁶Rom 3:25 is crucial in this respect, and the discussion of the possible meanings of pre-Pauline tradition is extensive.

⁶⁷Hans Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 110-111. Paul seemed to maintain respect for the cultus, despite the sacrificial death of Christ. This tension is maintained also by Eugenius Krol in "De sacrificiis Iudaicis quid senserit S. Paulus?", p. 305.

⁶⁸We begin with two views of Paul's cultic language which raise questions about the usefulness of Paul's cultic language in assessing his attitude towards the Temple (A). We then present a cautious assessment of Paul's attitude towards the Temple within the broader question of Paul's relationship to Judaism (B). Thirdly, we demonstrate that the question about Paul's attitude towards the Jewish cultus still remains as we present two opposing views on the subject (C). Then we summarize and conclude (D). The survey also proceeds

chronologically.

⁶⁹The discussion of theological questions is divided into two main parts dealing with different aspects of Paul's cultic language: The sacrifice of Christ and the Christian (A), and the priesthood of Paul (B). Questions of methodology are focused on, suggesting the need for the exegetical approach adopted in this study. Then we summarize and conclude. Part (A) proceeds chronologically, but (B) does not follow (A) chronologically. We have ended with (B) because of the specific relevance of Denis and Schlier's work to the thesis of this study. (Paul's use of temple language does not receive special treatment, because Paul does not use Temple language in Romans.) Criticisms offered will seek to present the need for a more thorough study of texts in Romans.

⁷⁰Terence Hawkes, Metaphor (London: Methuen, 1972), p. 7; also Aristotelis; De Arte Poetica Liber, ed. by Rudolf Kassel (Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1965), p. 34 or 1457b (μεταφορὰ δὲ ἔστιν ὀνόματος ἁλλοτρίου ἑπιφορὰ...).

⁷¹Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible, p. 144.

⁷²Ibid., p. 145.

⁷³Anthony C. Thiselton, The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1980), p. 350, commenting on Robert W. Funk's Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God: The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 138-139.

⁷⁴Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric; Philip Wheelwright, Metaphor and Reality (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1962); For survey, see Hawkes, Metaphor; Paul Ricoeur, "The Metaphorical Process", in "Biblical Hermeneutics" Semeia 4 (1975), 75-106, and more recently, The Rule of Metaphor, translated by Robert Czerny with Kathleen McLaughlin and John Costello (London and Henley, 1978), pp. 247-256; Earl R. MacCormac, Metaphor and Myth in Science and Religion (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1976), pp. 72-101; Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible, pp. 144-159.

⁷⁵Richards, The Philosophy of Rhetoric, p. 100.

⁷⁶Funk, Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God, p. 138.

⁷⁷Ibid., p. 139.

⁷⁸Owen Barfield, "The meaning of the word 'Literal'", in Metaphor and Symbol, Proceedings of the twelfth Symposium of the Colston Research Society held in the University of Bristol, March 28th - March 31st, 1960,

edited by L. C. Knights and Basil Cottle (London: Butterworths Scientific Publications, 1960), 48-63, (p. 52); similarly C. S. Lewis, "Bluspels and Flalansferes", in The Importance of Language, ed. by Max Black (Ithica, New York: Cornell University Press, 1969), 36-50.

⁷⁹Harold W. Attridge, "Review of Robert J. Daly's Christian Sacrifice", JBL 100 (1981), 145-147, (p. 147).

⁸⁰Ibid., p. 147. ⁸¹Ibid., p. 147.

⁸²Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 6.

⁸³Ibid., p. 9, "eine reflectierte und eine naive", pp. 6-10.

⁸⁴Hermisson, Sprache und Ritus, pp. 27-28.

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 28.

⁸⁶Gerhardus van der Leeuw, Religion in Essence and Manifestation 2 Vols., translated by J. E. Turner from 2nd edition (Gloucester, Mass: Peter Smith, 1967), Vol 2., p. 570.

⁸⁷Hermisson, Sprache und Ritus, pp. 24-28, 155.

⁸⁸Daly, Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 6, and pp. 6-8 for discussion of spiritualization.

⁸⁹R. D. Hecht, through personal correspondence, has helped immensely in the understanding of interiorization presented here.

⁹⁰Mircea Eliade, Yoga: Immortality and Freedom, translated by William R. Trask (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958), p. 111, also pp. 111-114.

⁹¹Kees Bolle, The Persistence of Religion: An Essay on Tantrism and Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy (Numen suppl. 8, Studies in the History of Religion [Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965]), p. 105.

⁹²Hecht, "Sacrifice, Comparative Study and Interpretation" (Ph. D., University of California at Los Angeles, 1976), p. 110.

⁹³Ibid., p. 110. ⁹⁴Ibid., p. 110.

⁹⁵One may apply the word 'interiorization' to Paul's statements about his libation-like suffering (possibly leading to death?), such as in Phil 2:17 and 2 Tim 4:6. But further description is still necessary, since Paul's sacrifice is not an internal experience as such, and in Phil 2:17 specifically it is part of a broader sacrificial picture.

CHAPTER II

PAUL'S CULTIC LANGUAGE AND THE JEWISH CULTUS: HISTORICAL QUESTIONS¹

A. A Preliminary Concern: the Nature of Paul's Cultic Language

1. Paul's Cultic Language as an Aspect of Early Apologetic: C. F. D. Moule's Thesis and Argument²

a) Moule's thesis and argument

This article presents an explanation for much NT cultic language; there was an apologetic need. Moule suggests, following on from the work of P. Carrington and E. G. Selwyn, that much cultic language in the NT is evidence of the apologetic need to answer the charge of ἰδίοις that may have been offered by Jews and Gentiles.³ Cultic language in other words could be the result of answering questions concerning the absence of Temple, priesthood and sacrifice.⁴

Moule's study centres around particular words: (τόπος), οἶκος, χειροποιήτος, ἀχειροποιήτος, λογικός, πνευματικός, σῶμα, εὐάρεστος, κεινός and derivatives thereof.⁵ The study climaxes with a study of Hebrews, the closest thing in the NT to a catechetical reply to questions concerning the lack of the Temple, priesthood, sacrifice, and circumcision in Christianity.⁶ Moule concludes that there are "reasonable grounds for presuming

a 'sanctuary and sacrifice apologia' as part and parcel of early Christian catechesis".⁷ Moule sees this apologetic as being directed particularly toward Judaism, in view of the earliest struggles and persecutions.

Moule's article adds a specific content to Wenschkewitz's suggestion about the apologetic nature of cultic language. Moule suggests that such an apologia was needed in light of the pressure of Judaism, and out of such a context the "theme of sanctuary and sacrifice" found its place in catechetical form.⁸

b) Moule's subsidiary argument concerning Paul

Within this broader perspective, Moule considers Paul's use of cultic language. He sees a "'sublimation'" of the sacrificial system in a number of places in Paul's writings.⁹ Moule agrees with C. H. Dodd's suggestion,

"that Paul's temperament demanded that he should boast, and that his psychological pilgrimage can be traced in terms of the 'sublimation' of that boast from a selfish or narrowly nationalistic theme until it is a boasting in nothing but Christ and him crucified". (footnote 10)

Moule sees this as paralleled by Paul in his

"'sublimating' the Levitical terms and Judaistic phrases, which had been his former boast, into purely spiritual senses, wholly on the level of personal relationships and volition, in which the supreme sacrifice (as in Hebrews) is the self-oblation of Christ". (footnote 11)

Examples of this are taken from Eph 5:2; 2 Cor 2:15; Phil 4:18, 2:17; Rom 15:16, 1:9; and 2 Tim 4:6. Moule speaks of this as "the language of compensation" coming forth in response to criticism from those who felt Paul had rejected the "ancestral glory of Israel".¹²

c) Evaluation

In Moule's thesis, Hebrews is the climax of the

growth of an 'apologia' concerning sanctuary and sacrifice, an 'apologia' that is part of the growth of early church catechesis. One has to evaluate Moule's thesis by viewing each text containing cultic language against the background of the possible apologetical need and response. This must be done, since although Hebrews may represent the "most stately piece of apologetic", it may not represent the sum of a traceable growing number of parts.¹³ Undoubtedly, Hebrews has an apologetic thrust, and the cultic language within it supports this thrust. One must use care, though, in working backwards from this "climax" through earlier material, and indeed material with differing situations and genre. More precisely, it would be wrong to stress the apologetic and catechetical force of particular uses of cultic language within the NT, unless the text suggests that characteristic for itself. At the same time, apologetic teaching is a broad phenomenon with various provocations or reasons behind it, even within the broad perspective of an early church identifying itself in relation to Judaism. Thus, this general picture, which surely must be appropriate for some uses of cultic language, needs further development at the point of individual texts in differing documents.

Moule views particular words as indicative of this sanctuary and sacrifice apologetic. The most questionable point in this view, and the one that needs more consideration, is in the connecting links between the various significant word groups and the actual unified apologetic theme itself. It is suggested here that Hebrews and sections of 1 Peter may bring together some of these words

within an apologetic-catechetical theme, but thematic links are usually absent within most of the NT documents. Thus, the rationale and apologetic of a document like Hebrews may not represent the best framework for understanding the use of cultic language in some other parts of the NT. We are not saying that Moule has done this for each use of cultic language, but that Moule's perspective should be viewed as an option while individual texts are being considered. Furthermore, if the apologetic perspective seems an appropriate framework, it then needs to be developed more contingently with the situation of the particular text.

Concerning the subsidiary thesis, it is hard to assess the prominence of a personal psychological process when inherited religious language is in use.¹⁴ Again, the need is for detailed consideration of the text in light of the particular situation that is being addressed. Then one can view the way that cultic language, as part of Paul's expression of his Christian thought, presents itself in a particular place.¹⁵ At times, cultic language was used without the need to postulate the idea of language of compensation, unless one means this in the most general sense (e. g., Phil 4:18, 2:17; Eph 5:2 to mention three of the texts Moule suggested).

d) Conclusion

The common element between Moule's catechetical argument, and his discussion about Paul seems to be the apologetical need (personal and corporate) presented by Judaism. In Paul's case, this was something that was experienced on the personal level, and in his call to

address the needs of the churches. Beyond this level, how Paul in fact used early catechesis is not spelled out by Moule, although it can be assumed in general terms from the model of Hebrews, and Paul's own desire to strengthen the church. Both aspects of Moule's thesis, and indeed the way they may be joined together, need to be used with care in further discussion. His suggestions are valuable as exegetical options that have a historical framework in the increasing need for Christian self-definition in the early years. They must not be used, though, to control the understanding of all uses of cultic language by Paul. The suggestion that the historical setting of such language is the struggle with or threat from Judaism and the need for apologetical response should not be made a determinative factor or axiom when considering the meaning and the use of cultic language.

2. Paul's Cultic Language as a Part of the Eschatological Realization of the Cult: Konrad Weiss' Thesis and Argument (footnote 16)

a) Weiss' understanding of Paul's spiritualization of the cult

Weiss differentiates between cultic language and other images or metaphors that Paul used. Paul as priest,¹⁷ community as temple,¹⁸ Christian experience as sacrificial gift¹⁹ are not simple metaphors, but contain a concrete reference that has been spiritualized.²⁰ This spiritualization has to do with more than the separation of the inner reality of cultic practice from the concrete and repeatable.²¹ Paul's spiritualization has to be seen as directly connected to the recognition of the present reality of the "Christ-Jesus epoch".²² All of salvation history has pointed to and is fulfilled or realized in the

present. Indeed the religion of the Fathers is being fulfilled in this new epoch. The use of cultic language within this framework is not just a matter of a second cultus, or simply a matter of spiritualization. The reality has come in Christ and his epoch.²³

Weiss prefers the concept of salvation - or eschatological - realization of the cult to the notion of spiritualization.²⁴ Not only is this to be distinguished from mere metaphor, but also from the use of pagan ideas to express Christian realities.²⁵ Weiss sees Paul's cultic language as completely Jewish. It is cultus language that Paul used, and this was not spiritualized from a stoic or Hellenistic-Jewish perspective. Weiss emphasizes the Jewishness of Paul in every respect, even his concern for the Jews, and his desire that they come to faith in Christ. It is in relation to the salvation of the Jews that Paul sees the salvation of the world.²⁶ Thus, Paul's use of cultic language is part of the Jewishness of his perspective, and reveals not only the continuity of Christianity with Israel, but reveals that the fulfillment of salvation for Israel and the world has come in Christ.

b) The implications for a historical perspective

It is significant that Weiss suggests that Paul's eschatological interpretation of the cult is not dependent on Paul's understanding of the present cultus in Jerusalem.²⁷ He suggests that the question concerning Paul's practical and theoretical relationship to the Jerusalem cultus cannot be answered. Furthermore, he suggests that this question and the question of the role

of the cultus in Jewish piety at that time are of little relevance to the discussion of Paul's belief in the eschatological realization of the cult. Weiss leaves two other questions unanswered. The first has to do with the place of new cult forms in the Christian community, and the second has to do with cultic practices with which the Pauline churches may have been confronted. These questions pertain to ritual in general, and pagan practices in particular, both of which are seen as quite distinct from the cultic language Paul uses.²⁸ Most importantly though, as we have noted, Weiss presents his view of Paul's particular use of cultic language, while denying that it has any direct connection with Paul's relationship to the Jerusalem cultus.

c) Evaluation

Weiss' study is especially interesting when seen in contrast to Moule's perspective on cultic language. Weiss does not mention any apologetic or polemical thrust to cultic language. Paul's language says nothing negative about the Jerusalem cultus, nor does it set up an alternative to answer questions concerning the nature of Christianity. Rather, such language is used to state the reality of the eschatological fulfillment of the religion of the Fathers. Weiss sees intrinsic truths communicated in this language of fulfillment, which are not dependent on the present cultus for their meaning. Moule, on the other hand, sees a defence of the cult-less nature of Christianity within much use of cultic language.

In order for Weiss' argument to incorporate so many uses of cultic language, he has to state two principles

that we question. The first is the separation of cultic language from other "languages" that may involve simple metaphors; something Weiss does because cultic language embodies real or objective referents.²⁹ In Weiss' effort to emphasize the distinctiveness of Paul's use of language from the cultic world, he has drawn too sharp a line of distinction between cultic language and other language worlds. He has also de-emphasized any metaphorical aspect of cultic language, which we would suggest is significant in the interpretation of many texts (as our exegeses will attempt to show). Weiss contrasts cultic language with illustrations from the sports world.³⁰ Here an obvious distinction can be drawn because of the vastly different roles that sports and the cultus played in the history of Israel, and even in the experience of the apostle Paul. It may have been more difficult to make a distinction if ransom or exodus themes were used for comparison, as would be the case also if juridical ideas were expressed or apocalyptic language used. It is the significance of the cultus for Israel that makes any transference of words and concepts attached to it important. This does not mean that Paul used cultic language with any less metaphorical significance on occasions.

Weiss leaves open questions concerning the relevance of the Jerusalem cultus.³¹ If Paul uses this language of himself, his mission, his gospel, and his converts, then an eschatological understanding of such uses of cultic language must suggest something about the present cultus. If not, one must appeal to diversity of usage, and indeed the metaphorical nature of much cultic

language, which although suggesting something about the nature of the present cultus, allows for less direct statements about the cultus itself. Weiss' de-emphasis of the metaphorical role of cultic language, and his clear insistence on distinctiveness, seems to leave open questions that need to be answered.

The second aspect of Weiss' study that we question is the attempt to see all cultic language as distinctively Jewish. It is doubtful that Paul would have referred to pagan cults explicitly in a positive way. It may be, however, that he appeals to aspects of the cult metaphorically, and in such a general way that he does not specify the Jerusalem cultus (1 Cor 9:13; Phil 2:17; Rom 12:1). In other words, the metaphorical use of the language may indicate that the priority of Paul's statement is in the point of the metaphorical language, and not the external referent (although this may be important to know for some texts). There are the occasions when a definite identification of the external referent is uncertain (as with 1 Cor 9:13; Phil 2:17; Rom 12:1). This again is the sort of issue that needs to be decided for each text, taking into account Paul's audience, any possible sources, and the point he is trying to make. Weiss' claim that there is such a degree of Jewishness in Paul's uses of cultic language needs further support, especially when one takes into account other evidence as did Schmitz and Wenschkewitz.

d) Conclusion

The comprehensiveness of Weiss' thesis, like Moule's, needs careful qualification and restatement. Of most

importance for our study is the separation of Paul's use of cultic language from the historical realities of Paul's relationship to and understanding of the Jerusalem cultus. Weiss has pointed to the difficulty of drawing conclusions from such language, and that we agree with, although we may view the metaphorical aspect of the language differently. But this difficulty does not mean that a historical framework cannot or should not be postulated. Judging from the different conclusions of Weiss and Moule, such an attempt at historical reconstruction seems necessary.

B. An Attempt at Historical Reconstruction:
Ambiguities and Implications

1. W. D. Davies' Perspective in The Gospel and
the Land (footnote 32)

What K. Weiss leaves undiscussed, W. D. Davies pursues at length: the issue of the significance of Paul's use of temple language, especially its implications for the Temple in Jerusalem. Ultimately, Davies settles for a number of ambiguities in the historical picture, but he does present a perspective from which to view Paul, and his use of temple language.

Davies believes Paul to be a part of that broader phenomenon expressed in the NT; "coming to grips with Gentile Christianity".³³ First-century Christians, as evidenced in the NT, responded differently to "the geographic realia of Judaism, and they either abandoned or transformed them or lent them a new perspective".³⁴ The crucial point is that the issue had to be dealt with. The inclusion of the Gentiles became the central factor in

dealing with Jewish doctrines of the land. The growing lack of emphasis on the land was caused by Gentiles becoming a majority, the expansion of the Christian movement, and the already existent mixture of positions in Judaism itself.³⁵

Davies sees a development in Paul's thought away from traditional Jewish-Christian hope in the parousia as the "confirmation" of faith, and a movement towards a focus on the grace of God being expressed in the Gentile churches.³⁶ At the same time it is possible that Paul

"never completely and consciously and emotionally abandoned the geography of eschatology: it may have continued alongside his new awareness of the 'ecclesiological' eschatology inaugurated by Christ".³⁷

Paul had no theological need for this geography of eschatology, but he seemed to have felt no "incongruity" in holding on to it.³⁸ As Davies summarizes his position elsewhere, Paul's "attachment to the Temple, and Jerusalem and to the land remained, emotionally at least, to the end".³⁹

Davies sees in Paul's temple language the idea of the Christian being "the eschatological temple", but this is not expressed in opposition to the Jerusalem Temple, "of which it is the 'fulfillment'".⁴⁰ Davies leaves open the interpretation of 1 Cor 3:16-17, suggesting that it could be viewed in terms of "the eschatological temple of Jewish hope", or as asserting "that God dwells in the human heart, not in stone temples".⁴¹ In general, he seeks to carve a path between the apocalypticism of Johannes Munck, and the Hellenistic picture of Lucien Cerfaux, although his discussion is much more complex than this statement may indicate.⁴² Ultimately, Paul and the Hellenists did

break the territorial structures of Christianity, and this was done in a Christological way.⁴³ For Paul, particularly, being "in Christ" becomes the centre of religious experience, a religious experience in which there is "neither Jew nor Greek".⁴⁴

2. Evaluation and Conclusion

Davies is cautious with the evidence, and insists upon no clear denial of the Jerusalem cultus, nor a definite replacement theme.⁴⁵ Although we are left with some ambiguities, the implications of Paul's theology are clear. At the same time, it is clear that Paul did not sense the need to speak against the cultus explicitly or polemically within his ministry to the Gentiles. The question needs to be raised again in view of this picture of Paul's lack of polemic against the cultus: does Paul's use of cultic language have at times an apologetical thrust implying something concerning the Jerusalem cultus? And furthermore, what of Paul's language in relation to the death of Christ?⁴⁶ Does that ever imply something or state something about the cult? We consider two scholars below who present differing views on this issue.

C. Paul and the Temple: The Views of Frances Young and Martin Hengel

1. Young's Historical Framework

Frances Young has been one of the most significant contributors to the recent discussion of sacrifice and its place in the early church.⁴⁷ For our purposes, we will consider her suggestions concerning a historical progression in the early church's relationship to the cultus, and the use of cultic language.

In "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity", Young works backwards historically to see the roots of early Christian attitudes towards the cultus and Law.⁴⁸ It is significant that Paul was interested in different issues than reflected in Hebrews, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Epistle to Diognetus.⁴⁹ For Paul never tells Jews not to be Jews, and he did not argue "that the sacrifice of Christ annuls Jewish sacrifices or customs".⁵⁰ As Young states:

"It did not occur to Paul that there was a Christological principle which demanded the rejection of Jewish rites, customs and laws, even though the imaginative use of typology had already suggested that 'Christ, our Passover was sacrificed for us', and that the new Christian community had inherited the promises of Israel. The Christological argument was a natural extension of the primitive kerygma that the scriptures had been fulfilled, but the extension was only made under pressure. It was a means of justifying the split with Judaism after it had occurred,..." (footnote 51)

It is essential, therefore, to remember that Paul ministered before the break with Judaism, and too much must not be read into his Christological arguments, even if they use cultic language. Such typological uses of cultic language do not explicitly reject the Jerusalem cultic practices.

In a short article, Young presents five characteristics of sacrificial thought relevant for Paul and the NT generally, summarizing many of her findings.⁵² These are principles that are appropriate for interpreting sacrificial language, because they were aspects of sacrificial thought at that time. First, "the workings of sacrifices were not a subject of speculation; sacrifices were accepted as ordained by God in the Law".⁵³ Secondly, "sacrifice was not understood as a single type

of act with a single meaning".⁵⁴ Thirdly, "for the ordinary Jew",..."it was already usual to find equivalents to substitute for literal sacrifice".⁵⁵ Fourthly, "the sacrifice par excellence was the self-surrender of the martyr who refused to compromise his loyalty to God".⁵⁶ And fifthly, "there were several different levels of understanding" of sacrifice, "not necessarily compatible, yet operative at the same time".⁵⁷ All of these factors indicate that the use of cultic language by the NT and Paul was nothing new. Too much must not be read into such cultic language because of its familiarity, diversity, and the historical framework. No formal break with the Temple need be presupposed.

In short, Paul must be placed between an early church that maintained attachment to the Temple and the definite split with Judaism.⁵⁸ Paul used cultic language

"to describe the worship and service of Christians, in much the same way as Jews of the dispersion already did. Besides this, he had also used sacrifice as a means of understanding the death of Christ".
(footnote 59)

Finally, although Paul did not theologize the particular aspects of sacrifice, Young uses Paul as evidence for the beginning of the development of the Christian spiritual cult.⁶⁰

2. Hengel's Historical Framework

Martin Hengel argues that Palestinian Jewish Christians "no longer ascribed atoning effect to sacrifice in the sanctuary",⁶¹ and that "from the beginning" they "adopted a fundamentally detached attitude to the cult",⁶² although certain compromises were made. Associated with this and responsible for it was the interpretation of

Jesus' death as expiatory sacrifice, which Hengel thinks goes back to the earliest tradition and Jesus himself.⁶³

Paul, also, recognized the end of the significance of the cult, as can be seen from his use of cultic language in two ways. First of all, Paul's usual formulas for the death of Christ were chosen instead of cultic language, because of the superiority of Jesus' death to the cultic model.⁶⁴ Thus, Hengel says that the $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\nu \acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho$ formula

"represented a demarcation from the worship of the Temple, which expressed the fundamental, qualitative difference between the dying of Jesus on the cross on Golgotha and the ongoing sin-offerings on Mount Zion". (footnote 65)

Uses of $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi$, and $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi$ are also used as evidence for this.⁶⁶ Thus, in Paul's lack of cultic language and his choice of other formulas, one can suggest an implicit break with the cult. Although Hengel admits that Paul "sometimes" used cultic language to interpret the death of Christ, Paul preferred to use the brief "death" and "delivered-up" formulas.⁶⁷ A second line of argument is seen in the way Hengel treats Rom 3:21-26.⁶⁸ Hengel interprets these verses to indicate Paul's description of the death of Jesus "in categories associated with the end of the temple cult".⁶⁹ At the same time, Hengel sees this text as containing an "older traditional formula, because he [Paul] knew that such language would be well understood in Rome", despite the fact that "Paul himself placed no particular value on this cultic vocabulary".⁷⁰ Thus the infrequency and the type of use of cultic language in relation to the death of Jesus indicate a perspective on

the cult: the cult had been surpassed and rendered unnecessary or ineffective for atonement because of Christ's sacrificial death.

3. Evaluation and Conclusion

Both Young and Hengel give perspectives from which to view Paul's use of cultic language, although neither of them deal extensively with Paul; Young because of the breadth of her treatments of sacrifice, and Hengel because of his focus on the origins of the doctrine of the atonement. Therefore, the claims made by both Young and Hengel need to be considered further within the Pauline material.

The real issue that separates Young and Hengel is the perceived relationship between the soteriological significance of the death of Christ and the Jerusalem cultus. Young's emphasis on the diversity and various levels of meaning that cultic language can have, as well as her broad historical perspective, lead her to deny any explicit or implicit rejection of the Jerusalem cultus by Paul. At the same time, she does believe that Paul's use of sacrificial language, as it focuses around the death of Christ, indicates how a "new relationship" with God, "replacing the old", was perceived by Paul.⁷¹ If Young is emphasizing the idea of replacement, then Paul's use of sacrificial language would need to be viewed as different from that of other Jewish sources like Ben Sira, Philo, and Rabbinic material.⁷² Even the Qumran documents, although providing interesting uses of cultic language, do not fit within this category of Paul's use of cultic language,⁷³ because of its relation to the death of

Christ. Thus, while assessing broad phenomena (as Young does), distinctive features must be explained, and not underestimated, even if Paul never explicitly rejects the Temple. One has to ask if there is something in Paul's understanding of salvation in Christ that may cause a different type of reflection on the cultus from that of other groups 'within' early Judaism. Hengel seeks to argue this. His arguments, however, concerning ἑφ' ἅπασιν (Rom 6:10), and the significance of Paul's lack of cultic language must be supported by more evidence from Paul's letter.

D. Summary and Conclusions: From Schmitz to Hengel

The fact that Paul used cultic language non-literally is understandable in the light of the non-literal use of cultic language in both Jewish and Hellenistic writings before and after him (Schmitz, Wenschkewitz, Young).⁷⁴ The diversity of his use of cultic language probably makes impossible any uniform theory for Paul's intention in using cultic language in every case, and Paul probably reveals different sources for different uses (Wenschkewitz). Paul maintained and adapted the sacrificial understanding of Jesus' death already established, and used cultic language in various other non-literal ways that may have not been original to him. His most distinctive uses of cultic language are self-descriptive (Wenschkewitz), and such uses should not be ignored in assessing the significance of Paul's cultic language (Weiss). It is important to remember Paul's context of mission to the Gentiles, which provided both the opportunity for non-literal use of cultic language, and made the issue of the

cultus less crucial than if Paul's focus had been the Jews (Wenschkewitz, Davies, Young). At the same time, the Gentile mission raised fundamental soteriological questions, which Paul and others responded to in ways that decreased the importance of traditional Judaism in the life of the Gentile-dominated church (Davies). But Paul's mission took place before a definite break with Judaism, and he sought to maintain a relationship between the Gentile churches and the Jerusalem mother church. Paul's own religious practices, when in Jerusalem, may be of little consequence to his gospel for the Gentiles, and are not an issue in his letters. Even so, the evidence from Acts indicates that Paul was willing to participate in Temple activity, and this is at least in line with Paul's desire to be a Jew to the Jews.⁷⁵

The implications of Paul's use of cultic language are numerous, and have been assessed in various ways. Much cultic language does indicate the focus of religious experience around Christ, and salvation in him (Schmitz, Wenschkewitz, Davies, Young). But how this language then reflects the relationship of salvation in Christ to the Jerusalem cultus, is another matter. Weiss has warned us against reading too much into the eschatological fulfillment language of Paul.⁷⁶ Young suggests that such cultic language is explicable in the light of contemporary use, and the use of cultic language in a Christian context does not explicitly or implicitly question the cultus in and of itself. Moule, on the other hand, postulates an apologetic setting for much cultic language, including Paul's need to defend himself against the threat

of Judaism.⁷⁷ The need for self-definition and defence brings to the surface the need to explain the true cult of Christianity. This is a realistic suggestion, but it is more accurate to speak of Paul defending the gospel and apostleship, at times, with the use of cultic language, rather than presenting any systematic defence of a Christian cult as such.⁷⁸ At the same time, not all of Paul's uses of cultic language can be brought into this framework.⁷⁹ It is necessary to remember the contributions of those who have shown the ease with which cultic language could have been used without much reflection or reactionary motive (Schmitz, Wenschkewitz, Young). Thus, diversity must be kept in mind: diversity of use, context, and implication.

Hengel's suggestion that Paul not only denied any further atoning significance to the Jerusalem sacrifices, but also reflected this understanding in his use of cultic language needs further explication, and needs to take into account the diversity of Paul's cultic language. At the same time, few would doubt that Paul would ascribe to the Temple practices soteriological significance for Gentiles. It may be that Hengel is right in suggesting the early understanding of the soteriological implications of the sacrificial death of Jesus, which for him means that any further Temple activity was a matter of practical compromise. But the nature of the compromise needs to be considered, since much of the maintained cultic practice in the ancient world could be labelled as a type of compromise (as Schmitz noted negatively about Judaism).⁸⁰ Paul presents himself to us as one who did make

compromises, but not when a soteriological issue was at stake. The place to begin in this complex issue is to suggest that Paul's own participation in Temple practice did not compromise his stand on soteriology for Gentiles, nor his stand on soteriology for Jews.⁸¹ The diversity of Temple rituals within an election-covenant context allows for respect towards and participation in the cult without challenging primary theological concerns. Thus, Paul could have participated in Temple practice, as a Jew in Christ, because he did not perceive it as a soteriological alternative. Frances Young's insights concerning the lack of a singular meaning for sacrificial practice, and the possibility of different understandings of sacrifice operating at the same time, need to be kept in mind. Paul undoubtedly viewed the Temple as one of the privileges of the Israelites (Rom 9:4-5), but these were Israelites descendant from an Israel born through divine promise and the obedience of faith (Rom 4:1-25, 9:4-5). Paul's arguments concerning the primacy of promise and faith in relation to the Law would certainly hold true for the Temple as well, as the listing and wording in Rom 9:4-5 would indicate. The Temple could still have been relevant as a place of worship, prayer, and even future hope, but the power of God for salvation was now mediated through the gospel to Jew and Greek alike (Rom 1:16). Indeed the gospel is now the meeting place of divine promise and the obedience of faith, for through Christ God has brought life out of death for all who believe (Rom 4:24-25). Thus, even if through Christ and the proclamation of the gospel there is an atonement

(as such) available to the Gentiles as well, that does not mean that the Temple is rendered meaningless, even if the atoning efficacy of sacrifices was seen to be irrelevant or typological.⁸² The Temple was still the centre of Jewish worship, a worship that involved sacrifices.⁸³

It is evident from the studies we have surveyed that there is a need to integrate more thoroughly Paul's uses of cultic language within his particular arguments. General theories fall short of dealing with the complexities of the issues raised by such diversity in the material. The options are numerous and vary in probability in relation to particular texts. One needs to see how Paul can use cultic language in a particular argument, and assess its implications in the context of a particular correspondence. This is especially the case if the content is soteriological, although other aspects of Paul's theology may provide a significant framework for discussing the historical implications.

Before we do this for Romans, we will consider attempts to explain Paul's cultic ideas. These studies may indicate distinctive features in Paul's theology and soteriology that are related to cultic thought. Although our focus will be on the theological issues dealt with by significant contributors, it will be evident that the historical picture cannot be forgotten, even if one consciously tries to do so.

Footnotes

¹We are thinking of historical questions as they pertain to Paul in general, and not Romans in particular.

²Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice".

³Ibid., p. 38. See Philip Carrington, The Primitive Christian Catechism (Cambridge: CUP, 1940), and Edward Gordon Selwyn, The First Epistle of St. Peter (London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd, 1947), pp. 365-466. Also see C. F. D. Moule, Worship in the New Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961) pp. 38-39, and Alan Cole, The New Temple.

⁴Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice", p. 39. Room is left for the whole matter of self-definition, but Moule argues primarily in terms of the opposition of Judaism.

⁵Ibid., p. 41; see list at the end of the article.

⁶Ibid., pp. 36-40. ⁷Ibid., p. 40.

⁸Ibid., p. 29. ⁹Ibid., p. 35.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 35. Moule does not state the source for C. H. Dodd's suggestion, since it is a casual reference, but it is consistent with Dodd's thoughts in "The Mind of Paul: I", in New Testament Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), 67-82. The study is dated 1933.

¹¹Moule, "Sanctuary and Sacrifice", p. 36.

¹²Ibid., p. 36. ¹³Ibid., p. 36.

¹⁴R. K. Yerkes in his chapter on "The Christian Sacrifice" speaks of "the sublimation of sacrifice" in Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953), p. 197. This is expressed in four purposes of sacrifices: "(1) to learn the will of God", "(2) to co-operate with God and to do that will", "(3) to rely upon God for protection when doing his will", "(4) to surrender oneself entirely to God and his will" (p. 202). In Yerkes' detailed study, his approach to Christian sacrifice is under these general categories, which represent the avenues of sublimation into the Christian framework. He mentions a number of the same concepts mentioned by Moule (pp. 207-215). We mention Yerkes' work by way of contrast, because although he emphasizes the idea of sublimation, he does not stress any apologetic framework. F. C. N. Hicks' The Fullness of Sacrifice: An Essay in Reconciliation (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd, 1930) suggests that basic sacrificial ideas are behind much NT theology. The emphasis is not on a particular apologetic or psychological situation, but is something that is basic to the NT in light of its Jewish cultic background. We suggest, therefore, that an apologetical use of cultic thought, sublimated or otherwise, needs to be shown from the situation of a text, since such cultic

language in one sense should be expected.

¹⁵We recognize that this was not within the scope of Moule's study.

¹⁶Konrad Weiss, "Paulus - Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde", TLZ 79 (1954), 355-364.

¹⁷Weiss notes that Paul refers to the apostolic office which he fulfills doing priestly sacrificial service in the sanctuary of the gospel of Christ Jesus, "Paulus - Priester", p. 360. Texts used to present the priesthood of Paul are Rom 1:9, 15:16; Phil 2:17, 4:17 f.; 1 Cor 9:13 f.; and they are supplemented by Paul's view of apostleship, Gal 1:10,15; 1 Thess 1:9; Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; pp. 356-358.

¹⁸Because God is present in the community, the community becomes the temple, "Paulus - Priester", p. 360. The temple theme and the cultic life of the people is viewed in 1 Cor 3:16 f., 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; 1 Cor 5:7; Rom 11:16, 2:29, 4:12; Phil 3:3; Col 2:12; 1 Cor 10:21; pp. 359-360.

¹⁹Christendom is made up of the holy ones, by virtue of the Spirit, whose existence in faith is presented as an unblemished offering either unmediated or through the priestly mediation of the apostle, "Paulus - Priester", p. 360. Focus on the offering of Paul, or the community's offering is by way of Rom 15:16, 12:1 f., 16:5, 14:18; 1 Cor 16:15; Phil 4:18; pp. 358-359.

²⁰Ibid., p. 360.

²¹Although Weiss referred to Wenschkewitz's work, he wanted to identify the spiritualization of the cultus in a different way than Wenschkewitz did.

²²Ibid., p. 361.

²³Ibid., pp. 361-362. Paul, according to Weiss, does not describe a Christian cult programmatically, but if he did: (1) the priesthood would have been the apostolate, (2) the sacrifices - works of faith, labours of love, trials, (3) the mode of holiness - the Spirit, (4) the covenant people - *ἐκλεκτοὶ ἅγιοι* of the Christian congregation.

²⁴Ibid., p. 362. ²⁵Ibid., p. 362.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 363-364. ²⁷Ibid., p. 362.

²⁸Ibid., p. 362.

²⁹Ibid., p. 360 "enthält sachliche Bezüge".

³⁰Ibid., p. 360. ³¹Ibid., p. 362.

³²William David Davies, The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine

(Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1974).

³³Ibid., p. 373. ³⁴Ibid., p. 373.

³⁵Ibid., p. 369. ³⁶Ibid., p. 373.

³⁷Ibid., p. 220. ³⁸Ibid., p. 220.

³⁹William David Davies, "Paul and the People of Israel", NTS 24 (1978) 4-39 (p. 19).

⁴⁰Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 193; stated in relation to 2 Cor 6:14-18.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 193. ⁴²Ibid., pp. 201-220.

⁴³Ibid., p. 375. ⁴⁴Ibid., p. 220.

⁴⁵It is interesting that 1 Cor 3:16-17 can receive such diverse interpretations, and that the implications of a text like Rom 3:25 can be so different (Davies, Gospel and Land, p. 193 n. 56). Davies discusses the idea of Christ as a replacement for the Temple, but he prefers to see such an idea as not being antithetical towards or including a dismissal of the Temple.

⁴⁶This is an aspect of the evidence left untouched by K. Weiss.

⁴⁷Frances Young, "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity: A Study in the Relationship Between Jews and Christians in the Early Centuries", NTS 19 (1973) 325-338; "New Wine in Old Wineskins: XIV. Sacrifice", ExpTim 86 (1975) 305-309; Sacrifice and the Death of Christ; and The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom. Patristic Monograph Series, No. 5. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Philadelphia Patristics Foundation, Ltd., 1979).

⁴⁸Young, "Temple Cult and Law", pp. 329-330.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 330. ⁵⁰Ibid., p. 330.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 331. Underlined words are italicized in Young's article.

⁵²Young, "XIV. Sacrifice", pp. 305-309.

⁵³Ibid., p. 306. ⁵⁴Ibid., p. 306.

⁵⁵Ibid., p. 307. ⁵⁶Ibid., p. 307.

⁵⁷Young, "XIV. Sacrifice", p. 308.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 308. Young appeals to Acts 2:46 and 3:3.

⁵⁹Young, Sacrifice and the Death of Christ, pp. 49-50.

⁶⁰Young, Sacrifice and the Death of Christ, pp. 53-63.

⁶¹Martin Hengel, The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press, 1981).

⁶²Ibid., p. 56.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 65-75. Also by Martin Hengel, "The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ", BJRL 62 (1979-1980) 454-475 (pp. 474-475).

⁶⁴Hengel, The Atonement, pp. 50-51.

⁶⁵Ibid., pp. 51-52.

⁶⁶Ibid., pp. 47, 51. Only one Pauline reference is given: Rom 6:10.

⁶⁷Hengel, "Expiatory Sacrifice", p. 464. He notes Rom 3:25; 1 Cor 11:25; Rom 5:9, 8:3; 2 Cor 5:21; 1 Cor 5:7; Rom 8:34.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 463, and The Atonement, p. 45.

⁶⁹Hengel, "Expiatory Sacrifice", p. 463 (Underlining mine).

⁷⁰Ibid., p. 463. Hengel follows Thomas W. Manson's basic interpretation of this text, "ΙΑΔΑΧΤΗΡΙΟΝ", JTS 46 (1945) 1-10.

⁷¹Young, "XIV. Sacrifice", p. 308. Young argues this for Christians of the early church, but suggests that Paul would give evidence of this.

⁷²Ibid., p. 307. We mention this because of Young's appeal to them.

⁷³We are not seeking to deny the significance of cultic language used at Qumran that indicated rejection of the present Jerusalem cultus (practically speaking), and suggested the cultic nature of the community's self-understanding. We do suggest, though, that the role of Christ in Pauline soteriology and the lack of explicit rejection of the present cultus (as we will argue) set apart Paul's use of cultic language from much of that found at Qumran. For various appraisals of the Qumran evidence: Joseph Baumgarten, "Sacrifice and worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls" HTR 46 (1953), 141-159; J. L. Teicher, "Priests and Sacrifice in the Dead Sea Scrolls (A Question of Method in Historical Research)", JJS 5 (1954), 93-99; Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament SNTS 1 (Cambridge: CUP, 1965); Georg Klinzing, Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament SUNT 7 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971); E. Schussler Fiorenza,

"Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament" CBQ 38 (1976), 159-177; Paul Garnet, Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls WUZNT 2 (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1977); Robert J. Daly, Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen. Studies in Christian Antiquity 18. (Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1978), pp. 157-174.

⁷⁴For the presentation of much evidence (besides works already discussed at length): the first part of Philipp Seidensticker's Lebendiges Opfer (Rom 12, 1): Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 20. Münster Westf.: Aschen-dorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954.), pp. 1-120; Daly's Christian Sacrifice, and more recently and briefly Ferguson's "Spiritual Sacrifice".

⁷⁵Acts 21:26-27, 22:17, 24:17-18; 1 Cor 9:20.

⁷⁶We are agreeing with Weiss' caution, but would suggest that certain uses of cultic language, because of the arguments they are connected with, may prove significant to an understanding of the cultus. One does not have to reject the Jerusalem cultus outright to have a changed perspective on it.

⁷⁷Wenschkewitz's suggestion concerning the Judaizers is not far removed.

⁷⁸For example, Rom 3:25, 5:9, 8:3; 1 Cor 9:13; Phil 3:3.

⁷⁹Examples: ethical exhortation context; Rom 12:1; 1 Cor 5:7; Eph 5:2; 1 Cor 3:16-17, 6:19, 10:18; 2 Cor 6:16-18; Self-description/apostleship Rom 15:16; Phil 2:17; 2 Cor 2:14-17; 2 Tim 4:6; thanksgiving for gift received Phil 4:18; literal reference or quote in argument Rom 9:4, 11:3.

⁸⁰By "compromise" we are not suggesting that it was perceived as such, but that it would not seem to follow the thought or perspective that characterized a person or group. Those that can be added to Paul who did not reject the cult outright are such as Philo, Seneca, and Epictetus. One only has to think of the prophetic challenges to particular cultic practice, and "spiritualizing" trends in the inter-testamental period to realize that perspectives on the cultus were not uniform, although cultic practice continued. Jesus himself did not challenge the sacrificial role of the cultus as such, although his prophetic anger and perspective may have suggested this to contemporaries and future interpreters (Matt 21:12-16; Mark 11:15-18; Luke 19:45-46; John 2:13-22).

⁸¹This compromise must be considered in view of the reasons given for Paul's involvement in Temple activity or other Jewish ritual activity on different occasions (e. g., 1 Cor 9:20?, Acts 21:26-27, 22:17, 24:17-18).

⁸²Sacrifices could be offered within a context of ultimate forgiveness by God for those in Christ; forgiveness was a matter of God's grace, not manipulation. Although Paul may have been accused of being anti-Temple (Acts 21:28), it is most probable that one should view the whole matter of Gentile inclusion and acceptance without circumcision as the real issue that indeed caused the accusation of defiling the Temple.

⁸³Schmitz erred in his low estimate of sacrifice in Judaism, although he was right to emphasize the legal framework that ensured the continuance of cultic practices (Die Opferanschauung, pp. 189-195). This need not be viewed negatively, though.

CHAPTER III

PAUL'S CULTIC LANGUAGE AND HIS THEOLOGY:

THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

A. The Sacrifice of Christ and the Christian

The Christian understanding of sacrifice, and the relationship of the sacrifice of Christ to that of the Christian are preliminary and fundamental concerns that we must view. The following presentation of contributions not only seeks to interact with the views expressed, but seeks to show the need for a careful exegetical method when dealing with the language of sacrifice.

1. Philipp Seidensticker's Lebendiges Opfer (Rom 12:1)

a) Seidensticker's Christological perspective

Seidensticker attempted a thorough theological study of Christian sacrifice as a contribution to the study of Pauline theology. C. F. D. Moule has noted that "the two words which Dr. Seidensticker has seized upon, *θυσία ζῶσα*, epitomize the distinctively Christian idea of sacrifice, and that is his theme".¹ For Seidensticker sacrifice is christologized in the sense that "the cultic concepts of sacrifice, priest, and temple centre solely on the person of Christ".² Seidensticker describes this unique nature of Christian sacrifice (particularly as expressed by the apostle Paul) against the background of Hellenistic and

Jewish cultic thought that is different despite common features. This unique understanding of sacrifice is presented in Seidensticker's section, "The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ and its Relationship to λογικὴ λατρεία according to the Teaching of the Apostle Paul".³

Seidensticker states that Christ's death in Paul's thought is a cultic salvation-reality.⁴ Having looked at such texts as Rom 3:25, 1 Cor 5:7, and Eph 5:2, Seidensticker concludes that Paul referred to the death of Christ as a cultic sacrifice.⁵ Seidensticker proceeds to view the essence of this cross-sacrifice of Christ in terms of 1) Christ's role (or personhood) as mediator, and 2) Christ's self-offering or surrender (as a sacrifice).

1) It is the self-offering Christ and the Son of God that Paul presents as mediator.⁶ Christ's mediating work is not limited to his earthly work, but is seen also as the work of the exalted Christ.⁷ As mediator Christ is the head of a new humanity bound in solidarity to him, a position in which Christ atones for all sin and as exalted Lord administers all life.⁸ Both Christ's atoning work and his glorification of God are his mediation, both part of a cultic work of salvation, the sacrifice of atonement on the cross and the praise offering of the transfigured Christ.⁹ In principle, the representative nature of Christ's mediation (including his death) moves beyond a juristic representation, and is viewed in terms of mystical union with Christ, made accessible by baptism.¹⁰ Seidensticker views a substitutionary role for Christ cautiously as a third kind of substitution to be placed beside the Levitical priesthood and the servant of God

tradition (with which Jesus is sometimes identified).¹¹

2) It is Christ's voluntary self-giving, submission, and/or surrender that is sacrificial. The specific focus of Paul's description of Christ and his mediating work in sacrificial terms is his death.¹² Within the complexity and even trinitarian implications of Christ's sacrifice, Seidensticker allows for both the expression of God's initiative,¹³ and the culmination of Christ's obedience in his death on the cross.¹⁴ Thus, because of Christ's nature (God and man), the objective and subjective aspects of Christ's cross-sacrifice are expressed.¹⁵

Seidensticker proceeds then to discuss the cultic salvation-reality of the church ("Christ-community of the Faithful" [p. 203]). This does not involve Hellenistic spiritualization,¹⁶ but is grounded in the church's unity with Christ and his death (by means of baptism).¹⁷ The climax of this section is Seidensticker's exegesis of Rom 12:1.¹⁸ This text stands as Paul's strongest criticism of Hellenistic piety, and for Seidensticker it is specifically Christological in content and implication. *Λογικὴ λατρεία* speaks of a spiritualized piety, a subjectivity with cultic trimming (lacking a true cultic event or understanding thereof),¹⁹ whereas *Θυσία ζῶσα* speaks of Christological worship, a continual event of complete self-offering to God with Christ (for all).²⁰ The concept of *Θυσία ζῶσα*

"binds the cross-death and Christian life to a cultic community in the Spirit of Christ. What the Christians are they are through Christ, sacrifice and priest together, because Christ is sacrifice and priest in one person" (footnote 21)

For Seidensticker, everything in the life of the

church is cultic because of the death of Christ and the church's dying with him in baptism.²² The climax of Christian experience as sacrifice is the Lord's supper,²³ but in principle the whole of the church's existence is a sacrifice of Christ, which is always "in fieri".²⁴ Within this unity with the sacrifice of Christ, Seidensticker maintains a distinction between the sacrifice of Christ and that of the church. Christ's sacrifice was suffering-obedience resulting in atonement. The church's sacrifice is the obedience of faith, which is before all an offering of joy and thanksgiving.²⁵ But, in Christ the church's life is indeed cultic as is Christ's life.²⁶

In conclusion Seidensticker suggests that the sacrifice of Christ continues and completes the OT cultic institution.²⁷ This is not expressed in terms of a continuation of the Levitical priesthood as such,²⁸ but rather Christ becomes the focus of typological exegesis and is the prophetic fulfillment of the servant of God (Isaiah 53).²⁹ Ultimately, though, in a general and complete sense "the sacrifice of Christ is a continuation and the final conclusion of the old institution of sacrifice among the chosen people".³⁰

b) Evaluation and conclusions

Seidensticker affirmed the realistic use of cultic language by Paul while also emphasizing the transformation of cultic ideas because of the Christological and mystical-pneumatic framework of Paul's theology. Thus, although Christian existence is cultic, it is cultic in a distinctively Christian way. This perspective is so different from that of Otto Schmitz that it is worthy of

brief comparison. We noted Schmitz's attempt to disavow the significance of a narrow cultic idea within a Christian framework, and now we note the attempt to indicate the distinctives of broad cultic ideas within a Christian framework. These differing concerns have resulted, on the one hand, in Schmitz's assessment of the casual and metaphorical use of cultic language in many texts (such texts as Rom 12:1), and on the other hand in Seidensticker's understanding of sacrifice as central and transformed within such texts as Rom 12:1. Having suggested that Schmitz may have treated cultic language as too insignificant at times, it may be that Seidensticker has placed too much emphasis on a distinctive but broad Christian understanding of sacrifice, and has therefore included too much under the label 'cultic'. By dealing broadly with cultic concepts and speaking in terms of a "cultic salvation-reality" (pp. 145, 203), it may be that Paul's own use of cultic language and associated ideas are at times superseded. Seidensticker presents much careful exegesis and he allows for diversity and nuance in the use of cultic language, but such discoveries may be lost within his Christological perspective which allows for the transformation of cultic ideas. Thus, although Seidensticker has rightly allowed for the significance of cultic ideas in Paul's thought, Seidensticker's study raises questions related to the implications of the diverse metaphorical uses of cultic language by Paul.³¹ We must ask specifically, does Paul unify his uses of cultic language in a way that supports the emphasis that Seidensticker suggests? Or does one need to use other

categories, outside of cultic ones, to unify Paul's use of cultic language in a way that better represents his emphasis and thought?

Our exegesis of Rom 12:1 will indicate that we do not agree with the way Seidensticker has united cultic ideas by means of baptismal union with Christ. When Seidensticker sees implicit in *Θυσία ζῶσα* the binding of the Christian life to the cross-death of Christ in the Spirit of Christ, this seems to move beyond the emphasis of Paul.³² Although the connection between Rom 12:1 and Rom 6 is rightly noted, it is the maintenance of the prominence of baptismal unity with Christ that needs to be questioned or explained more carefully.³³ Our disagreement may be also at the level of the interpretation of baptism in relation to Rom 12:1 and more specifically the way baptism becomes a part of cultic Christian experience.³⁴ This will need to be addressed in our exegesis.

Seidensticker's cultic picture is sometimes ambiguous, and it seems to be beyond the intention of Paul himself. For instance, although Paul's concept of sacrifice is limited to the death of Christ (p. 203), the suggestion is made that the sacrifice of Christ is always being made (p. 252).³⁵ Furthermore, although Christ's death is the focus of Paul's concept of sacrifice, Seidensticker's broad development of Christ's 'cultic' mediation in describing the essence of the cross-sacrifice allows for the application of a whole range of ideas, cultic and non-cultic, to Christ's sacrifice. Expansion of cultic ideas can be seen also in Seidensticker's discussion of Christ's mediating work itself. Although

Seidensticker states that Paul never designates Christ as priest, this fact proves to be insignificant in the overall presentation of Christ as priestly mediator and sacrificial victim.³⁶ Clearly Paul did not need to state that Christ was a priest to develop ideas of priestly mediation, but not all ideas of mediation or representation are cultic. For example, Paul may not have been emphasizing cultic ideas in Rom 6, even if they are implicit.

We are thus cautious about the broadness of the cultic ideas that structure Seidensticker's study. In connection with this caution, we note the lack of concern on Seidensticker's part to discuss the distinctive situation, structure, and purpose of Romans. This type of discussion for Romans may have placed theological interpretation within the limits of Paul's apparent intentions in the writing of the letter, and helped in the assessment of the meaning of differing uses of cultic language.³⁷

Lastly, Seidensticker noted the place of obedience in Christian sacrifice, and the ethical nature of Christian existence and practice. This is justified, since this is a connection that Paul himself seems to make (even if his language is metaphorical [note Rom 12:1 and 15:16-18, especially in view of Rom 1:5 and texts like Phil 4:18 and Eph 5:2 which clearly have an ethical emphasis]). Although Christ's divinity allows for distinctive elements in his sacrifice, his humanity allows for the shared element of obedience in Christian sacrifice.

2. Raymond Corriveau's The Liturgy of Life³⁸

a) Corriveau's theological perspective

Corriveau has restated Seidensticker's perspective

with an emphasis on obedience and the ethical dimension of the Christian life.³⁹ He shows how various aspects of Christian experience in Paul's letters are given cultic description.⁴⁰ He argues that there is a liturgy of life, Christologically and sacramentally founded and framed, and spiritualized by means of the Spirit. All of life is worship, reflecting the cultic character of Christian existence itself. As did Seidensticker, Corriveau sees Rom 12:1 as central to the NT concept of sacrifice.⁴¹ He sets forth a unified picture of sacrificial theology in relation to Rom 12:1:

"The sacrificial death of Christ is essentially a cultic action since, in passing to the Father, Christ offers supreme glory to the Father, and becoming a life-giving spirit, reconciles man to God. Rooted in the death of Christ, the activity of the Christian community is thus in its inner structure a cultic activity. Dying with Christ, being crucified with him in baptism, stamps the whole earthly life of the Christian, sanctified by his Spirit, with the cultic character of his death on the cross. It is thus that Paul could characterize the life of obedience of the Philippians as a sacrificial liturgy of faith (Phil 2,17) and in similar terms the self-offering of the Romans. This whole concrete existence is a sacrifice (Rom 12,1) and offering to God (Rom 15,16)" (footnote 42).

Corriveau states this unified sacrificial theology with reference to L. Cerfaux's suggestion that the spiritual cult "does not appear to be thematically linked to the sacrifice of Christ".⁴³ Corriveau disagrees with Cerfaux, and seeks to demonstrate this unified sacrificial thought from Romans.⁴⁴ Central to Corriveau's argument is the baptismal commitment suggested by *παριστάνω*,⁴⁵ and the concept of "sacrificial obedience".⁴⁶ It is by means of baptism that one is joined with Christ. In this way, one gains cultic status, being joined to the sacrifice of Christ,⁴⁷ which is "total obedience and submission to the

will of God".⁴⁸ Obedience is central in Romans for viewing the work of Christ, and Corriveau argues this from Romans 5 and 6, as well as Rom 3:25.⁴⁹ Christ's obedience becomes representative for man, by uniting him with Christ in baptism; a uniting with the Christ who is Son of God, and identified with "sinful man".⁵⁰ Then, in union with Christ, the Christian seeks to live with similar obedience.⁵¹ This is the sacrifice of Rom 12:1, and it is brought about by the apostle (15:16,18). The obedience and submission of the Christian, by virtue of "quasi-identification with Christ" is united to and continuous with the sacrifice (obedience) of Christ on the cross.⁵²

b) Evaluation and conclusions

Corriveau, by dividing his study according to letters of Paul, is able to take account of emphases in the letters. This he does for Romans in a clearer fashion than Seidensticker. Romans presents the most comprehensive picture of Christian sacrifice, and this is stated most clearly in Rom 12:1. Nevertheless, he does not discuss the relationship of this Christian sacrifice to the particularities of the letter. Romans, and 12:1 in particular, would seem to emphasize what is true for Paul's thought on the whole. Corriveau has therefore emphasized the theological and coherent, and not emphasized the contingent aspect of Paul's thought.⁵³

Corriveau's unified picture of Christian sacrifice in reference to Rom 12:1 seems to move outside of the language and thought of Paul expressed in Romans, and also seems to unify concepts in ways that Paul does not.⁵⁴ Most helpful is Corriveau's movement from obedience to

sacrificial obedience, and on to sacrifice. This demonstrates one way cultic thought is connected to ethical teaching, but it probably is not central to Rom 3:25 (see exegesis on Rom 3:25). Greater recognition of the distinctive features of Paul's emphasis in this section of the letter is needed. The theological has given way to the Christological in Corriveau's perspective, something that is not reflective of Paul's emphasis in Romans 1:16-4:25, and indeed Romans 1-11. Corriveau's focus on ethics has resulted in a description of sacrifice that does not seem to take all the evidence into account, and has not followed the argument of Paul in the letter. His definition of Christ's sacrifice displays the ethical and mystical framework, but it does not emphasize the theological content that the cultic language explains and illustrates.

3. R. J. Daly's Perspective on "The Pauline Theology of Sacrifice"(footnote 55)

a) Daly's perspective

R. J. Daly provides a more comprehensive and historical study of Christian sacrifice than either Seidensticker or Corriveau, although he seems in basic agreement with both. Paul's place within the pre-Origen evidence for the Christian doctrine of sacrifice is that of "the first theologian of Christian sacrifice".⁵⁶ Daly suggests that Paul saw Christian sacrifice under three categories or aspects: "(1) the sacrifice of Christ, (2) the sacrifice of the Christian, (3) the Christians as the new temple".⁵⁷ This is significant since Daly suggests that the NT says little about sacrifice and cult,

probably because of its nomistic rather than priestly roots in Judaism.⁵⁸ Thus Paul's "rather full theology of Christian sacrifice" proves to be a crucial development that church fathers in later periods would draw on.⁵⁹

Daly's discussion of Paul needs to be seen in light of his more general picture of Christian sacrifice. Daly's thesis concerning the NT material as a whole is that the "operative concept of sacrifice ... is primarily ethical" (note Corriveau above).⁶⁰ As Daly notes, "the New Testament concept of Christian sacrifice is, thus, not cultic or liturgical, but practical and ethical".⁶¹ This can be viewed within Daly's broader perspective concerning both a "spiritualizing" and an "institutionalizing" trend in the understanding of sacrifice.⁶² Daly's emphasis is on the spiritualizing trend. He suggests three recognizable stages in the development of this trend. The first was embedded in the OT itself, and involved a "theology of divine acceptance" that stressed the need for proper dispositions in bringing sacrifices, but the cultus itself was still central.⁶³ The second was largely a post-exilic development that focused on the dispositions themselves and the value of obedience to the Law. Sacrifice became a subsidiary of obedience to the Law, and other acts of obedience accomplished what sacrifices did in the God-man relationship.⁶⁴ The third stage was and is the Christian one, incarnational spiritualization. It is the stage that Daly sees as present in the NT and the early church. Christian sacrifice gains perfect realization in Jesus Christ in his obedience and love to the Father "to whom" he offers, and his self-sacrificing love and service to

and for us "for whom" he offers.⁶⁵ The followers of Jesus are to experience the imperfect but similar realization of Christian sacrifice, a sacrifice that is "both spiritual and bodily".⁶⁶ Paul fits within this last stage as the first real "theologian of Christian sacrifice" as we have mentioned.⁶⁷

Daly's discussion of the Pauline theme of Christians as the new temple has little that is new or unexpected.⁶⁸ The second category is "the Sacrifice of Christ".⁶⁹ He begins with 1 Cor 11:23-25 and 10:14-21, and then moves to *ὑπέρ* - formula texts, both suggesting that Paul viewed Christ's death sacrificially.⁷⁰ Paul's use of 1 Cor 5:7 makes this explicit, although this is not creative on Paul's part, but shared with the synoptics. On the other hand, Paul was the first notable witness, if not originator, of the idea that "Christ is the sin-offering (for our sins)".⁷¹ He suggests that Paul saw the death of Christ under both the aspect of the Passover and the sin-offering. These were rites most closely associated with redemption and forgiveness of sins. Because of this "it was perfectly natural for the first Christians to look upon Christ as their Passover (lamb) and their sin offering".⁷² The third section, "the Sacrifice of Christians" contains a variety of texts, including Rom 12:1, and 15:15 f. In this section his work is dependent upon P. Seidensticker, A.-M. Denis, and H. Schlier.⁷³ Rom 12:1 is viewed, in agreement with Schlier's position, as a deliberate joining of Hellenistic and Jewish ideas to "bring out more clearly the nature of Christian sacrifice".⁷⁴ Furthermore, "Paul totally rejects a cardinal

principle of Greek religious thought - the dualistic rejection of matter in favor of spirit - in order to emphasize a cardinal principle of Christian thought: the incarnation".⁷⁵ This incarnational principle is particularly relevant to Daly's further suggestion that the cultic description of Christian life in the rest of Rom 12:1-2 is "in terms equally applicable to Christ as to the individual Christian".⁷⁶ Rom 15:15 f. is viewed in light of H. Schlier's comprehensive treatment of this text and his description of sacrifice (to be discussed below).

b) Evaluation

Daly's three categories for studying Paul's thought remind one of H. Wenschkewitz's work,⁷⁷ although Daly emphasized the Hellenistic evidence much less than Wenschkewitz did. In general, Daly is significant for his presentation of so much material within a broad framework. Furthermore, his suggestion that Paul saw the death of Christ in relation to both Passover and the sin-offering is one not stressed by some previous studies (e. g., Schmitz, Wenschkewitz) and is one that needs to be considered (1 Cor 5:6-8, Rom 8:3-4, 2 Cor 5:20-21). But Daly has received criticism for lack of "good analytic categories", and for his uneven treatment of NT evidence.⁷⁸ Also, he used some texts to support the temple motif that are not appropriate,⁷⁹ although his exegesis is usually done carefully, especially considering the broad scope of the work.

At the heart of Daly's perspective on Christian sacrifice is the incarnation. The principle of incarnation allows for Paul's similar cultic

description of the life of Christ and the life of the Christian. Although this is the case, this does not hinder Daly from noting the distinctive elements in Paul's teaching concerning the sacrifice of Christ, a distinctiveness that even seems to stand in relation to Christian martyrdom.

Our exegesis of Rom 12:1 will differ concerning the Christological implications of the text, and this will prove important in constructing a view of Christian sacrifice from Romans. But in many cases we are in basic agreement with Daly's exegesis.

The breadth of Daly's work has not allowed him to deal with Paul at length, and the contingent factors of Paul's different letters are not discussed. Paul is seen as a general forerunner of Origen, exhibiting a similar pattern in his use of cultic ideas as does Origen. This is possibly helpful in viewing the broader perspective of early church thought, but the need for further consideration of Paul's cultic language remains. This is illustrated by Daly's presentation, with little comment, of Schlier's understanding of Paul's concept of sacrifice (in relation to Rom 15:16), a comprehensive picture of sacrifice which has broad implications. Schlier's suggestion concerning Paul's concept of sacrifice is placed within one of Daly's categories, 'The Sacrifice of Christians', without any substantial interacting with it.⁸⁰ Further interaction would have been helpful since Schlier is presenting what he believes to be Paul's view of sacrifice.

Daly's concern is to place Paul at the beginning of

stage three of a spiritualization process, and therefore the idea of incarnational spiritualization should be seen in the background of Daly's discussion. It comes to the foreground most notably in relation to Rom 12:1.⁸¹

Incarnational spiritualization is such a broad concept that it serves as a description of a particular religious tradition, which does affect the use of cultic language, but it is not always clear how it has done so. It would have served our purpose (not necessarily Daly's) to show explicitly how this concept is intrinsic to and is worked out in other uses of cultic language by Paul. At the same time, it is suggested here that the diversity of Paul's cultic language, in source, use, and implication needs further description beyond this broad category. Expressing Paul's theology of sacrifice under three categories and against the background of a singular distinctive or framework has left many specific textual questions for further consideration.

4. Tibor Horvath's The Sacrificial Interpretation of Jesus' Achievement in the New Testament
(footnote 82)

a) Horvath's perspective

T. Horvath's study is of interest, not only because he discusses Paul and Romans within his brief monograph, but because he views Romans as distinctive in terms of Paul's use of sacrificial language. This differs from the studies we have viewed so far.

Horvath suggests generally that "the notion of sacrifice in Paul, understood as the reconciliation of God with men seems to be prior to the redemption".⁸³ In Romans Paul uses ideas of expiation and sacrifice in a

distinctive way, as well as the love of God, to explain the death of Jesus.⁸⁴ Paul uses sacrificial ideas in relation to justice (3:25), and wrath (5:9).⁸⁵ He is responding to the situation of the gospel moving from the Jews to the Pagans, a situation that may be misread by the Pagans to indicate their righteousness. To strengthen his argument Paul speaks of expiation by innocent blood, which was familiar to the Romans. In the context of mission, and even feeling frustrated about Jewish rejection, Paul uses ideas of expiation, sacrifice, and even propitiation to explain the gospel afresh to the Gentiles. Thus, a theological framework is presented to explain the death of Jesus in Romans, which receives sacrificial description in that context.⁸⁶ Horvath ultimately offers a definition of sacrifice which involves faith and obedience in response to God's 'sacrifice'.⁸⁷ This sacrificial picture is distinctive, especially in its theological dimension.⁸⁸

Horvath's study emphasizes the theological nature of Romans 1-11 as it deals with the meaning of the death of Jesus. Rom 12:1 and 15:16 are dealt with separately under the category of "the life and death of Jesus' followers".⁸⁹ He interprets these cultic language texts (and Rom 1:9) in relation to the particular sections of the letter, but he does not discuss these latter texts with reference to the situation and purpose of the letter. His interest in these texts is the life of obedience that the apostle is to bring about, a new life for Jews and Gentiles, which evidently presupposes the "unacceptable" and "meaningless" nature of ritual sacrifices of both Jews and Gentiles.⁹⁰ Thus, Horvath affirms the sacrificial nature

of Christian obedience and faith. He suggests that Paul extended "such a terminology to the life of the faithful", once it was already "applied to Christ and his work".⁹¹ The connection that makes such an extension valid is the Christian's sharing of Christ's life.⁹²

b) Evaluation

Horvath's emphasis on the role of sacrificial ideas in relation to God the Father is significant, especially in Romans.⁹³ He sees it appropriate to speak of "God ... as sacrificing to man, i. e. uniting himself to man".⁹⁴ It is "God who presented Himself in a self-revelatory event in order to be accepted by man in faith".⁹⁵ This is God's sacrifice, which seems to be different in kind from the sacrifice of men.⁹⁶ The nature of Paul's cultic description of God's revelation in Christ will need to be considered in our exegeses (3:25, 5:9, 8:3), but here we would suggest that Horvath has extended Paul's understanding of sacrifice (at least as expressed in Romans) beyond what the cultic language seeks to convey. The description of 'God in Christ' in Romans is cultic and specifically sacrificial, but Paul does not seek, in our opinion, to present God as sacrificing.⁹⁷

It is significant that in his discussion of Paul, Horvath does not connect Rom 3:25 and 5:9 to Rom 12:1 and 15:16. It could be that such texts cannot be unified on the basis of sacrificial thought alone, and indeed different cultic ideas may be expressed in these texts. Horvath's different understandings of sacrifice allow for this.⁹⁸ It may be, though, that these cultic texts can and need to be unified as aspects of Paul's

presentation in the letter and their cultic content viewed accordingly.

Union with Christ, for Horvath, is the basis for the transfer of sacrificial language to the life of the Christian. This we agree with in a general sense, but would want to question a chronological or clearly logical progression in the use of sacrificial language from Christ to Christian. Paul's ability to use sacrificial language to describe the true religious experience of man is not necessarily dependent upon a concept of union with Christ, even if true religious experience is. Cultic language was current, and uses of it need not presuppose a conscious dependence on a doctrine of union with Christ in each case.

Horvath has pointed out three needs in the study of cultic language relevant to this thesis. One need is to consider further the situation of Romans in seeking to understand a particular use or set of uses of cultic language by Paul. Horvath attempted to do this for Romans, despite the brevity of the study. It is interesting in this respect that Horvath considered Romans to be distinctive in its use of cultic language. This is something we suggest also, but for different reasons as will become evident. It will become apparent also (Part Two, Chapter I) that we postulate a different setting for Romans than Horvath, and that we find Horvath's emphasis on the Gentile audience to be an over-emphasis. Compared to other Pauline letters, Romans seems to be written with Jewish-Christian tradition in mind, not to mention many Jews, despite the fact that it is probably

written to a Gentile majority.⁹⁹ The second need is to consider further the role of the apostle in this Christian sacrifice. Sacrifice, for Horvath, involves God's self-revelation and man's response to God's word.¹⁰⁰ This would seem to place the apostle in the centre of the Christian sacrificial activity. The third need relevant to this thesis is to consider further the relationships between different uses of cultic language, used in relation to God, Christ, and the Christian. Generally speaking, cultic language may be used differently when speaking of God than when speaking of man, and the way it describes Christ must be viewed carefully in the light of this possibility. The next study we consider makes helpful suggestions in this regard.

5. S. W. Sykes: a Bi-focal View of Sacrifice¹⁰¹

a) Sykes' Perspective

The theological studies we have considered have assumed the significance of sacrifice within a Christian context. Sacrifice is a natural, although modified concept in a Christian context. The metaphorical nature of some uses of sacrificial language has not been stressed, except when it is suggested that cultic language is not merely metaphorical, or that it has been spiritualized in some way. S. W. Sykes' work does not offer radically new conclusions, but his perspective reflects a careful attempt to deal with the diversity and metaphorical use of cultic language.

Sykes' thesis is that "sacrificial language is used realistically" in the NT.¹⁰² He notes at the same time that "some of the concepts of sacrifice appear to bear a

'metaphorical' meaning", which means they modify the meaning "of an original subject (the death of Christ)".¹⁰³ Such possible metaphorical uses of sacrificial language are actually "foundations of a new world of meaning", and one has to consider them within the "boundaries of religious worlds of meaning in which sacrifice appears as specific and significant acts".¹⁰⁴ Thus, Sykes attempts to be sensitive to the fact that sacrifice and sacrificial language is functioning within a framework that may modify its meaning, even as it modifies the meanings of those subjects it describes. Even if the meaning of sacrificial language and concepts is different within the Christian religious tradition, it would seem that such language must be viewed as having realistic meanings within this setting.¹⁰⁵

To understand the meaning context of sacrifice in the NT, one needs to keep in mind three aspects of NT teaching: "resurrection", "eschatology", and "narrative".¹⁰⁶ The first two refer to religious perspective, and the last refers to the the form of much of that perspective, a gospel that is largely narrative.¹⁰⁷ This is a story about God's dealings with his people, which focuses on God, and on Jesus. These two foci of the narrative set up a bi-focal perspective through which to view sacrifice in the story; sacrifice will function in relation to the major characters in the story.¹⁰⁸ This is a framework that Paul not only uses, he is also a part of it.¹⁰⁹ Sykes insists that one cannot speak of the sacrifice of Christ in a vacuum, rather one must keep in mind this particular "new world of meaning", because it

is crucial to how the death of Jesus is "denominated a sacrifice".¹¹⁰

Sykes suggests concerning Paul that "what he says about the death of Christ" has a "bi-focal" character and aspect to it.¹¹¹ This "bi-focal" perspective is reflected in the sacrificial images used. On one level, sacrifice is seen as an act of God in a context of sin and wrath. The result of this act is justification by faith.¹¹² This is the emphasis that is reflected sacrificially in Rom 3:25, 5:9, 8:3; 2 Cor 5:19,21; and Gal 3:13-14.¹¹³ Sykes, like Horvath, emphasizes this wrath/sin context in Romans particularly, and the nature of Romans as a "sophisticated" statement of the gospel.¹¹⁴ Sykes does not seek explanation beyond this, but allows for the emphasis of the letter. The second level or focus of Paul is on Christ's sacrifice as the "climactic act of a life of self-giving, an act with a voluntary and purposive intention, whose quality is taken to be paradigmatic for all future human life".¹¹⁵ It is when sacrifice is looked at from this perspective that the nature of the sacrifice of the Christian can be seen. Christ's sacrifice was the climax of offering "himself in love for others", a sacrifice which Christians are to offer in conformity with Christ (Rom 12:1).¹¹⁶ Sykes then speaks of the significance of these Christian sacrifices:

"In the Christian world of meaning these sacrifices are no more metaphorical than is Christ's. From other standpoints such sacrifices are, no doubt, 'spiritualized', in as much as the fruit of the sacrifice is, in the broad sense, spiritual and ethical (see Rom 12:3-21)". (footnote 117)

Sykes, similarly to R. J. Daly, notes the ambiguity

of the concept of 'spiritualization', especially because of Paul's idea of presenting "the Christian's body to God".¹¹⁸ Thus the sacrifice is not "non-material".¹¹⁹ Sykes suggests, in reference to 1 Cor 5:6 f., that "from the Christian standpoint, his life is the festal celebration of self-offering, inaugurated by the sacrifice of Christ".¹²⁰

b) Evaluation

Sykes' suggestion of a bi-focal perspective in the narrative of the Christian gospel is significant. It is helpful to view how sacrificial ideas function differently when used in the different levels of the "story". Sykes has sought to view sacrifice as it functions within different foci of the Christian tradition. He has not sought to unify the sacrificial ideas beyond this, nor to present a theology of sacrifice. At the same time he has affirmed the significance of sacrifice as central to an understanding of the Christian gospel, especially as communicated by Paul.

Although Sykes makes clear the fact that the Christian tradition provides "a new world of meaning",¹²¹ one has to ask how this interacts with Paul's Jewish tradition at different levels. It may be too general a framework to postulate a Christian context and then seek to describe different uses of cultic language within it. Paul's movement from Judaism to Christianity was not a matter of a uniform transfer of thought; rather there were points of both continuity and discontinuity. After all, the story is not completely new. Paul's climactic chapters are added to a story that had previous chapters of which Paul

was aware. Thus the intentions of Paul's statements and their role in the argument need to be assessed, since Paul is using language in a situation where various traditions are meeting.

Sykes is guarded when he speaks of the non-metaphorical nature of the Christian's sacrifice, and distinguishes between "the Christian world of meaning" and "other standpoints".¹²² It seems that even within the Christian tradition there may be an awareness that at times cultic language is being used in a non-literal way, and is evoking ideas intentionally, if not apologetically (e. g., Rom 12:1 *Θυσία ζῶσα, λογικὴ λατρεία* ; Rom 15:16; 1 Peter 2:5 *πνευματικὴ Θυσία* ; Hebrews 13:15-16). One is left with questions pertaining to the use of the words 'non-literal', and 'realistic' when used in connection with cultic language. At times its 'realistic' importance is more likely to be emphasized because of the continued meaningful significance of cultic language within a religious community. If a more distant historical standpoint is taken, then one must admit change in the use of cultic language, and the altering of some of the original literal meaning (e. g., some uses are now non-literal or spiritualized). At the same time there is a history of metaphorical usage that may be different from the literal use of cultic language, which is also significant within a religious tradition (in this case Israel's tradition).¹²³ We mention these questions, not because Sykes is unaware of them, but because we believe that these complex issues need to be considered at the level of each relevant text.

One possible omission in Sykes' work is any reference to Paul's use of cultic or sacrificial language in relation to gospel ministry.¹²⁴ In a sense, Paul saw himself as part of the story, and this may at times complicate the bi-focal picture that Sykes has presented. It would seem that mission is part of the "pre-understanding" with which we must approach Paul's teaching (something Horvath's study suggests generally). More consideration of this aspect of Paul's life and thinking would have made Sykes' insights more relevant to Paul. It may be in fact that instead of hopelessly complicating the picture, Paul's mission and the gospel proclamation may provide a framework for bi-focal viewing (as Denis and especially Schlier may indicate).

B. The Priesthood of Paul

The studies above (in A.) focused on sacrifice, and did not consider at any length the priestly language of Paul (which Wenschkewitz suggested was particularly Pauline). A.-M. Denis and Heinrich Schlier view Paul's priestly and cultic language,¹²⁵ Denis within in a number of Paul's letters and Schlier within Rom 15:14-21 (seen within the broader context of the letter and Paul's thought). Their studies are exegetical and they focus on Paul's 'cultic' apostleship.¹²⁶ Denis' study presents a coherent picture of a Christian cultus and Schlier's presents a coherent picture of Christian sacrifice, and both pictures are extended from the cultic description of the apostle's role. Insights from these studies will prove significant to the discussion of Christian sacrifice

in general, and cultic language in Romans in particular.

1. Denis' "La Fonction Apostolique et La Liturgie
Nouvelle en Esprit"

a) Denis' perspective

This study centres on four metaphors descriptive of the apostle's role in the new Christian cult. It presents a detailed exegetical and thematic study of the texts in which these cultic metaphors occur. The principal metaphors (and texts) are: (1) the apostle as "Liturge" [liturgist, celebrant, or priest] of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles (Rom 15:16), (2) the apostle as constructor of the spiritual temple (1 Cor 3:16-17), (3) the apostolic activity as a cult of an agreeable odour (2 Cor 2:14-17), and (4) the apostle poured out in libation (Phil 2:17).¹²⁷

Denis presents his perspective and method at the outset of the study.¹²⁸ Jerusalem was significant to Paul (as to other Jews), and particularly significant because it was there that he spent the early years of his life and was taught by Gamaliel. Paul, with this background and training, would not have thought to reject the cult, God does not take back his gifts to his people. At the same time, for Paul the true people of God were now Christians (true Jews are those revived by the Spirit of Christ). Paul maintained the place of the cult in this context by spiritualizing it, being too profoundly Jewish to deal with cultic realities in the Greek manner of one like Philo.¹²⁹ Crucial to Paul's spiritualization was the fact that the realm of the Messiah was that of the Spirit. Paul's spiritualization of the cult and Judaism was specifically because of his understanding of the penetration of the Holy Spirit. The whole life or

subsistence of Israel is now transposed by the Spirit into a perfect state.¹³⁰ This was a spiritualization of Judaism that was intended for both Jews and Gentiles. It was a spiritualization reflected in Paul's use of metaphors borrowed from the cult, of which a subsection described the apostolic role or function.

Denis views Paul's teaching concerning the spiritual cult as teaching not expressed in one place, but a teaching or doctrine that must be drawn from allusions and partial developments in various texts in Paul's letters. This view guides Denis methodologically so that he studies the texts containing the cultic metaphors to discover their unifying theme or doctrine. This he does while also noting the distinctive features of each text.

Denis concludes that the texts considered do not contain mere metaphors, but separate developments of the doctrine of the spiritual cult which reflect a coherent doctrine,¹³¹ and a profound reality.¹³² The doctrine expresses the completion and realization of the OT by the NT, and the spiritualization of Judaism including the Temple. The new cult is the life of faith, Christians are the new temple, and their lives are the sacrifices and offerings.¹³³ Paul's gospel and preaching is the source of this new life of faith, he makes possible this cultic life (the spiritual or new cult) for the Gentiles through his apostolic ministry.¹³⁴

Our concern is not Denis' labelling of the different aspects of the new cult in the Spirit (this is not his concern either), nor the extensive details of his study, but his emphasis on the role of the 'liturgical'

ministry of the apostle that forms the new cult. The Gentiles are dependent upon the 'cultic' apostle. Paul "is the origin and source of their life of faith", and therefore of the new cult for the Gentiles.¹³⁵ The role of the apostle, which involves the transmission of the life of faith, is a cultic and sacred reality.¹³⁶ This sacred and cultic aspect of the ministry is not separable from the apostolic function. It is the apostolic grace which makes Paul the liturgist of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles.¹³⁷ In this ministry Paul enables the Gentiles to participate in the messianic blessings of the elect people.

Denis' starting place for this picture of apostolic ministry is Romans 15:16, a picture that is broadened by the subsequent texts which support the idea of Paul as the apostle that initiates and celebrates the new cult in the Spirit for the Gentiles. Denis' study ends (in summary fashion) by viewing the apostolic word as that which "has cultic value".¹³⁸ It is the apostolic word which "lays the foundation of the temple" (1 Cor 3:16-17), and is "the sacred act which renders possible the daily offering and sacrifice" (Rom 15:16), which "completes the sacrifice by means of the libation" (Phil 2:17), and which "confers the life-giving priestly benediction" after "the offering of perfumes" (2 Cor 2:14-17).¹³⁹

Denis allows for possible development in Paul's cultic picture and doctrine, a development reflected in Philipians. Here the worldly cult is counterpart to a cosmic liturgy. This development is eschatological. The apostle's libation and Christian celebration join with the

whole universe in the recognition of the Lordship of Christ.¹⁴⁰

b) Evaluation

Denis suggests that Paul's spiritualization of Judaism is a transformation due to the Holy Spirit. Although this may be the case in the broadest sense, care must be used in assessing the point of particular metaphors to see if they support a uniform and thematically connected theory of spiritualization. It is not certain that such a coherent spiritualization is clearly implied by Paul's cultic metaphors, especially those metaphors descriptive of his own ministry. For instance, the actual cultic picture expressed in Philippians (e. g., 2:17) is difficult to assess, and does not seem to clearly reveal an earthly counterpart to the celestial cult (as Denis concludes).¹⁴¹ This raises questions concerning the interpretation of metaphorical language. Denis has interpreted the metaphors with other concepts in the letters, and then considers the metaphors together because of their cultic theme. This is legitimate, but we would stress the need to limit the thrust of the metaphor to what is most obvious in context. Otherwise, overstatement or over-interpretation can take place in relation to the intention of the author. Overstatement can be made also if texts are used that do not contain the metaphorical image in order to strengthen the teaching associated with a metaphorical theme. In Denis' section on the spiritual temple theme, he discusses Rom 8:9-11, which does not have an explicit reference to the Temple.¹⁴² Denis considers this as a parallel, and is cautious. We agree with the caution, and

suggest that such a text needs to be used carefully, even if it contains relevant ideas, such as God's indwelling presence. The fact still remains that Paul does not refer to the Temple in Romans. It may be that temple language in 1 Cor 6:19-20 is used to express ideas similar to those in Rom 8:9-11, and that one can suggest reasons for the absence of temple language. But this may raise questions concerning the significance of the cultic language, if in fact Paul can state parallel ideas without the cultic metaphor. We are illustrating merely the need for care in assessing the role of metaphorical language. Metaphorical language, even if not merely metaphorical, does not necessarily point beyond itself to a theological structure expressed by similar metaphors. And likewise, one cannot assume that a particular metaphor is close at hand because a theological idea associated with it has been expressed. When one views 2 Cor 2:14-17 or Phil 2:17 it is clear that such texts definitely say something with cultic language of the significance of apostolic ministry and the suffering involved, as Paul seeks to make his point in context. But one needs to be careful in viewing these texts in relation to other uses of cultic language or images. Paul's metaphors are diversified and appeal to his audience's world or his own. The intention of the metaphor varies greatly, and this must be emphasized, if a coherent theology is sought. Our concern is to suggest that Paul's cultic language is not always part of a programmatic spiritualization of Judaism, at least not in a consistent fashion.¹⁴³ If Paul is using a Jewish image, but still seems to be expressing an idea

without consciously spiritualizing Judaism as such, one must be careful in speaking in these terms (as we noted with Weiss' approach above). This is something we must consider in our exegesis.

Despite these criticisms, Denis has produced thorough studies of a number of cultic metaphors. His attempt to deal with cultic language as metaphors that point towards a theme is a clear statement of approach, although it must be used with care. By focusing on the apostolic function, he has isolated an aspect of Paul's thought that was particularly Pauline (as Wenschkewitz noted).¹⁴⁴ By focusing on these metaphors, he has emphasized something other than union with Christ and his death as the centre of cultic reality. The ministry of the apostle himself is cultic, and it leads to the life of faith among the Gentiles, and the presence of the Spirit, and thus the cultic description of the community. This is a provocative idea, and one that brings into consideration texts that are often given less treatment than they deserve in the study of Paul's cultic language.¹⁴⁵

As we have noted, the first text that Denis considers is Rom 15:16. It may be that pursuing further how this text and its cultic image relate to other emphases in Romans may be a fruitful procedure. Denis has presented a significant aspect of Paul's self-description and understanding of his apostleship. But the importance of this self-description in Romans needs to be pursued further, especially because of its position within a section that defends Paul's boldness in the letter (15:14-21).

2. Heinrich Schlier's "Die 'Liturgie' des apostolischen Evangeliums (Rom 15, 14-21)" (footnote 146)

a) Schlier's perspective

Schlier states that Paul describes his apostolic ministry as the priestly, public-official, and eschatological liturgy of the gospel.¹⁴⁷ Through such a liturgy or apostolic service, the Gentiles are offered to God. Christ allows his liturgist to bring about the obedience of faith through his word and deed. This is a liturgical ministry among all nations, and through this obedience of faith, the sacrifice is accomplished. The service of this liturgy is to lay the foundation of the church in the cosmos, thus securing the church's preservation. Schlier suggests that this is what Paul claims he has done by way of reminder in Romans through the development of the traditional gospel.¹⁴⁸

Central to this apostolic ministry (liturgy) is grace.¹⁴⁹ The grace of God is operative in the ministry of the apostle. This includes the call of God to Paul, and through Paul. More than this, in Paul's ministry the work of Christ, which can be described as grace, is actual and present.¹⁵⁰ This grace is involved in Paul's service, which is the proclamation of the gospel, calling for obedience from the Gentiles. Such a response of faith in obedience is a sacrifice in response to the sacrifice of Christ.¹⁵¹ Because of the sacrifice presented and responded to through Paul's ministry, Paul's ministry is priestly. It is the grace of God, the actual working of Christ in this apostolic ministry that gives it its sacral character and makes it a real priestly liturgy.

The centre of Christian sacrifice, as a comprehensive

process, is the apostolic liturgy. In this liturgy, Paul "takes up the grace of Christ's sacrifice into his gospel and apostolate and hands it on to the nations".¹⁵² Thus, the grace of sacrifice is a three-fold process: (1) the self-sacrifice of Jesus Christ, (2) the sacrificial service of the priestly liturgy of the gospel through the apostle,¹⁵³ and (3) the obedience of faith.¹⁵⁴ Of most importance is that within the liturgy of the apostle the concrete sacrifice of Christ for our benefit is made available through the power of the Spirit, and is communicated through the gospel. Christ becomes credible through the liturgy, and one can entrust oneself to him there.¹⁵⁵ Through the apostolic liturgy the sacrifice of the Gentiles is rendered acceptable to God. Thus the comprehensive sacrifice of Christ - apostle - and church is completed.

Schlier does not view this as a spiritualization of the cult, but a replacement. This is an eschatological and universal concept. The offering is no longer presented in the Jerusalem Temple through ritual, but rather takes place among the Gentiles, who are themselves the offering. This is the "Endopfer", one that takes place through the apostolic liturgy, which operates throughout the inhabited regions of the Roman world.¹⁵⁶

b) Evaluation

Schlier is concerned to bring out the theological implications of the text. He is careful in working with Pauline vocabulary, and sets the text within its role as an apologetic for Paul's writing of the letter. His emphasis on the mediating role of the ministry of the

apostle in the grace of sacrifice is justified, because it seems to be the thrust of Rom 15:16. His identification of the sacrifice or offering with the Gentiles themselves (Paul's offering) who are offering their obedience of faith (their offering - Rom 12:1) is one we affirm and will consider below (exegesis of 15:16).

The most provocative aspect of Schlier's discussion is the place of the sacrifice of Christ within the apostolic liturgy. It is by the proclamation of the gospel through the Holy Spirit that the sacrifice of Christ is effective, e. g., it can be responded to by the obedience of faith. It is at this point that Schlier leaves out of the picture Pauline texts from Romans concerning the death of Christ. Unlike T. Horvath, Schlier does not really attempt at any length to interact with earlier references to the sacrificial death of Christ in Romans (3:25, 5:9, 8:3).¹⁵⁷ It needs to be shown that Paul did or even could have presented a clear picture of an apostolic liturgy of bringing and producing sacrifice. This may in fact be a reasonable deduction, if it is clear that the gospel proclamation is seen as continuous with the sacrificial death of Christ.¹⁵⁸ Schlier sees such a continuity because of the concept of grace (*Χάρις*).¹⁵⁹ His use of grace (Gnade) is comprehensive to say the least.¹⁶⁰ One has to question whether Paul would have understood grace, especially in relation to sacrifice, in the comprehensive way that Schlier suggests.¹⁶¹ Again we are left with the need to discover clearer connections drawn by Paul himself in this attempt at viewing a Christian cult. It may in fact be the case that Paul's

thought is very similar to what Schlier is suggesting, but that Paul has not expressed it clearly in terms of the grace of sacrifice.¹⁶²

Another aspect of Schlier's study that needs further consideration is his 'eschatological replacement' idea, which is based upon the common use of 'now' in relation to the revelation of righteousness, and salvation.¹⁶³ This is stated more definitely than by K. Weiss, and is similar to Denis' and Seidensticker's emphasis. It is helpful that Schlier moves the discussion out of cultic language itself at this point, and looks for other indicators that may suggest that the cultic language supports the 'eschatological replacement' idea.

The strength of Schlier's work is that he has sought to explain Rom 15:14-21 within the context of Romans first, and then other Pauline letters. He also has presented clearly a text where Paul speaks of his apostolate in sacrificial terms and sought to integrate it with broader Pauline ideas so as to present a comprehensive sacrificial theology. Much of Schlier's 'thesis' is implicit in other studies considered in this survey,¹⁶⁴ but he has provided an explicit sacrificial theology relevant for the study of Romans.

C. Summary and Conclusions

We have seen the difficulties in seeking to present a Pauline theology of Christian sacrifice that is truly Pauline. Often the contingent nature of Paul's teaching, including the use and meaning of particular words, is not emphasized or is lost. Either one is presented with a

theory of the cultic nature of the Christian life that seems more complex and integrated by mystical ideas than Paul indicates, or certain aspects of the evidence are not considered so that the picture is incomplete.¹⁶⁵ More care is needed to make Paul's own use of cultic language and ideas the guide for presenting a comprehensive view of Paul's cultic thought;¹⁶⁶ cultic thought that may not fit within a concept of sacrifice itself. This not only involves an awareness of Pauline usage of words, but resisting the temptation to place undue emphasis on certain cultic terms or phrases, unless they prove to be significant in context. It also involves recognizing the diversity of sources for Paul's use of cultic language, and the need to study Paul's use carefully in light of his particular emphases.

We have seen much evidence presented that may be used in assessing the theology expressed in Paul's cultic language. It is evident that Paul does describe Christian existence cultically, both in relation to the death of Christ,¹⁶⁷ and the presence of the Spirit.¹⁶⁸ There are deeds that can be viewed sacrificially,¹⁶⁹ and there is the exhortation to present bodies as a living sacrifice.¹⁷⁰ The death of Christ can be viewed in some sense cultically affecting reconciliation, forgiveness and justification through faith,¹⁷¹ and it can be seen as the climax of a life of love, a sacrifice pleasing to God.¹⁷² Furthermore, baptismal commitment and obedience seem to be closely associated with sacrificial concepts.¹⁷³ Paul does speak of his own life and ministry in cultic terms.¹⁷⁴ The Lord's supper has cultic

connotations,¹⁷⁵ and Paul does use cultic language in literal senses on occasion.¹⁷⁶ Cultic language is in fact an important aspect of Paul's vocabulary.¹⁷⁷ It permeates apologetic, didactic, personal, liturgical, and especially practical and ethical material. Paul, at the same time, does not seem to bring his cultic language together often and this suggests a lack of interest in explaining his theology cultically at least in a comprehensive way.

S. W. Sykes has provided us with the best approach to the subject, while still maintaining the significance of sacrificial ideas. It is best not to construct a theology of sacrifice, until one sees how sacrificial and cultic ideas are a part of Paul's broader thought. This needs to be taken beyond Sykes' overview level, and done in the context of a thorough discussion of exegetical matters. Thus, if sacrificial or cultic ideas present themselves as crucial to Paul's argument and thought, then one can speak of a sacrificial or cultic aspect of Paul's theology.¹⁷⁸ Sykes has also shown the need to consider the metaphorical aspect of the language in use, although he did not do this at length. One needs to consider a particular use of cultic language, and seek to suggest if there is metaphorical language present, and of what type. This clearly needs to be done with each use of cultic language, in view of the possible options relevant to the type of usage being presented. This is true, even within a "Christian world of meaning".¹⁷⁹ Despite transformations in meaning, which were not always exclusively Christian, the literal sacrificial and cultic meanings were still basic options within Paul's lifetime, a fact that suggests that numerous

uses of cultic language should still be labelled as non-literal, even if used realistically.¹⁸⁰ This needs to be done so that the language can be interpreted in Pauline ways, and not with an assumed theological structure.¹⁸¹

It must be seen as significant, in the light of Paul's lack of systematic theology, that there are such significant statements that contain cultic language in a letter such as Romans. The studies above often dealt with Romans, if Romans was not their primary concern. This was appropriate, and it is an indication of the possible significance of cultic concepts within Paul's thought, at least at the time of the writing of this letter. Horvath noted the distinctive emphases of Romans in relation to the use of cultic language, but his treatment was limited and we have disagreed with his emphasis on the significance of the Gentile audience of the letter. There needs to be further consideration of the place of cultic words and concepts in Romans.¹⁸²

More so than other studies we have considered, Schlier's exegetical study has led him to consider Paul's cultic picture in relation to the purpose of the letter. This leads him to consider the place of other cultic language in Romans, although he deals very briefly with material in 1:16-11:36. By keeping in mind his exegesis of 15:16, and his attempt to develop a Pauline concept in relation to sacrificial language ($\chi\rho\rho\rho$), Schlier has suggested a Pauline perspective from which to view some other uses of cultic language.¹⁸³ This is especially important when one attempts to present some type of unified picture of Paul's thought concerning sacrifice.

Thus, we suggest that by following in the footsteps of Schlier's exegetical approach, but keeping in mind the contributions of numerous scholars, we can more carefully consider some crucial uses of cultic language within the Pauline corpus; those that are significant in Romans. This will aid in presenting a descriptive study of Paul's use of cultic language in Romans, instead of constructing a theology of sacrifice that may not really represent his thought.¹⁸⁴

Footnotes

¹C. F. D. Moule, Review of Lebendiges Opfer, by Philipp Seidensticker, in JTS NS 6 (1955) 281-284, (p. 281). See also, Robert T. Siebeneck, review of Lebendiges Opfer, by Philipp Seidensticker, in CBQ, 17 (1955) 657-658. He says, "this work studies Greek, Jewish, and Christian cult to show the Christological and pneumatic peculiarities of the NT cult-concept" (p. 657).

²Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, p. 325. This is the starting point of Seidensticker's conclusion.

³Ibid., p. 121. The Christian cult as expressed by Paul (as noted in relation to the sacrifice of Christ [p. 202]) seems to represent the transforming of both OT and Hellenistic cultic ideas.

⁴Ibid., p. 145, and the section (pp. 145-203). We only deal generally with Seidensticker's conclusions concerning Paul, and not with his perspective on the Lord's supper, Hebrews, or Revelation.

⁵Ibid., p. 171. This phrase is an abbreviation for "through the shedding of blood". Seidensticker views "God set him forth as an atonement offering by virtue of his blood" as an appropriate translation of the cultic language in Rom 3:25, p. 169.

⁶Ibid., p. 173. Seidensticker notes that Paul does not designate Christ as priest directly.

⁷Ibid., p. 179, and generally. ⁸Ibid., p. 202.

⁹Ibid., p. 201. ¹⁰Ibid., p. 188.

¹¹Ibid., p. 188. ¹²Ibid., p. 203.

¹³Ibid., p. 192. ¹⁴Ibid., p. 199.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 191. ¹⁶Ibid., p. 203.

¹⁷Seidensticker's discussion of the cultic aspects of the church proceeds under two headings: 1) the church as the community of the saints in Christ, and 2) the event-character of the Christ-community.

¹⁸Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, pp. 256-263.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 262. ²⁰Ibid., p. 262.

²¹Ibid., p. 262.

²²Ibid., p. 237. The event-character of the Christian life is made possible by baptism.

²³Ibid., p. 280.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 251-252. It is only in relation to Christ's death that Seidensticker speaks of the

satisfaction of God, p. 325.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 255-256.

²⁶Seidensticker realized that his approach is theological, but he believed historical study, moving from the environment to the NT, would come to the same result. The distinctiveness of the NT still would be affirmed. The cultic thought focuses on God in Christ. The cultic order finds its ultimate 'liturgical' shape in the cross-death of Christ (Lebendiges Opfer., p. 327). The cultic concept is Christologized. This is not a spiritualization, but a different phenomenon. It is mystical, but real fellowship with Christ within which a transition takes place from historical reality to mystical reality (pp. 327-328).

²⁷Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, p. 328.

²⁸Seidensticker viewed direct connections with details of the cult, as in the priestly writings, to be of secondary importance.

²⁹Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, p. 328.

³⁰See Siebeneck, review of Lebendiges Opfer, p. 658. Siebeneck notes further, particularly in relation to Hebrews, that "Christ is the personal focus in whom the royal and priestly character of the whole chosen people is brought together" (p. 658).

³¹We agree with this concern raised by Moule, review of Lebediges Opfer, pp. 282-283.

³²Ibid., p. 262. "Θυσία ζῶσα verbindet Kreuzestod und christliches Leben zu einer kultischen Gemeinschaft im Geiste Christi". This is not the only text that is viewed as understandable in view of baptismal unity with Christ, and seems in our view to be interpreted beyond the concern of Paul. Seidensticker's discussion of Phil 2:17 and 4:18 ties the offering of Christians to Christ and the life of obedience and love that Christ's life was and is (p. 225). We question the likelihood that this was Paul's concern in these texts.

³³Ibid., pp. 257-258.

³⁴In general we would be in agreement with the conclusions of Günther Wagner concerning baptism in Rom 6 (Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries, English trans. [Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd Ltd, 1967]).

³⁵Ibid., p. 252. Seidensticker's statement that "Das Opfer ist also stets 'in fieri'" seems to point to the idea that the death of Christ itself is not the simple focus of the use of sacrificial language, unless one views the Pauline meaning of the death of Christ very broadly.

³⁶It is different for Paul to speak of Christ functioning in a mediating fashion than for Paul to affirm the priesthood of Christ. Paul could speak of Christ's

intercession (Rom 8:34) without explicitly emphasizing the priesthood of Christ. Paul may have seen Christ as a priestly messiah, but he does not state this in Romans.

³⁷It is interesting to note that although Seidensticker states that Rom 12:1 does not contain a clear reference to the Eucharist (Lebendiges Opfer, p. 263), he does suggest that the consummate realization of Rom 12:1 is in the Lord's supper (p. 279). This is understandable, though, in view of Seidensticker's approach. It is understandable also that Seidensticker does not see Rom 9:4 as indicating the real significance of the present Jerusalem cultus to Paul (p. 134).

³⁸Raymond Corriveau, The Liturgy of Life: A Study of the Ethical Thought of St. Paul in His Letters to the Early Christian Communities Studia Travaux de Recherche 25 (Bruxelles - Paris: Desclee De Brouwer, 1970)

³⁹The subtitle indicates this: "A Study of the Ethical Thought of St. Paul in His Letters to the Early Christian Communities".

⁴⁰Ibid., note conclusion: "All is for the glory of God" (pp. 244-245). Cultic description is given to "conversion from sin" (pp. 233-237), "faith obedience" (pp. 237-239), "the apostolate" (pp. 239-240), "love-service" (pp. 240-243), and "marriage, virginity, and chastity" (pp. 243-244). He does not include the pastorals in his study.

⁴¹Ibid., p. 177. ⁴²Ibid., p. 177.

⁴³Ibid., See Lucien Cerfaux, Le Chrétien dans la théologie paulinienne, (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1962), p. 258. This is a suggestion that needs consideration, although Cerfaux does not discuss it at this point. It is also a suggestion with which we will basically agree.

⁴⁴Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, on Rom 1:9 (pp. 140-148), Rom 15:16 (pp. 148-155), and Rom 12:1-2 (pp. 155-185).

⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 167-169. ⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 172-177.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 177. ⁴⁸Ibid., p. 172.

⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 172-174. ⁵⁰Ibid., p. 174.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 175. ⁵²Ibid., p. 176.

⁵³Therefore some of the criticisms of Seidensticker's work are still applicable to Corriveau. The matter of contingency and coherence has been addressed by J. Christiaan Beker in Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), "Contingency and Coherence in Paul's Letters" (pp. 23-36).

⁵⁴Corriveau, Liturgy of Life; Paul does not seem

to discuss the ontological change of Christ in relation to sacrifice, nor in relation to reconciliation. And the phrase, "in passing to the Father" presents ambiguity that Paul doesn't (p. 177).

⁵⁵Daly, Christian Sacrifice, p. 230. Also significant are Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, and "The New Testament Concept of Christian Sacrificial Activity", BThB 8 (July 1978) 99-107.

⁵⁶Ibid., p. 491. ⁵⁷Ibid., p. 491.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 208. ⁵⁹Ibid., p. 230.

⁶⁰Daly, Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 10.

⁶¹Ibid., p. 83. ⁶²Ibid., p. 136.

⁶³Ibid., p. 136.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 136-137. This is similar to the picture O. Schmitz presents of "late Judaism in Die Opferanschauung, especially pp. 189-195. But Daly does not have the same negative picture of Judaism and sacrifice that Schmitz had, which seemed to be a part of his evaluative perspective on religious experience.

⁶⁵Daly, Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, pp. 137-138.

⁶⁶Ibid., p. 137.

⁶⁷Daly, Christian Sacrifice., p. 491.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 232 ff. The primary texts are 1 Cor 3:16 f., 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:19-22. He sees the idea presented in other texts as well - Rom 8:9,11,15 f.; 1 Thess 4:8; 1 Cor 2:10-16; 2 Cor 1:22; Rom 5:5.

⁶⁹Ibid., p. 236.

⁷⁰Although we will not focus on the use of ὑπέρ, we agree in general with Daly's conclusions.

⁷¹Ibid., p. 237. Primary texts are 2 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13; Rom 8:3, 3:24 f., and 5:9, pp. 237-240.

⁷²Ibid., p. 240.

⁷³Ibid., p. 240. We will consider the contributions of A.-M. Denis and H. Schlier below (in B.). Daly does not emphasize the priestly role of Paul.

⁷⁴Ibid., p. 245. ⁷⁵Ibid., p. 246.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 246.

⁷⁷Wenschkewitz, in "Die Spiritualisierung", studied temple references, and then discussed sacrifice under "(1) in reference to Christ" and "(2) in general form", on

pp. 110-111, 116.

⁷⁸On Daly's lack of good "analytical categories" in studying sacrifice, see Attridge, review of Christian Sacrifice, p. 147; on uneven treatment of NT, p. 145.

⁷⁹Daly, Christian Sacrifice, p. 249. (We will note this in Denis' work also.) At the end of his discussion of Schlier's perspective on Rom 15:15 f., Daly suggests that in 15:20 Paul may have had a "community as temple of God" theme in mind. This is not explicit in Rom 15:20.

⁸⁰Although Daly notes a possible 'Temple' theme in 15:20, he does not really interact with the unified picture of sacrifice that Schlier presents. Daly's three categories for presenting the theology of sacrifice are presented at the beginning of the work (Christian Sacrifice, p. 3).

⁸¹Ibid., pp. 243-246.

⁸²Tibor Horvath, The Sacrificial Interpretation of Jesus' Achievement in the New Testament: Historical Development and Its Reason (New York: Philosophical Library, 1979). Horvath deals with Paul on pp. 47-66 under three headings: "(1) Jesus' life and death" (pp. 47-56), "(2) The life and death of Jesus' followers" (pp. 58-65), "(3) The Last Supper - Eucharistic celebration" (pp. 65-66).

⁸³Ibid., p. 87.

⁸⁴Ibid., p. 53; Horvath sees Romans as "perhaps the most explicit theological treatise of Paul on the question of why Jesus had to die".

⁸⁵Ibid., p. 54.

⁸⁶Ibid., pp. 53-56; Horvath mentions other factors in Paul's argument in Romans, but these are not essential for our concern.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 87, "nothing else but faith and obedience to the word of God".

⁸⁸We will not deal with Horvath's broader thesis. He is suggesting that the sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' achievement developed in a mission context, which made reasons for the death of Jesus necessary (Horvath, Sacrificial Interpretation, pp. 2-3).

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 63; Horvath's last category, "(3) The Last Supper - Eucharistic celebration" (pp. 65-66), considers two passages in Paul (1 Cor 10:14-21, and 11:17-34).

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 63. ⁹¹Ibid., p. 87.

⁹²A similar type of reasoning is proposed for the validity of using sacrificial language for the Eucharist:

a "very close relationship between the table and the cup of the Lord and the body and the blood of Christ" (Ibid., p. 88).

⁹³Ibid., pp. 53-54; also pp. 8-9, 86-87.

⁹⁴Ibid., p. 87. ⁹⁵Ibid., p. 87.

⁹⁶Ibid., p. 87.

⁹⁷This will need to be viewed in our exegetical section. It is our opinion that to speak of God as sacrificing (e. g. Rom 3:25, 5:9, 8:3; 1 Cor 5:7, 2 Cor 5:21) is to go beyond the language and intention of Paul.

⁹⁸S. W. Sykes' suggests (in the study we will consider below) that in Paul's letters, "the sacrifice of Christ has to be looked at in two ways" ("Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology", in Sacrifice, edited by M. F. C. Bourdillon and Meyers Fortes [London: Academic Press, 1980], pp. 61-83, [p. 76].)

⁹⁹For general support of this thesis, and especially of the (Hellenistic) influence on the language in Rom 3:25, see Sam K. Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event Harvard Dissertations in Religion 2 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975).

¹⁰⁰Horvath, Sacrificial Interpretation, p. 87.

¹⁰¹Sykes, "Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology"; in relation to Paul especially pp. 76-77.

¹⁰²Ibid., p. 62.

¹⁰³Ibid., p. 64. Sykes' focus is primarily on the use of sacrificial language in relation to the death of Christ, although he does consider other uses.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., pp. 63-64.

¹⁰⁵For a differing perspective, specifically one that seeks to see substitutes for sacrificial language, see C. F. D. Moule, "The Sacrifice of the People of God" in Essays in New Testament Interpretation (Cambridge: CUP, 1982), pp. 287-297.

¹⁰⁶Sykes, "Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology", p. 64.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., pp. 64-66. ¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 66.

¹⁰⁹Ibid., pp. 76-77. ¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 67.

¹¹¹Ibid., p. 76. Sykes is assuming ^{EXISTED} that the need for an explanation of the death of Jesus was "from the first" (p. 69), and that early attempts were focused on "texts about sacrifice, rather than sacrifices themselves" (p. 69).

¹¹²Ibid., p. 76. ¹¹³Ibid., pp. 73-74.

¹¹⁴Ibid., p. 73.

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 76; especially in reference to Eph 5:2.

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 76. ¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 76.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 76; see Robert J. Daly, Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, pp. 6-8.

¹¹⁹Sykes, "Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology", p. 76.

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 76. ¹²¹Ibid., p. 64.

¹²²Ibid., p. 76. It could be that certain uses of sacrificial or cultic language could have been understood outside the Christian sphere the same way, despite the obvious broader distinctions because of life in Christ (e. g., Phil 4:18). We recognise that Paul has so united the cultic language to his message in many cases that it is difficult to assess this possibility.

¹²³Something that Hermisson considered as an important aspect of his study (Sprache und Ritus, pp. 27-28).

¹²⁴Because the work is on sacrifice this is understandable, but Phil 2:17 (2 Tim 4:6), and Rom 15:16 could have received mention, if not Rom 1:9, and Phil 3:3.

¹²⁵Albert - Marie Denis, "La Fonction Apostolique et La Liturgie Nouvelle en Esprit: Étude thématique des métaphores pauliniennes du culte nouveau", RSPHTh 42, no. 3, (1958) 401-436; RSPHTh 42, no. 4, 1958 (617-656). Heinrich Schlier's main contribution that we will be considering is "Die 'Liturgie' des apostolischen Evangeliums (Rom 15, 14-21)".

¹²⁶A similar study is offered by Karl H. Schelkle, "I Abhandlungen 1. Der Apostel als Priester", ThQ, 136 (1956) 257-283. Schelkle develops the priestly rôle of Paul (pp. 267-274), and general priesthood (pp. 275-283). Significant is the theological framework of "word" and "cult" that Schelkle presents for ministry (pp. 259-268). Paul, and indeed all apostles, are priestly in their mediation of the word of revelation and their involvement in active ministry within the cultic community (pp. 267-269). As Denis will emphasize, Schelkle sees the real cult as the cult of the Spirit (pp. 280-281). Thus cultic language is used beyond the metaphorical level, and the cult is spiritualized. K. Weiss' "Paulus - Priester" also emphasizes the priestly cult of Paul, and Denis' work is in basic agreement with it.

¹²⁷Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle"; other texts are considered within the study of each metaphor. The most extensive treatment is given to the apostolic libation theme, pp. 617-650.

¹²⁸Ibid., pp. 401-402. ¹²⁹Ibid., p. 402.

¹³⁰Ibid., p. 402. ¹³¹Ibid., p. 654.

¹³²Ibid., p. 655. ¹³³Ibid., p. 655.

¹³⁴Ibid., pp. 655-656. ¹³⁵Ibid., p. 655.

¹³⁶Ibid., pp. 655-656. ¹³⁷Ibid., p. 656.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 656.

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 656. I have noted the relevant texts.

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 656. ¹⁴¹Ibid., p. 656.

¹⁴²Ibid., pp. 409-410. Denis discusses this text in his section on the temple theme, although it is considered as a parallel reference.

¹⁴³Ibid., note pp. 650-651.

¹⁴⁴Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 130.

¹⁴⁵Konrad Weiss' conclusions are quite similar, but his treatment is much briefer.

¹⁴⁶The article is an exegesis of this text with a theological reflection on the relationship between grace and sacrificial thought.

¹⁴⁷Schlier, "Die 'Liturgie'", pp. 248-253, 259. This is straight from Rom 15:14-21, keeping in mind a wide definition of liturgy and liturgist.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 259.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., pp. 253-256. It is evident from Schlier's discussion of grace, in "Vom Wesen der Apostolischen Ermahnung nach Römerbrief 12:1-2" (Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge, 5th ed., [Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1972]), 74-89, that he has a three-fold concept of grace that correlates closely with its cultic description in his discussion of Rom 15:14-21. The grace of God is in Jesus Christ, which Paul has received from God through the revelation of Christ to him. Secondly, the grace of God comes in the apostolic service of the gospel itself, as Christ works through Paul. Thirdly, the grace of God is a church establishing grace, which builds the church and also supplies grace in the deployment of charismata in the church. There is a line of grace, so to speak, binding together Christ - Apostle - Church. This same line will be seen in the grace of sacrifice that Schlier describes below.

¹⁵⁰Schlier, "Die 'Liturgie'", p. 254.

¹⁵¹Ibid., p. 255. ¹⁵²Ibid., p. 256.

153 This is expressed in Paul's devotion to and for the gospel.

154 As R. J. Daly translates it, this involves "submitting oneself to God for the sake of one's neighbor", in Christian Sacrifice, p. 248.

155 It is wherever the gospel is responded to by obedience that the liturgy is completed and the sacrifice offered. Thus, the word "there" is not used in a concrete spatial sense.

156 Schlier, "Die 'Liturgie'", pp. 251-252.

157 Schlier appeals primarily to Eph 5:2 and 1 Cor 5:7 in reference to the sacrifice of Christ ("Die 'Liturgie'", p. 255).

158 The fact that the content of the gospel includes the proclamation of the sacrificial death of Christ could lead in this direction, if one sees Romans 1-11, and especially 1:18-8:39, as explaining or defending Paul's gospel (1:16-17). Also, the fact that Paul sees salvation in the believing of the gospel would lead in this direction (1:16-17, 10:9-10).

159 Ibid., pp. 253-256.

160 Ibid., p. 253, Christ is the grace of God; p. 254, the gospel and apostolate are grace; p. 253, the apostolic liturgy is grace, "Charis".

161 See note 149.

162 This is a phrase, 'grace of sacrifice', that Paul does not use.

163 Ibid., p. 252; Rom 3:31 ff., Rom 15:8; 2 Cor 6:2.

164 It is stated explicitly in Daly's Christian Sacrifice, pp. 248-249.

165 It may in fact be that the concept of sacrifice itself is not the best way to unify Paul's 'cultic' thought. Seidensticker and Corriveau illustrate this problem, since their presentations of sacrifice seem to have moved beyond Paul's thought. Of Daly, Horvath and Sykes' works, Sykes has been the most helpful in suggesting a way to view sacrifice, allowing for diversity within the Christian 'story'. Horvath noted the distinctive character of Romans, which is suggestive for our study, while showing the need for Sykes' study. Denis' study demonstrates the significance of the cultic description of Paul's ministry, an aspect of cultic language and thought that needed to be emphasized. Schlier has moved towards a comprehensive 'cultic' picture, using the cultic description of Paul's ministry as a base. But more needs to be done in viewing other texts in Romans (Schlier's main source) to see whether or not Paul can actually be spoken of as presenting a unified Christian cultus or

concept of sacrifice.

¹⁶⁶This does not mean that Paul's own language must be used in the end, but that it needs to guide in the attempt to study Paul or place him within the early church's use of cultic language.

¹⁶⁷1 Cor 5:7 ff., Eph 2:11-18.

¹⁶⁸1 Cor 3:17, 6:19; 1 Cor 6:16 ff.; Eph 2:18-22; Phil 3:3.

¹⁶⁹Phil 4:18, (Rom 14:18).

¹⁷⁰Rom 12:1.

¹⁷¹Rom 3:25, 5:9 8:3; 2 Cor 5:14,21; Eph 1:7, 2:13; Col 1:20 ff. These need to be defended to be sure. The exegesis below will seek to do this for the texts in Romans.

¹⁷²Eph 5:2. It is interesting how crucial this text has been in the discussion of Christ's sacrifice.

¹⁷³This can be seen when connections between Romans 6 and 12:1 are rightly drawn. On the obedience theme, note Rom 15:16-18.

¹⁷⁴Rom 1:9, 15:16; Phil 2:17; 2 Cor 2:14-17.

¹⁷⁵1 Cor 10:16, 11:23-25.

¹⁷⁶1 Cor 9:13, 10:18; Rom 9:4, 11:3.

¹⁷⁷There are numerous words and texts that we have not included above, which add to the picture of Paul's use of cultic language: Rom 11:16, 8:34, ἡ ἀπαρχὴ - Rom 8:23, 11:16, 16:5; 1 Cor 15:20, 23, 16:15; 2 Thess 2:13; ΠΑΡΙΣΤΑΝΩ in Rom 6, 12:1; Eph 5:27; Col 1:22, 28; 2 Tim 2:15; and possible connotations in Rom 14:18; 1 Cor 8:8; 2 Cor 4:14, 11:2. Drawing lines of distinction is difficult, and it is best to focus on words that are clearly cultic in at least a number of their uses.

¹⁷⁸The phrase "theology of Christian sacrifice" is not preferred in this study, but if such is used, then it should reflect a theology that is significantly influenced by sacrificial concepts and presents a clear description of the nature of sacrifice for the Christian. We prefer not to use it, not only because we do not like 'theological genitives', but also because 'sacrifice' has been used too broadly.

¹⁷⁹Sykes, "Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology", p. 76.

¹⁸⁰See Owen Barfield, "The meaning of the word 'Literal'".

¹⁸¹Paul participated in Jewish Temple activity after

writing Romans (according to Acts 21:26-27, 24:17-18), so that the literal meaning of sacrifices was not something of the past alone.

¹⁸²Seidensticker and Daly do not really consider Romans separately from other letters. Corriveau does this in view of the distinctives of the cultic images in the letter, but there is no attempt at discussing introductory questions concerning Romans. Horvath and Sykes mention some distinctives of the letter, but their discussion is brief. Denis is only concerned with Rom 15:16, which is dealt with carefully. Schlier takes the discussion of Rom 15:16 one step beyond Denis by developing a concept of sacrifice.

¹⁸³We have also noted the emphasis of Wenschkewitz, Weiss, and Denis. Corriveau does consider Rom 15:16, although Rom 12:1 is more important to his thesis. A study of a different kind, but one that starts with the significance of Rom 15:16 is that of D. W. B. Robinson, "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope" In Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday, ed. Robert Banks, (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 231-245.

¹⁸⁴This study will be at this level, although we want to keep in mind the significant discussion concerning the use of cultic language today. The question concerning the modern use of cultic language in the communication of the gospel has been clearly presented by C. F. D. Moule: "The sacrifice of the People of God"; Hort Society Lecture (January 20, 1983), "Do Biblical Meanings Demand Biblical Words?"; "Preaching the Atonement", Epworth Review, 10 no. 2 (May 1983), 70-78. Moule suggests that "words denoting cost and expenditure have come to do the same work as the metaphor of sacrifice, which may therefore more appropriately be replaced by them, free as they are of propitiatory associations" ("Preaching the Atonement", p. 71). Frances Young on the other hand argues that "sacrificial symbolism is basic to man's make-up and can still meet with response. What we need to do is to make the symbolism live again, released from cramping and deadening definitions which have killed it" Sacrifice and the Death of Christ, p. 134. The last sections of Young's book (pp. 101-138) are addressed to the issue of the relevance of sacrificial ideas and symbols in the church and the world today. Eberhard Jungel argues for the need to see Christ's death as sacramentum before it is viewed as exemplum, and suggests that "sacrifice in its metaphorical sense, and with it the whole cult terminology is very useful for distinguishing the Christian life" (in "The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ as sacramentum et exemplum" [underlining mine], p. 14. From a different perspective, R. J. Daly, having presented his conclusions concerning Christian sacrifice in relation to the trends of spiritualization and institutionalization, states "that is what Christian sacrifice was for the writers of the New Testament, and, to the extent that we are truly Christian, that is what it must also be for us today"

(Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 140). Daly's emphasis on the ethical dimensions of cultic language, and on the idea of "self-giving love" (p. 140) would seem to be similar to that of Moule's emphasis. Daly's starting and ending point, though, seems to be that Christian sacrifice is "basic to an understanding of Christianity" (p. v.). Thus, he does not ask the question that concerns Moule.

Implications of our study for this broader discussion will be suggested briefly in an excursus at the end of the conclusions. Issues related to the place of words, traditions, and indeed theology within the life of the church cannot be the focus of our concern. But by studying Paul again, we hope to gain a better perspective for a fundamental aspect of this whole discussion.

PART TWO

AN EXEGETICAL ASSESSMENT OF PAUL'S USE OF CULTIC LANGUAGE
IN MAJOR TEXTS IN ROMANS

CHAPTER I

ROMANS AND CULTIC LANGUAGE

A. Introduction

The discussion above has sought to show that the need remains to evaluate Paul's use of cultic language in relation to the particular source in which it is found. This does not just include the immediate context of texts, but the purpose and nature of the letter in question. More specifically, one cannot ignore issues related to the purpose and nature of Romans, if the cultic language in that letter is particularly significant. The discussion above has shown that the search for Paul's understanding and use of cultic ideas and language has raised issues which need to be addressed at the level of the individual text. Otherwise, general theories and attempts at placing Paul within the broader historical picture may obscure the real significance of cultic language for Paul wherever he uses it.

Within the broader discussion, we have seen the importance of a number of the uses of cultic language in Romans. Therefore it is necessary to consider introductory matters relevant to the letter. In this chapter we present our perspective on the letter, and illustrate the significance of the cultic language within it.

Subsequently we can view the particular texts in question.

The perspective on Romans presented here is an eclectic one, dependent on much of the recent discussion.¹ At the same time, it is inevitable that one must take a side in the current debate, and that is true of this perspective. We agree with K. P. Donfried's two methodological principles: 1) "any study of Romans should proceed on the initial assumption that this letter was written by Paul to deal with a concrete situation in Rome", and 2) "any study of Romans should proceed on the assumption that Rom. 16 is an integral part of the letter".²

We begin with the second principle. This principle concerning Romans 16 is one that has received substantial support recently.³ In short, it does seem that the textual evidence is best explained if 1:1-16:23, regardless of conclusions concerning 16:24 and 16:25-27, is considered original.⁴ In chapter 16 the greetings give insight into Paul's knowledge of different Christians and groups in Rome (16:3-16), and information about the probable bearer of the letter (16:1-2), Paul's fellow-workers, amanuensis, host, and others who send greetings (16:21-23). Furthermore, chapter 16 includes a final exhortation, calling for awareness and avoidance of those who cause dissensions and difficulties (16:17-20). This gives insight into Paul's concern for Rome, and possibly a particular problem that Paul foresaw, if it was not already a problem.⁵ The exhortation in Rom 16:17-20, appearing at this point in the letter, is probably inclusive of any person or group that would cause

dissension, as Paul's instruction in 14:1-15:6 indicates. The exhortation does not have the pointed character of Gal 5:7-12, although the arguments of both letters suggest that there was an overlap in the issues that were at stake. It is most probable that Paul was aware of diversity and lack of unity at Rome, and that there was the potential for much disagreement with his gospel at Rome, despite the fact that there were those present who were in substantial agreement (among whom were those that Paul greeted in 16:3-16). The situation has not reached the level of controversy that took place in Galatia, but this may be precisely because Paul has not ministered in Rome. The exhortation may reveal, also, an aspect of Paul's method in Romans, which was to identify with the authoritative teaching that had been received in Rome (6:17, 15:14-15). In 16:17 Paul identified the cause of problems with those who disagreed with traditional teaching. (We will suggest the source of this teaching below).

Chapter 16, therefore, suggests that Paul was writing with a basic knowledge of his audience. It may be that one could describe Paul's knowledge of the situation at Rome as "minimal" in relation to the intimate knowledge he had of churches under his own ministry, but that does not mean that Paul "did not know the church at Rome".⁶ The fact that Paul did not discuss individuals in chapters 1-15 does not prove that Paul "did not have any very specific knowledge of the particular incidents and personalities that may have been involved".⁷ If Paul was being careful in his presentation of material in the letter, as comments in 1:12, 6:17, 15:14-15, and 16:19-20 suggest, then he may

not have wanted to argue in the letter with (potential) face-to-face opponents. In any case, our concern is not whether Paul had "any very specific knowledge" or not, but that he had enough specific knowledge to know the general situation at Rome (at large), and probably enough to know the specific situation of some at Rome (as 16:3-16 may indicate).

This leads us to discuss issues related to the first of K. P. Donfried's methodological principles mentioned above. In what sense Paul wrote the letter "to deal with a concrete situation at Rome"⁸ must be clarified.

B. The Purpose of Romans

1. The Occasion of Writing

There is little indication that Paul would have written this letter to Rome if he had not planned to go there. This may seem an arbitrary suggestion, but the clear careful announcement of Paul's intended visit (1:8-15), and the further explanation of Paul's plans (15:22-29) frame this letter. The simplest conclusion, because Paul gives no indication otherwise, is that the contents of the letter are written with the future ministry in Rome and Spain in mind. Paul makes clear that his desire to minister in Rome was not new (1:12, 15:22-23), but that the past ministry had kept him from getting to Rome (15:17-23).⁹ There was no more room for Paul's foundational ministry in previous regions travelled, so a stage of Paul's ministry was completed (15:20,21,23). Paul is speaking, therefore, as an apostle who is now directing his attention elsewhere at the close of one

stage of ministry. Romans is the first step in preparation for the future ministry. It is a defence of Paul's gospel in view of this future ministry.

When Paul wrote Romans, the trip to Jerusalem with the collection for the poor among the saints (15:25-29) was in the immediate future. The phrase *ὡς εἰς πορεύματα* (15:24) suggests that the trip was at hand, and that this was the responsibility that was keeping Paul from coming to Rome directly (15:25-29). Paul's request for prayer (15:30-32) indicated his apprehension concerning the trip, and his desire to involve the Christians at Rome in a supportive way in his ministry. Whatever the connection between the Gal 2:10 agreement and the present collection, Paul was embarking on a journey that he hoped would result in the acceptance of his *διακονία* (15:31), which represents the fruit of his ministry (*ἀποστολή* - 1:5). It is entirely reasonable to suggest that whatever Paul would write at this time would be coloured by his concern over the Jerusalem visit. This does not mean that Paul wrote the letter as if Jerusalem was its destination, but that immediate concerns would probably affect the way he presented his gospel, and the way he responded to the situation in Rome.¹⁰

Information concerning Phoebe (16:1-2), and Gaius (16:23, 1 Cor 1:14?) most probably locates Paul at Corinth or nearby. This fits in well with the three-month period in Greece mentioned in Acts 20:3.¹¹ The letter was written, according to the chronology of Acts and assuming Corinth as the place of writing, in the weeks before Passover (57 C. E.).¹² C. E. B. Cranfield sums up the

situation by saying,

"we conclude that - within the period extending from late 54 to early 59 within which the composition must certainly fall - the Epistle to the Romans was most probably written either during the period comprising the last days of 55 and the early weeks of 56 or during that of the last days of 56 and the early weeks of 57". (footnote 13)

When the letter was to arrive in Rome is hard to say, but some time near or during the Passover to Pentecost season is most probable. Thus, it would arrive in Rome within weeks of when Paul hoped, at the time of writing, to be in Jerusalem (Nivan - Sivan 57 C. E.?).

2. The Intended Function of the Letter

Romans functions as a document of missionary enterprise, preparing the Christians in Rome for an apostolic visit,¹⁴ presenting and defending the apostolic gospel, and preparing the church(es) for its (their) role as supportive sending church(es).¹⁵ The letter has the character, therefore, of an apostolic "ambassadorial letter"; careful and formal in presentation, and explanatory and defensive in content.¹⁶

Paul's letter to Rome announces his intention of ministering in Rome (1:8-15, 16-17), and being sent by the elect of Rome to minister in Spain (15:24-29). By the time Paul announced the apostolic visit (in a context that clearly expressed it as a part of Paul's apostolic obligation 1:8-15), he had already given a cryptic and probably traditional summary of his gospel (1:2-4), and included those at Rome within the sphere of his apostolic grace (1:1,5,6). The prescript, which was extraordinarily long for Paul, indicated the formal and almost diplomatic tone of the letter.¹⁷ Paul recognized the maturity of the

Christians at Rome, and thus spoke of his contribution there as *τι μετὰ δῶ χάρισμα ὑμῶν πνευματικόν...* (1:11), which was carefully qualified by Paul's desire to benefit from their faith. This was in keeping with the principle stated in 15:20-21, because Paul was making it clear that his ministry to those at Rome would not be a foundational one as such. This needed careful explanation, which 15:14-29 provided. In 1:13-15 though, in what functioned as a "body-opening section" of the letter, Paul revealed that he saw his ministry in Rome as significant in and of itself.¹⁸ These words, 1:13-15, led into Paul's declarative confession of his gospel (1:16-17), and the subsequent presentation of his gospel and paraenesis (1:18-15:13).

The broadest rationale behind the contents of the letter is that it was an apologia for Paul's gospel and mission. At the same time, the letter acts as *Χάρισμα πνευματικόν* itself, being a foretaste and representative of his preaching ministry. This is stated because the letter functions "as a substitute for Paul's oral presence with the congregation".¹⁹

This apologia seems to be crucial not only because of the future ministry in Rome, but particularly because of Paul's desire to minister in Spain. It is clear from Paul's language that he wanted the believers in Rome to support his future mission (15:24, 29), just as he desired their support for the Jerusalem collection (15:25-32). The language used (*ὑφ' ὑμῶν προπεμφθῆναι* - 15:24) indicates that Paul wanted the church(es) of Rome to be the sending church that would thrust him forth to the next

stage of ministry. Paul's language is "subtle, diplomatic language that leaves the readers free to fill in the details",²⁰ but it was clear enough, as Cranfield notes,

"to denote the fulfillment of various services which might be required by a departing traveller, such as the provision of rations, money, means of transport, letters of introduction, and escort for some part of the way". (footnote 21)

Paul's request for Phoebe (16:1,2) may illustrate the type of reception and support that he himself desired, although in his case it needed to be stated because of his gospel and apostolic calling.²²

Paul's practice was not to burden churches in which he was ministering, so this may appear to be unprecedented (note 2 Cor 10:13-18, 11:7-11, 12:13-14). It is not the case, though, that Paul would reject gifts from other churches (2 Cor 11:8, Phil 4:14-19), or that he would not ask for help for others and himself when passing through (1 Cor 16:6, 11). It may be extremely important, therefore, that the believers at Rome were established in the faith beyond the level of a foundational ministry, and that Paul made it so clear that he was to be passing through (15:24 *διὰ πειροσόμενος*, 15:29). He would not burden a young church where he was staying, but the church of Rome was in a different position spiritually, and Paul is not planning on ministering there indefinitely.²³ Thus, Paul's eagerness to come to Rome, and his emphasis on the fact that he is passing through are not in contradiction. They clarify Paul's intentions so that the believers in Rome will be prepared to send Paul on to Spain after he has ministered there and been refreshed by fellowship with them (1:12, 15:32).

3. Factors Affecting the Content of the Letter

If the perspective above is correct, and Romans ought to be viewed as an apostolic ambassadorial letter, then Paul's purpose in establishing formal apostolic relationship with the church(es) needs to be kept in mind. This would account for the formal homiletical style, the careful defence of the gospel, and the inclusion of the paraenesis. Such a letter would be read at worship or fellowship gatherings in Rome as an apostolic introduction and preliminary *Χάρισμα Πνευματικόν* (1:11).

This purpose in writing meant that Paul needed to present himself and his gospel in a way that was particularly relevant for the Christians at Rome. This is a situation that is difficult to reconstruct, although we have already noted that chapter 16 gives us some scaffolding for the project. Here a number of broad factors are suggested which are relevant to an understanding of the Christian community(ies) at Rome.

1) The edict of Claudius (Suetonius' The Lives of the Caesars, Book 5, xxv., 4 [Loeb]), at least partially expelling Jews from Rome and definitely disrupting life among the Jewish-Christian element (Acts 18:2, probably more than is reflected by Dio Cassius, Dio's Roman History, Book lx. 6, 6 [Loeb]) has lost its effect. Therefore, Jews, and specifically Jewish Christians, expelled from Rome are returning or have recently returned.²⁴ The situation would foster suspicion between Jewish and Gentile Christians, not to mention suspicion between Jews and Jewish Christians. Jewish Christians would need encouragement to integrate into a changing

church, and unity would need to be a priority concern.

2) Both the synagogues and the Christian congregations seemed to lack a central organization; there is little evidence of a unifying leadership present in Jewish or Christian circles, at least in terms of formal structure.²⁵ In a city the size of Rome this is not surprising. The situation does not necessitate rival factions, although various traditions would be favoured in different groups. This situation may be reflected in Romans 16, where greetings are sent to various groups, whose inter-relationships are not clear. Paul's exhortation in 16:17-20 may reflect his desire that further disunity and rival factions would not develop. It is of interest that Paul only refers to one ἐκκλησία in Rome, and that is the one that meets at the home of Prisca and Aquila (16:5). This probably does not suggest a deliberate denial of other groups of Christians at Rome, or that there are no other churches as such. It does indicate respect and support for Prisca and Aquila, as is indicated by the position of their church at the beginning of the list of greetings. It is probable that one source of knowledge of the Christians at Rome for Paul was this couple, and their house church.

3) Regardless of the make-up of individual house-congregations, it seems that the readership of the letter consisted of both Jews and Gentiles. This is suggested by the mixture of Jews and Gentiles (apparently) mentioned in the greetings (16:3-16). Furthermore, even if Paul's argument is rhetorically directed, and relevant to the situation in Rome, the references to Gentiles (1:14-15,

11:13), and to Jews (2:17, 3:9) indicate that his gospel is for Jew and Gentile, even if it is for the Jew first (1:16). Few would disagree with the probability that the church(es) of Rome were made up of Jews and Gentiles, although there is disagreement over the ratio of each. It is also uncertain how integrated the different groups may have been. Thus, if it is right to postulate different house churches in Rome, they may have had vastly different racial compositions, and different relationships with the synagogues. Although the evidence is scarce for a cumulative assessment, it seems most likely that at the time of writing the Christians in Rome were Gentile in majority.²⁶

4) These introductory issues suggest that there was the potential for conflict along Judaizer/libertine lines, which would seem to be reflected in Paul's teaching in 14:1-15:13. Despite its general character, Paul's general and unifying paraenesis is probably in response to the situation in Rome.²⁷ What is significant here is not identifying Jews and Gentiles in this controversy, since both may have been behind the categories of either the strong or the weak,²⁸ but rather the way Paul calls for unity in this situation, a unity that clearly is to cross Jew/Gentile distinctions (15:7-13), and implicitly all other distinctions.

5) The situation sketched above forces us to consider the origin of Christianity in Rome and what is the source of the teaching with which Paul seeks to show agreement (6:17, 16:17). Ultimately, this remains in the shadows of early church history. It does seem most likely that amidst the diversity that must have been present in Rome

there was some connection with Jerusalem, and that early or at the beginning there was contact with Jewish-Christian teaching and/or mission. This does not necessitate the presence of Peter in Rome before Paul, but we suggest that there most probably was contact with Jerusalem, and respect for the Petrine apostleship and mission. This is conjecture, but it has a number of supportive factors. 1) The tradition of Petrine leadership in Rome may reflect early contacts with Jerusalem, if not Peter's visit to Rome.²⁹ The Jewish community in Rome seemed to have strong ties with Jerusalem, and this may have been the direct avenue through which Jewish-Christianity arrived in Rome.³⁰ 2) It is hard not to think of Paul's statements concerning his apostleship in Gal 2:1-10, when one reads Paul's self-description in Romans (1:5, 1:14-15, 11:13-14, 15:14-21). Especially significant is Paul's description of how he hopes his ministry will affect his own people. There is little indication of direct ministry here, which would be in keeping with Gal 2:7-9. The mention of the Jerusalem collection, and indeed Paul's request for prayer for it, may implicitly indicate Paul's response to the Gal 2:10 agreement (15:25-32). Paul's stress on the priority of the Jew in gospel call and privilege (1:16) may not only reflect a personal perspective, but respect for Jewish mission. This would be especially significant if this was the foundation of the church at Rome. Other similarities with Galatians would suggest that Paul needed to cover some of the same theological ground, albeit in a more careful tone. Again this may reflect an awareness on

Paul's part of a connection with the Jerusalem church.³¹

3) Paul's careful defence of his gospel against antinomian accusations (3:8, 6:1-8:17) may partly indicate his desire to clarify his gospel for those of a conservative Jewish-Christian position. Even Paul's strong argument for the continued place of Israel in God's purpose of salvation (9-11), despite the Gentile audience pointed to in 11:13, may indicate concern for Jewish Christians in Rome.

Admittedly, all the above would be true if the church at Rome had a strong Jewish element regardless of connections with Jerusalem, or if it needed to be instructed concerning the priority of the Jews. It seems likely though that a connection with Jerusalem was the case, precisely because of the strong Jewish element in Rome, and the source of much teaching in Rome, therefore, could have been Jerusalem. After all, Paul clearly claims Jerusalem as the beginning point of gospel ministry (15:19), a geographical comment that reflects a theological and eschatological perspective. Far from showing any disagreement with those in Jerusalem, Paul sees this as the starting place of the eschatological preaching of Christ.

If this was the case, then there probably was some rapid change in the recent past in Rome, due to the edict of Claudius, and the expulsion of at least some of its Jewish-Christian members and leaders. Rome, in a more dramatic way than other communities, was experiencing the phenomenon of being a church of "Jewish origin but of Gentile growth".³² The return of Jewish Christians would precipitate a difficult situation, especially because of the large Jewish population in Rome, and the anti-semitic

- 16:1-(27) Postscript
- a) 16:1-2 recommendation
 - b) 16:3-16 greetings (to)
 - c) 16:17-20 final exhortation
 - d) 16:21-23 greetings (from)
 - e) (16:24 or 16:25-27 - grace or doxology)

The outline below, which will reflect the same basic divisions as the above epistolographic structure, reflects rhetorical analysis.³⁵ Rhetorical structure varies in relation to the type of argument. There is no reason to force Romans narrowly within one category. It is primarily epideictic, according to Wuellner, but the future visit and Paul's desire to have Rome's support for future mission may give the argument a deliberative role as well.³⁶ On another level, Robert Jewett's suggestion that Romans is a "unique fusion of an 'ambassadorial letter' with several other sub-types in the genre: the paraenetic letter, the hortatory letter, and the philosophical diatribe"³⁷ is an adequate description of the rhetorical character of the letter, regardless of Paul's awareness of particular rhetorical genre.

Prescript 1:1-7
Exordium 1:8-12 (Prooemium) - including Causa
Narratio 1:13-15
Propositio 1:16-17 (thesis), (transitus to probatio)
Probatio 1:18-11:36 (confirmatio)
Probatio's exhortation 12:1-15:13 (paraenesis)
Peroration 15:14-16:(27)

(Note that the exordium (prooemium) can be used to speak of the whole beginning section of the rhetoric within a letter framework (1:1(8)-1:15), and in that case the narratio could be seen as included within it.)
(footnote 38)

2. Cultic Language and the Basic Structure of the Letter

The outlines above help us to visualize points of

transition in the letter. At two obvious points of transition cultic language is central; the introduction to the paraenesis in the body-middle of the letter (probatio's exhortation) - 12:1-2, and the transition to the closing section of the letter (peroration) - 15:14-16. A third possible use of cultic language worthy of mention in the light of structure is λατρεύω (1:9) in Paul's thanksgiving, part of the exordium of the argument. This is not a common word in the Pauline corpus (Rom 1:25; Phil 3:3; 2 Tim 1:3), and does not appear in the other Pauline thanksgivings. Thus, where Paul establishes rapport with his audience in the context of thanksgiving and prayer, there is probably a foreshadowing of Paul's fuller self-description in 15:16. Given the character of 15:14-32, in that it expands and explains further Paul's remarks in the exordium and narratio, this connection seems probable. (This self-description early in the letter [1:9 ff.] may also be viewed in contrast to the false worship described in Rom 1:25, although cultic worship is not specified in either case).

The exegesis below will seek to bring out the meaning and significance of these texts, especially 12:1³⁹ and 15:16,⁴⁰ which are structurally significant texts in the letter. These texts, therefore, merit our attention, not only because they contain definite cultic words, but because they help to frame Paul's argument in the letter. These texts do not restate Paul's propositio (1:16-17), but are relevant to it, and give insight into the reason for Paul's presentation of his gospel in Romans.

3. Cultic Language and Paul's Argument

Paul uses cultic language within the main part of his argument (1:18-11:36), and a number of uses do seem to be explanatory of his main thesis (1:16-17). Paul's declarative confession, after announcing his desire and right to preach the gospel in Rome, is that this gospel is the power of God (God's means) for salvation to all who believe, to the Jew first and also to the Greek (1:16). The principal rationale behind his confession in 1:16 is stated immediately in 1:17, which is Paul's basis for his argument, stated with its proof-text from Hab 2:4. This rationale is amplified and clarified most strongly in 3:21-26. Paul's statements in 3:21-26 are the core of his early argumentation in the letter, based on 1:18-3:20, and defended most immediately by 3:27-4:25. The relative clause in 3:25 - ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἰλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ αἱματι - is instrumental in explaining how redemption (deliverance) in Christ demonstrates the righteousness of God. This is a significant part of Paul's thesis, since he must clearly demonstrate that the gospel of salvation is indeed the gospel of the righteousness of God. This is structurally as well as conceptually crucial to Paul's argument. We will argue that Paul's words in the relative clause suggest cultic ideas that support his argument.

5:1-11 is a section within which Paul changes his emphasis. The foundation is his previous argumentation concerning justification (5:1, 9), but he moves now to language of reconciliation and salvation. The importance of this passage from a structural point of view is that it

brings together a number of themes in Romans (justification, life under grace, and ultimate salvation), and points the argument in the direction of chapter 8.⁴¹ This transitional section, though, is still dependent on the earlier argument concerning justification, and is tied to it by the emphasis on the death and resurrection of Christ.⁴² By using the phrase *δικαιωθέντες ... ἐν τῷ ἥματι αὐτοῦ* in 5:9, as we will seek to argue below, Paul points back to his earlier statements in 3:21-26, and therefore refers again to the cultic ideas behind and implicit within justification, which is an important part of his thesis (1:16-17).

In 6:1-8:17 Paul directly defends his gospel against antinomian charges, ending with a description of life in the Spirit. The climax of Paul's discussion, which involves sin, the flesh, and the Law, is undoubtedly 8:1-17. The core of Paul's argument is stated in almost summary fashion in 8:1-4. Here again, Paul brings together his argument and grounds it in relation to Christ, undoubtedly referring to the death and resurrection of Christ, which is the basis of "no condemnation" (8:1), and which enables the just requirement of the Law to be fulfilled (8:4). Paul's phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* speaks of the sacrificial role of the Son of God sent in the likeness of sinful flesh (8:3).⁴³ The phrase is used in an explanatory way in this context of *κατάκριμα* (8:1) and *τὸ δίκαιωμα* (8:4). Although this is a further development from ideas in 3:21-26, it can be seen as an apologetic development in the light of the antinomian objections to the gospel. It is thus a clear return to Paul's

primary thesis, since by showing how the requirement of the Law is fulfilled, Paul demonstrates again the ability of his gospel to save. It is then left for Paul to discuss the nature and hope of this salvation (8:18-30).

There is one other use of cultic language in Romans that will receive attention below (11:16).⁴⁴ This is Paul's metaphor in 11:16a; *εἰ δὲ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἁγία, καὶ τὸ φῦρον*. This is not as significant a use of cultic language from a structural point of view as those mentioned above. Furthermore, Paul develops another metaphor after this one, suggesting that the point he has made is a general one and that the metaphor in 11:16a has finished its role. At the same time, it is a text that comes at an important point in 9-11. The first fruits metaphor is found after Paul has identified his intended audience as Gentiles, and after he has revealed his hope that his glorying in his own ministry may save some of his own countrymen, a hope expressed within a definite understanding of the history of salvation (11:13-14 within 11:11-15). This text is an illustration of the use of a cultic image when Paul is thinking of God's grace, faithfulness, and the resulting fruit (especially in the light of his own ministry).⁴⁵ It is the abrupt and seemingly insignificant nature of this metaphor that needs to be noted. Paul could use cultic language without programmatic reflection, and that calls for caution in attempting to combine his cultic images. At the same time, this use of cultic language (11:16) is another indication of the way Paul can use cultic language to defend his gospel.

4. Cultic Language and the Purpose of Romans

The above uses of cultic language (3:25, 5:9, 8:3, 11:16) seem to suggest that cultic thought is important for Paul's defence of the gospel in Romans, and specifically important for his explanation of justification and righteousness (3:25, 5:9, 8:3). When one is reminded of the importance of cultic terms at structurally significant points in the letter (1:9, 12:1, 15:16), it seems that this combination needs explanation.

It is imperative, therefore, that we keep in mind the purpose of the letter as expressed above. The role of the letter as apologia for gospel and apostleship will in fact be supported and illustrated by this use of cultic language. It is the nature of the letter that has given rise to the particular use of cultic language in it. It is within such a letter that God's righteous provision of justification is defended with the help of cultic ideas, and the Christian response to the gospel and Paul's apostolic ministry receive cultic description. The relationship between these different texts particularly in the light of the cultic language within them must be given careful consideration after the significance of the use of cultic language within each text has been considered. This is what the exegeses below will seek to do.

Footnotes

¹On recent discussion see: The Romans Debate, ed. Karl P. Donfried, (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Press, 1977); William S. Campbell, "Why Did Paul Write Romans?", ET 85 (1974), 264-269; Andrew J. M. Wedderburn, "The Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again", ET 90 (1978-1979), 137-141; John Drane, "Why Did Paul Write Romans?" in Pauline Studies: Essays presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday, ed. Donald A. Hagner, Murray J. Harris, (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980), 208-227; William S. Campbell, "Revisiting Romans", Scripture Bulletin 12 no. 1, (Summer 1980), 2-10, and "The Romans Debate", JSNT, 10 (1981), 19-28; and Frederick F. Bruce, "The Romans Debate -- Continued", BJRL 64, no. 2, (Spring 1982), 334-359.

²Karl P. Donfried, "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans" in The Romans Debate, 120-148, (p. 122).

³Bruce Metzger, TCGNT, pp. 533-536; C. E. B. Cranfield, The Epistle to the Romans, 2 vols., (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 1979), vol. 1, pp. 5-11; Bruce N. Kaye, "'To the Romans and Others' Revisited", NovT 18, fasc. 1 (1976), 37-77, a reply to T. W. Manson's influential article, "St Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others" BJRL 31 (1948), 224-240; Harry Gamble Jr., The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977); K. P. Donfried, "A short Note on Romans 16", in The Romans Debate, pp. 50-60, and "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans", pp. 141-143; Ulrich Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, 3 vols., EKK 6, (Neukirchen - Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977-1982), vol. 1, pp. 22-27; in opposition to this view, Ernst Käsemann treats chapter 16 as a separate entity and seems to favour "the hypothesis of a small independent letter to Ephesus", Commentary on Romans, trans. G. W. Bromiley, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980), p. 419.

⁴H. Gamble Jr. argues carefully for the inauthentic nature of 16:25-27, and the authenticity of the more typical Pauline benediction in 16:24, (Textual History of the Letter to the Romans, conclusions on p. 124, and p. 132). We are not fully convinced by Gamble's reasoning, but remain uncertain about the authenticity of the doxology. We suggest, though, that if it is not Pauline, it is carefully written in the light of the letter and particularly the prescript (note Gamble, Jr., p. 123), and if it is an addition, it is very early (note p46, and p61). Thus, even if it is not Pauline, it can be used to highlight Pauline phrases used in the letter. In effect, therefore, we leave it in brackets as does B. Metzger, TCGNT, p. 536. In principle, we must do the same for 16:24, since its presence is dependent on what is decided concerning 16:25-27.

⁵This exhortation has similarities to Phil 3:17-4:3, although Paul does not cite individuals. Points of

similarity between Phil 3:2-11 and Romans may suggest that Judaizers are at least included within those that are to be watched carefully and avoided. This may also be confirmed by similarities with Galatians (particularly the emphasis on justification), although Paul is obviously external to the situation at Rome at this point, which results in the argument of Romans having quite a different character than that of Galatians.

⁶Drane, "Why Did Paul Write Romans?", p. 211. Drane's very helpful discussion of the issues in the Romans debate may be too strong at this point.

⁷Ibid., p. 219.

⁸Donfried, "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans", p. 122.

⁹See 2 Cor 10:16, and Acts 19:21.

¹⁰Thus we suggest that Jacob Jervell's thesis is overstated, despite its valuable insights ("The Letter to Jerusalem", in The Romans Debate, 61-74. English trans. Jochen Hoffmann/K. P. Donfried ["Der Brief nach Jerusalem. Über Veranlassung und Adresse des Römerbriefes" ST 25 (1971), 61-73]).

¹¹It may be that the plot against Paul mentioned in Acts 20:3 had not yet affected Paul's travel plans, and that he was hoping to travel directly to Jerusalem. The western text suggests that the Jewish plot was "the reason for his leaving Greece, and his choice of the land route is ascribed to inspiration" (Kirsopp Lake, and Henry Chadwick, The Beginnings of Christianity: Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan and Co., 1922-1939), vol. 4, English Translation and Commentary, p. 253. Ernst Haenchen views the change of plans as due to the Jewish plot (Die Apostelgeschichte: Neu übersetzt und erklärt, 6th. ed. [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968], p. 513). F. F. Bruce, along with William Ramsay, also, sees the change in plans as due to the Jewish plot (The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary, (London: Tyndale Press, 1951), p. 370. Thus, we would see the plot against Paul as instrumental in his change of plans. It is a plausible suggestion that Paul was planning on taking a "pilgrimage" to Jerusalem, and hoping to be there originally by Passover, but then after the change of plans having to settle for getting there by Pentecost (20:16 and see F. F. Bruce's Commentary on the Book of Acts (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956), p. 405. In any case, it seems that the Passover to Pentecost season was in the near future.

¹²54 to 59 C. E. is the most reasonable time framework, with early in the year, 56 to 58 C. E., being the most likely. (William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, The Epistle to the Romans (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), p. xiii, Winter or Spring 57-58; C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), p. xxvi, first quarter of 59 or earlier;

Charles K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans (London: A. & C. Clark, 1957), p. 5, January-March 55, John Murray, The Epistle to the Romans 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959-1965), vol. 1, p. xvi, Spring of 58 (noting T. Zahn and J. B. Lightfoot), and 57 (noting W. Ramsay); Franz J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary, English trans. Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), p. 9, Spring of 57; F. F. Bruce, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary (London: Tyndale Press, 1963), p. 12, "early days of AD 57"; Matthew Black, Romans (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1973), p. 20, Spring 58.

¹³Cranfield, Romans vol. 1, p. 16.

¹⁴For a detailed outworking of 15:14-33 in view of the significance of an apostolic visit, see Robert W. Funk's "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Function" in Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox, ed. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 249-268.

¹⁵We use the term church(es) to suggest that there may have been different church groups in Rome that could have 'heard' the letter on different occasions. That the letter functions to actually enable the church to be behind Paul's ministry is the perspective of G. Schrenk in "Der Römerbrief als Missionsdokument" in Studien zu Paulus (Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1954), 81-106.

¹⁶Robert Jewett, "Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter", Int 36 (1982), 5-20, (p. 5).

¹⁷Note Nils A. Dahl's comments on the prescript in "The Missionary Theology In the Epistle to the Romans" in Studies in Paul (Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1977), 70-94 including appendices, (pp. 74-75). Dahl's perspective is very similar to and influential on the one presented in this thesis. On the diplomatic nature of the letter see R. Jewett, "Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter". We have been helped in our thinking concerning the prescript also (and concerning other parts of Romans) by Peter Stuhlmacher (Lectures at The Fuller Theological Seminary, [Pasadena, California] October 1983 [tapes]).

¹⁸John L. White, The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-Literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle SBLDS 2 (Missoula, Mont.: SBL, 1972), p. 84. This is indicated by "the disclosure formula" - οὐ θέλω δεῖ ὑμῶν ἀγνωεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ... (1:13). Note that William Doty begins the body of the letter at 1:13, Letters in Primitive Christianity (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1973), p. 43.

¹⁹J. L. White, "Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter Tradition", CBQ 45 no. 3 (July 1983), 433-444, (p. 439).

²⁰Jewett, "Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter", p. 18.

²¹Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 769. Cranfield notes that προπέμπω "became a regular technical term of Christian mission". Such uses of the word can be seen in 1 Macc 12:4; Acts 15:3; 2 Cor 1:16; Tit 3:13; 3 John 6; and even 1 Cor 16:6, and 11.

²²One needs to keep in mind the challenge of mission, when considering the likelihood of Paul's desire for practical support for his mission to Spain (15:24, 29). Rome was on the edge of this new frontier for Paul. It could be the sending church, the "Antioch" for this future mission.

The rationale behind the collection project (15:27) may give further insight into Paul's rationale for support. His comments concerning the collection are framed by his plans to go to Spain by way of Rome (15:22-24, 29). Paul speaks of the obligation that the Gentiles have to serve (ὀφειλέτας) Jewish Christians in material things or ways, since they have benefitted in sharing in the spiritual blessings of the Jews (τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινώνησαν (15:27). This illustrates the pattern of the olive tree presented earlier in the letter (11:16b-24); the Gentiles have been grafted into the spiritual blessings of Israel. If it is remembered that Paul specifically desired to impart χάρισμα . . . πνευματικόν at Rome (1:11), it is not difficult to see the response that should follow. The one imparting spiritual blessing deserves help in material ways. Paul's corrective in 1:12 shows that this is not a perspective that Paul is using to argue for support, but that does not mean that it is not a principle that Paul would appreciate the Gentile believers in Rome grasping. Paul speaks of himself in 11:1 as an Israelite. His ministry is indeed to the Gentiles (1:5, 11:13-14), specifically as the minister (λειτουργός) of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles (15:16). Thus, it would seem that Paul the apostle, in view of his spiritual ministry in Rome, would indeed deserve to benefit from the faith of those in Rome in a material as well as a spiritual way (1:12).

²³Did. 11:3-6 gives regulations for the receiving and sending of apostles and prophets, which suggests that such was an issue in at least one section of the early church. Although the regulations in Didache are very strict and probably not relevant in terms of the specific requirements laid down, they are helpful for our purposes in revealing suspicion towards those that would seek to stay for lengthy periods, and therefore burden a church. Paul, in a general sense, is sensitive to this in his ministry, but at the same time he believes that he is within his apostolic right to benefit from the church at Rome (1:12), and be sent by them to Spain (15:24, 29).

²⁴Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. xxi-xxii; George Edmundson, The Church in Rome in the First Century: An Examination of Various Controverted Questions Related to its History, Chronology, Literature and Traditions, Bampton Lectures for 1913 (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913), pp. 9-14; Barrett, Romans, p. 6; Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 11-12; Bruce, Romans, pp. 14-15; Black,

Romans, pp. 21-22; Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 16; Wolfgang Wiefel, "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity", in The Romans Debate, 100-119, (pp. 109-113); Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, pp. 35-36; Drane, "Why Did Paul Write Romans?", pp. 216-217; Bruce, "The Romans Debate--Continued", pp. 338, 339, 341; Raymond E. Brown, John P. Meier, Antioch & Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983), pp. 110-112.

²⁵Wiefel, "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity", p. 113; Sanday and Headlam, Romans, xviii-xxv; Barrett, Romans, p. 7; Harry J. Leon, "The Jews of Rome in the First Century of Christianity" in The Teacher's Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham, ed. E. J. Vardaman, J. L. Garrett, Jr., and assist. ed. J. B. Adair (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 1964) 154-163, stated on p. 158 with reference to the author's work, The Jews of Ancient Rome (Phila.: Jewish Publications Society of America, 1960) pp. 167-194; Bruce, "The Romans Debate--Continued", pp. 340-342; Brown and Meier, Antioch & Rome, 92 ff., and especially p. 101.

²⁶Paul's argumentation in 11:13-32 seems almost unnecessary for those in Rome, if the majority was made up of Jews. A number do support the idea of a Gentile majority: Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. xxxiii; Edmundson, The Church in Rome, p. 17; Black, Romans, p. 23; Campbell, "Why Did Paul Write Romans?", p. 268; Wedderburn, "The Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again", p. 141; Cranfield's discussion, Romans, vol. 1, pp. 17-21. In his careful way, Cranfield leaves the "question open", while being sure "that both the Jewish-Christian and the Gentile-Christian, elements were considerable: it was clearly not a matter of an overwhelming majority and a tiny minority", p. 21. We agree with Cranfield's latter statement, but still suggest that it was more likely that there was a Gentile majority by that time. The letter may have been read more than once, and some of the Christian groups in Rome may have been primarily Jewish. It would seem, though, that not only because of the content of the letter, but because of the pattern of Gentile acceptance and Jewish rejection that Paul himself refers to, the Gentile Christians would have been in the majority, or were becoming the majority by the time of writing.

²⁷In disagreement with R. J. Karris, "Romans 14:1-15:13 and the Occasion of Romans", in The Romans Debate, 75-99; and note in same volume Donfried, "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans", 120-148. The whole article questions Karris implicitly or explicitly; Donfried also questions Paul S. Minear, (The Obedience of Faith [London: SCM Press, 1971]), believing the situation in Rome to be important (contra Karris), but thinking that a detailed reconstruction of the situation from 14:1-15:13, or Romans in general, is "misleading" (contra Minear), p. 126. Also see Leenhardt, Romans, p. 12; Heinrich Schlier, Der Römerbrief (Freiburg: Herder, 1977), pp. 4-5; Günther Bornkamm, "The Letter to the Romans as

Paul's Last Will and Testament", in The Romans Debate, 17-31, p. 21; Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer vol. 1, pp. 35, 39-41; Bruce, "The Romans Debate--Continued", pp. 347-349.

²⁸Christian God-fearers may have had strict consciences about matters of food and drink (14:17), whereas Jews like Prisca and Aquila may have been more liberal in such things. Note also R. E. Brown's suggestion that guards against seeing controversy along racial lines alone ("Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity" in CBQ 45 no. 1 [Jan 1983], 74-79).

²⁹Eusebius' words suggest this (Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History with an English translation by Kirsopp Lake, 2 vols., The Loeb Classical Library, [London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1926, 1965], vol. 1., Book II, xiv-xv). This text was brought to my attention by Michael Thompson. A careful argument is presented by R. E. Brown in Antioch & Rome, pp. 92-127. Brown notes Ambrosiaster's statement concerning the Jewish character of the faith at Rome (pp. 110-111), along with the 42 A. D. date for Peter's leadership in Rome (figured from Eusebius and Jerome, p. 102), may suggest early influence from Jerusalem. An argument for a visit from Peter is given by J. W. Wenham, "Did Peter go to Rome in AD 42?", in TynBul 23 (1972), 94-102.

³⁰Leon, The Jews of Ancient Rome, p. 240; Brown and Meier, Antioch & Rome, pp. 95-97.

³¹R. E. Brown discusses the evidence of Galatians in relation to Romans, Antioch & Rome, pp. 112-113.

³²Black, Romans, p. 23.

³³Wiefel, "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity", pp. 101-105.

³⁴The basic patterns followed are presented by White in The Body of the Greek Letter, and with some differences by Doty in Letters in Primitive Christianity, although the final form expressed is our own.

³⁵The outline here reflects the work of Wilhelm Wuellner ("Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried--Karris Debate Over Romans", in The Romans Debate, 152-174) with refinements and minor changes due to the contributions of Jewett ("Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter") and Hans D. Betz ("The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians", NTS 21 (1975), 353-379. Again, the resulting outline is eclectic, but in its final form original.

³⁶Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans", pp. 165-166.

³⁷Jewett, "Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter", p. 9.

We want to be careful in such analysis, though, since the nature, for instance, of diatribe, and the question of whether or not it was a genre in the time of Paul, is still open (Donfried, "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans", pp. 132-141, but see S. K. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans SBLDS 57 (Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1981). Thus, such analysis must be descriptive, reflecting general rhetorical intentionality, without necessarily describing Paul's awareness of formal rhetorical categories and genre.

³⁸Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, p. 16, labels 1:8-17 as the prooemium, and sees Paul's theme in 1:14-17, but his analysis is not rhetorical in the sense of seeking to identify each rhetorical unit.

³⁹The use of λατρεία in Rom 9:4 and in 12:1 may also be added to the evidence that suggests that Paul is adapting a word, which he knows has cultic worship and service within its sphere of meaning, and that he has used it with this in mind.

⁴⁰Rom 1:9 will be considered briefly with Rom 15:16.

⁴¹A number of studies bring out the transitional nature of 5:1-11: Nils Dahl, "Two Notes on Romans 5", ST 5 (1951) 37-48, pp. 37-42; Warren W. Crump, "The Structure and Soteriology of Romans in Light of the Function of 5:1-11 in the Argument of the Epistle", Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1979; Bruce N. Kaye, The Thought Structure of Romans with Special Reference to Chapter 6 (Austin, Tex.: Schola Press, 1979), pp. 14-23.

⁴²On the centrality of this section from a tradition-redaction perspective, see Ralph P. Martin, Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981), pp. 127-154.

⁴³This will need to be proved by indicating the cultic use of this phrase.

⁴⁴This will be treated for the sake of completeness, and also because of the example it is of a casual use of a cultic image. Rom 9:4 (ἡ λατρεία) will not need separate treatment. It clearly does indicate Paul's positive understanding of the tradition of worship within Israel and his viewing of it as a privilege granted by God. This worship, we assume, is associated with the Temple. Rom 9:4 is important for our purpose in the way it affects the viewing of other texts, rather than deserving detailed treatment itself.

⁴⁵Note general harvest images in 1:13, and 15:28, which are not far removed.

CHAPTER II

CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL:

I. ROMANS 3:25

A. Summary of Interpretation

The section of text that interests us particularly is the relative clause ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἱλαστήριον διὰ [τῆς]¹ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι.... The clause (3:25a) clarifies the nature of the ἀπολύτρωσις declared to be in or by means of Christ Jesus (3:24b). This deliverance (redemption) is the means by which justification is offered graciously and freely (3:24a). The justification of sinners (3:23-24, 26c), δικαιοσύνη, is God's righteous activity, because God presented Christ as the one who made atonement [propitiation] possible by means of his blood [sacrificial death], being a means of atonement available to and effective by faith. This is viewed against the background of God's patient passing over of sins committed in the past. Paul's language may suggest an implicit comparison: God's presentation of Christ is viewed in relation to God's provision of the cultus for Israel. Christ, in a sense, is the ultimate means of atonement, an atonement understood in forensic and propitiatory terms due to the Paul's argument concerning righteousness, justification, and Christ's death. In

Christ, God provided a cultic centre (mercy seat), where He himself is present and propitiated, and He provided a cultic event, the sacrificial death and the presentation of the blood. At the same time, Paul's focus is clearly on Christ within God's purposeful "cultic" demonstration of His righteousness. The resultant meaning is: God set forth Christ as the means [basis] of propitiatory atonement through faith by means of his blood; or more generally, Christ is God's provision for atonement.

Paul argues that justification by faith demonstrates God's righteousness, despite the fact and indeed because of the fact that it is *Χρῆς νόμου* (3:21). God's eschatological acquittal of the sinner through faith in Jesus is accomplished justly, because it is the forgiveness of sins by means of a Christ-cultus. The righteousness of God in His provision of the cultus, something Paul's readers would not question, would make Paul's use of cultic language in relation to God's provision of Christ quite understandable. In this way, accepted ideas of God's righteousness and grace would be transferred to God's righteousness revealed in Christ.

Paul's language may be viewed as metaphorical in the broadest sense (see pp. 25-27). His emphasis (tenor) is the forgiveness gained through Christ, and how this demonstrates God's righteousness and justification at the same time. Cultic language, and the Jewish cultus itself (vehicle as such) may be used to clarify this two-fold emphasis (3:26c). Paul's language, therefore, may have theological strength and reverence due to Jewish religious tradition making it effective in an apologetic

context. At the same time, the style of the section betrays a liturgical character that suggests that such language was part of early Christian worship, and may have been familiar at Rome. Paul uses this language to strengthen his argument for those who had received Christian tradition, and had a strong Jewish-Christian element, even if they were predominantly Gentiles.

B. Romans 3:21-26 Within Romans

Romans 3:21-26 is a concise series of connected statements, unified thematically, which functions as the axis of Paul's argument in 1:(17)18-4:25. It contains propositional statements that are the "centre of Paul's theology in Romans",² or at least major elements thereof.³ The pericope is intensely theological, with the manifestation of God's righteousness, and His justifying activity receiving the focus.⁴ Christ and faith are viewed within this theological perspective, and are part of how God's righteousness reveals itself actively in the justification of all who believe (3:22).⁵

Despite the apparent relevance of the pericope to Paul's argument (especially as an amplification of 1:17), its discordance with the context has been noted. Robin Scroggs has suggested concerning 3:21-26 that it, "while obviously at the heart of Paul's gospel, reads almost like an intrusion into the context".⁶ He notes that 3:27 follows "smoothly after vs. 20, and faith is adequately explained by pointing to Abraham".⁷ Scroggs suggests that 1:16-4:25 and chapters 9-11 had been one "Homily on the Meaning of Israel's History"⁸ before the writing of

Romans, and that chapters 5-8 originally represented a separate homily.⁹ Concerning 3:21-26, Scroggs suggests that "it is possible that these verses did not belong to the original homily but have been inserted by Paul into the homily for the purposes of the letter".¹⁰ Thus, 3:21-26 was written specifically for the readership in Rome, whereas much of the surrounding material had a different or more general audience originally.

Scroggs is right in noting the distinctiveness of 3:21-26 within its context. Whether 3:21-26 was added to material already extant, or marks a deliberate change of style due to Paul's reaching the focal point of his argument is not definite. In either case, it is not of crucial importance in determining the meaning of 3:21-26 as it stands in the letter. What is important is its propositional character, its lack of dialogical elements, and its thematic relationship to the OT rather than explicit quotation thereof: all of which make it stand out in context. At the same time, Paul does tie the pericope into the previous argument (3:19-20), and 3:27 follows easily from 3:26,¹¹ not to mention its relationship to 1:17, which seems clear. In this respect, Scroggs has commented on the distinctive features of the pericope without emphasizing the way Paul has tied it into the rest of the letter.¹² We emphasize the deliberate thematic character of this pericope, while being cautious about Scroggs' specific theory.¹³

Because of its apparent role in the letter, 3:21-26 must be viewed in relation to Paul's argument, which it supports and indeed states. It can be seen as the

foundation of Paul's claim in 1:16, and an elaboration of his thesis statement in 1:17. If 1:16-17 does have the "epistolographic function"¹⁴ of "the formal opening of the body-middle",¹⁵ then 3:21-26 would seem to express the core of Paul's argument.

In a structural sense, 1:18-3:20 leads to and is preparatory for 3:21-26. The conclusion of Paul's argument in 1:18-3:20 is stated clearly in 3:19-20; a conclusion that is relevant to *πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῷ Θεῷ* and *πάντα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ*. The whole world is answerable to ("guilty before"¹⁶) God, including those under the Law, because no one is justified by works of the Law. Knowledge of sin comes through the Law, not justification.¹⁷

Paul's pessimism concerning man's justification outside of faith and outside of God's righteousness manifested in Christ is seen in 3:19-20, and 3:23. This makes the announcement of the present manifestation of God's righteousness significant (*Νυνὶ* 3:21, *νῦν* *καὶ* *ἰσχυρῶς* 3:26). 3:21-26 declares afresh that righteousness and justification must be viewed in relation to faith (3:21, 26 as in 1:17). The necessity for faith is supported by 3:27-4:25 and is confirmed further by the emphasis on the mediating role of Christ in 5:1-21.¹⁸

Along with Paul's emphasis on the newness of the righteousness of God, being through faith in Christ (3:21-26), he affirms continuity with the Law and the Prophets in a number of ways: (1) the new manifestation of righteousness actually is witnessed to by the Law and the Prophets (3:21), (2) it is a righteousness that establishes the Law, and does not abolish it (3:31),¹⁹ and (3)

it is a righteousness that is continuous with the way Abraham was reckoned as righteous (4:1-25). Furthermore, God's righteousness is viewed in terms of His continued faithfulness to Israel, which Paul argues is consistent with the privileges God gave to Israel (3:1-3, 9:3-5), despite Israel's general rejection of the righteousness that comes through faith (3:3-8, 9:6-11:32). With these emphases, Paul stresses the continuity of the purpose of God (11:1-32), which becomes a support for his gospel. Salvation-history is the frame for the picture of the righteousness of God in Christ that Paul paints (3:21-26). Close at hand are issues related to God's faithfulness to Israel, the place of the Law,²⁰ and related matters of specific covenantal demands.²¹

C. The Thesis of 3:21-26 and the Place of 3:25a Within It

1. Romans 3:21-24

Paul's thesis is concerned with the revelation of God's *δικαιοσύνη*.²² In 3:21-22, the righteousness of God is identified as that which is separate from the Law, although the Law and the Prophets speak of it. The repetition of *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* and the further description of it as "through faith in Jesus Christ" reveals the defining nature of this pericope, where *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ* is explained by a developing argument of continuous descriptive phrases and clauses. Of most importance is the connection of *δικαιοσύνη* with *πίστις* (faith), which becomes central to Paul's continuing argument (3:22,25,26, 27,28,30,31; 4:5,9,11,12,13,14,16²,19,20; also 5:1,2). It is not just faith in Christ but the principle of faith operative among all that Paul presents as an aspect of the

new manifestation of righteousness.²³ This is supported further by the idea of divine impartiality (οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή - 3:22 as in 2:11).²⁴ The equality of men before God is something Paul returns to in 3:9 (...πάντες ὑφ' ἁμαρτιάν), 3:23 (πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον ...), 10:12 (οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνος ὁ γὰρ αὐτὸς κύριος πάντων), and is closely related to the axiom εἰς ὃ θεὸς (3:29,30). 3:23-24 continues the thought of impartiality and therefore universal applicability of Paul's thesis. This is done in 3:23 by restating the situation of man (as under sin - 3:9-20) with the addition of an eschatological perspective (the failure to obtain the glory of God - note 5:2),²⁵ and in 3:24 by Paul's emphasis on the gift aspect of this deliverance in Christ (σωρεὰν τῇ αὐτοῦ χάριτι - 3:24).

God's impartiality is placed within a present but eschatological framework in 3:21-24. This can be shown if one compares 3:21-24 with 2:11-16 (even 2:4-16), which is expressed within the context of wrath and God's judgment (2:5). In 3:21, the present manifestation of the righteousness of God sets the framework (compare 2:5). The equality of men in view of this righteousness is stressed by the phrase "all who believe" (3:22 compare 2:6-10). The principle of impartiality/equality is stated (3:22 οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν διαστολή compare 2:11). Then the situation of man as sinner is stated (3:23) with the verdict already pronounced, with the help of the accusations of 3:9-20 (compare 2:12). Thus, it seems that the possible means of future justification in 2:13 is rejected, or must be interpreted in view of 3:9-20, and 3:23 becomes the

verdict that is universal. What is seen as a future judgment and possible justification in 2:13-14 (ἀπολοῦνται, κριθήσονται, δικαιοθῆσονται), becomes a present reality and possibility in 3:23-24. Therefore, the eschatological nature of God's justification through Christ is implied, as it breaks into the present through faith in Christ, in contrast to the awaited justification of 2:13. (Note comparison of 3:21-24 and 2:5-16 below.)

3:21	framework	2:5
manifestation of the righteousness of God		revelation of God's righteous judgment
3:22	equality in relation to righteousness	2:6-10
3:22	principle of equality before God stated	2:11
3:23	present verdict all sinned	future judgment all who sin 2:12
3:24	present justification through faith and through the deliverance in Christ	future justification on the basis of doing the Law 2:13-16

This present gracious justification²⁶ is διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως²⁷ τῆς ἐν χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3:24). David Hill has noted that whether the "manumission procedure" or "Exodus pattern" is suggested, "the central idea provided by both approaches is that of liberation effected by Christ's death, freedom from the slavery into which our sins brought us".²⁸ The word ἀπολύτρωσις probably already has a Christian nuance as in 1 Cor 1:30, and later in Col 1:14; Eph 1:7, and Heb 9:15. The use of ἀπολύτρωσις is not uniform in these passages, but it is evident that it takes on Christian meaning in relation to Christ (1 Cor 1:30), and forgiveness of sins in Him (Col 1:14; Eph 1:7, Heb 9:15). In 3:24, Paul is using theological language

with implications that reach beyond previous concepts in the pericope. Ἀπολύτρωσις speaks of the accomplishment of Christ, and probably became a word used in worship and liturgy to speak of the deliverance from sin which is a certainty for those in faith-union with Christ.²⁹ This particular emphasis, the forgiveness of sins (note Col 1:14; Eph 1:7), makes best sense in the context of Rom 3:23-24. God's justifying of "all" is explained as being accomplished through (by means of) what Christ Jesus did to enable the forgiveness of sins to be an actuality for believers. That ἀπολύτρωσις does not explicitly state the process of the forgiveness or deliverance from sin (whether manumission or an Exodus motif) is probably indicated by the immediate addition of the explanatory relative clause after "Christ Jesus" (3:24). This clause ties the idea of deliverance and forgiveness of sins in Christ into Paul's argument about the righteousness of God, which is further expanded in 3:25c-26.

2. Romans 3:25-26

3:25-26 can be viewed as a relative clause with, as Cranfield notes, "a main element followed by three formulations equivalent to final clauses".³⁰ Cranfield suggests that the three final clauses "together serve to clarify the key word ἐλαστήριον".³¹ It is more complete to say that the three final clauses clarify 3:25a by showing the purpose/result of God's action of presenting or setting forth Christ as ἐλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι. The emphasis seems to be on how in justifying men in the way He has (3:24-25c), God's own righteousness has been demonstrated in the very means of

justification. This is expressed clearly in the phrase *εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*. God's action in Christ expresses His own righteousness. The phrase can be translated "for a demonstration of His (God's) righteousness", although we recognise the difficulty of *ἔνδειξις*.³²

The following words (3:25c-26a) indicate that Paul's concern is to establish this point about God's own righteousness; he is not developing ideas communicated in 3:24b-25a. The purpose/result of God's activity in Christ, the demonstration of righteousness, is explained by the phrase - *διὰ τὴν πᾶρσις τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ*. The meaning of *διὰ* and what it is syntactically attached to in the previous phrases and clauses is questionable. This issue is in part influenced by how one understands *πᾶρσις*, and how *ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is connected to the previous words. If *διὰ* with the accusative is taken in the usual sense of indicating purpose, reason or cause (BAG, p. 180, GNTG 3, p. 268), then it seems that *διὰ* ... should give the reason why God's presentation of Christ as demonstrates God's own righteousness.

It seems most probable that *πᾶρσις* should be translated differently from *ἀφεσις*; in this case, "passing over" or "letting go unpunished" (BAG, p. 631).³³ This agrees well with the translation of *ἀνοχή* as "patience" or "forbearance".³⁴ Implicit in God's action in Christ (*ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἑλαστήριον*) is the fact that God did something in Christ that dealt with (propitiated and expiated for) sins previously committed. At the same time, God's lack of ultimate action in the past can now be

seen as due to His forbearance, and not His negligence.³⁵ If 2:4-5 is any sort of parallel to 3:25-26, where God's *Χρηστότης, ἀνοχή,* and *μακροθυμία* are shown before the day of wrath and the revelation of His righteous judgment, then it is best to view 3:25-26 eschatologically. The idea is of Christ bringing God's apocalyptic judgment and acquittal into the present. The past was the period of God's patience, but now God has acted concerning sin in an eschatological sense.

This understanding of 3:25b-26a is supported by 26b. This revelation of God's righteousness has taken place *ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ*, it is not reserved any longer. God has demonstrated His absolute rightness now; there has been a "proleptic manifestation" of the righteousness of God in a gracious way in response to human sin.³⁶ Paul's emphasis on the presentness of this revelation and action (*Νῦν* 21, *νῦν* 26), has both the sense of fulfillment (in relation to the witness of the Law and the Prophets), and its ultimate eschatological nature.

26c is a conclusion to 21-26b, juxtaposing the just nature of God with His act of justification by faith. The righteousness that man needs before God, especially in an eschatological sense, has been graciously given by God's provision of justification. In this provision, done in and through Christ, God has demonstrated His own righteousness. Even if the *καί* is taken as explicative, both God's being in the right and God's putting man in the right by faith in Jesus are important to Paul's thesis.

This context surrounds the relative clause that is our main concern (3:25a). We attempt below to show that

3:25a includes OT cultic elements that are significant in what Paul seeks to communicate as his eschatological gospel. (For a discussion of the issue of pre-Pauline material in 3:24-26, and how that affects interpretation see excursus 1.)

D. The Meaning of ὃν προέθετο ὁ Θεὸς ἑλκεῖον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ κρίματι.

1. The Words and Their Meaning in Context: Initial Observations

Ὁ Θεὸς, the subject of προτίθημι, remains central to 3:25-26, in keeping with the theocentric nature of the whole pericope.³⁷

Προέθετο (aorist middle of προτίθημι) can mean "set before oneself", "purpose to oneself", "put forth on one's own part", "display", "show"³⁸, "display publicly", "plan, purpose, intend",³⁹ and "proclaim", "set forth", possibly "offer", or "provide"⁴⁰. One is presented with the problem of whether it is God's purposing that is being emphasized, or the resulting action that makes it publicly accessible. The latter seems to be the emphasis. The temporal ideas suggested in νυνί... πεφανέρωται (3:21), and πρὸς ... ἐν τῷ νῦν κειρῷ (3:26) indicate Paul's eschatological and historical perspective. The temporal element is shown also by the use of τῶν προεχονότων ἰμνημάτων. The public character of God's activity (προτίθημι) is suggested by διὰ πίστεως, since in fact Christ as ἑλκεῖον must be responded to by faith. Likewise, ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ κρίματι points to the historical and public aspect to God's action in Christ; the event of Christ's death. This evidence helps us to agree with Sanday and Headlam (Romans, p. 87), and Kasemann

(Romans, p. 97) who both emphasize the public setting forth of ἑλαστήριον. Cranfield prefers to emphasize "God's eternal purpose of grace", and therefore interprets the word προτίθημι as "'propose to oneself' or 'purpose'" (Romans, 1, pp. 208-210). It is undoubtedly true that God's purposing was expressed in the setting forth of Christ as ἑλαστήριον, but the purposeful aspect of the verb need not negate the resultant action, which we suggest is the emphasis.

We view ἑλαστήριον⁴¹ as an adjective functioning substantivally, and our beginning point for definition is "'propitiatory,' 'serving for propitiation'",⁴² as in place, gift, or means of propitiation. Secondly, and as will be noted, numerous LXX usages, Philo and Hebrews 9:5 testify to the use of ἑλαστήριον in relation to the lid of the ark (the mercy seat). The centre of the Jewish cultus was seen as the place where God chose to meet with and command His people (Exod 25:22), and it was the place where the ultimate effects of the sin and uncleanness of the people were dealt with on the Day of Atonement (Lev 16:15-16). Thus, God's provision for the atonement of sin was particularly identified with it.⁴³ Then, thirdly, one must keep in mind the inscriptional finds and uses of ἑλαστήριον for atoning, appeasing, and reconciling gifts, often in the form of monuments.⁴⁴

Paul does not use ἑλαστήριον elsewhere, nor does he use ἑλάσκωμι, ἑλασμός, or ἑλεως.

One must therefore seek to understand Paul's use of ἑλαστήριον in the light of the context, and in the light of the most

relevant background material. Alternative translations are numerous, and depend on the translation of the whole clause. Before one can speak of the event, act, or place associated with *ἱλαστήριον*, it must be noted that the direct referent of *ἱλαστήριον* in Rom 3:25 is a person, Christ Jesus, the antecedent of the relative pronoun. Whatever connotations are significant to *ἱλαστήριον* these must be viewed as a description of the person of Christ within the purposeful activity of God in setting him forth.

Διὰ πίστεως almost appears as an intrusion into the clause, which is why so many redactional studies have separated it from the rest of the clause (see excursus 1). This is because *ἱλαστήριον* with *ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι* is a continuous use of cultic language, and easily suggests a cultic event (such as Lev 16:14-16). Conceptual tension is produced by the placing of *διὰ πίστεως* within it. The faith spoken of here is that which is part of justification; faith that is described further in 3:27-4:25, and has been in Paul's argument from the beginning (1:16-17, note also 1:5,8,12). *Διὰ πίστεως* helps to define *ἱλαστήριον* as that means of atonement or propitiation revealed by God in the gospel, and therefore intrinsically connected with faith. The contrast with the works of the Law is in the background (esp. 3:20, and 3:27-31). The *ἱλαστήριον* role of Christ is effective through faith (genitive of agency or manner, BDF, p. 119).

Ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι speaks of the manner and means by which God's action of presenting Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* was accomplished, and therefore the way atonement was made available (instrumental dative BDF, p. 118, closely

connected with what BDF calls an associative dative, p. 106). The means was his blood. (Note excursus 2 of this chapter on $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$ in Paul [Outside of Romans] and in the New Testament.) The position of $\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ emphasizes the fact that it was the blood of Christ himself, the blood of his sacrificial death, that was the means by which the propitiation and atonement were provided, within a justification - faith framework. Implicit in this emphasis on the blood of Christ may be a contrast with sacrificial blood (Lev 16:14-16). The phrase does seem to have sacrificial connotations.

(1) $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$ is not used often by Paul in relation to the death of Christ (Rom 5:9; [Lord's supper practice is being referred to, but death of Jesus is still relevant - 1 Cor 10:16, 11:25]; Col 1:20; Eph 1:7, 2:13). It is not a simple substitute for death. (2) It is used here in a theocentric and compressed proclamation, which is later alluded to in Rom 5:9. These two references are the only uses of $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$ in relation to the death of Christ in Romans. (3) The background is probably the connection of blood with the mercy seat and the Day of Atonement ritual as in Lev 16:14-16, the only place the two are explicitly connected in the LXX. But, even if this is not the case, the connection of $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$ with $\acute{\iota}\lambda\alpha\rho\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ does suggest the significance of blood within the OT sacrificial system, and its provision for atonement (Lev 17:11, also Ezek 43:14-20). The importance of the blood and blood rite within the cultus, especially in relation to atonement and the forgiveness of sins, must be kept in mind. (4) $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha$ becomes part of Christian language of worship, especially

associated with the Lord's supper (1 Cor 10:16, and 11:25 are the only uses of $\alpha\overset{\sim}{\iota}\mu\alpha$ by Paul before Romans that refer to the death of Christ [implicitly]). $A\overset{\sim}{\iota}\mu\alpha$ seems to be present in liturgical language used in early letters such as Eph 1:7; 1 John 1:7; 1 Peter 1:2 and 19; possibly Eph 2:13; and also see Rev 1:5, and numerous references in Revelation. Associations with the cultus, and sacrificial blood are not totally lost, but are included within the significance of Christ's death for believers.

(5) $A\overset{\sim}{\iota}\mu\alpha$ probably had particular early significance to Jewish Christians, even those that were, relatively speaking, Hellenistic, as suggested by Hebrews. The role of $\alpha\overset{\sim}{\iota}\mu\alpha$ in Hebrews is substantial, and it may reflect the fact that cultic ideas maintained significance at Rome, since Hebrews is associated with Rome (see excursus 1). In any case, Hebrews witnesses to interest in the cultus, later than Romans, but possibly not far removed from the type of ideas that Paul touches on in Rom 3:25.⁴⁵

It is likely that Paul used language that was developing particular Christian significance in teaching and worship. Paul is making a theological statement here, using terms that have already gained liturgical use (at least this is true of $\alpha\overset{\sim}{\iota}\mu\alpha$ - 1 Cor 10:16, 11:25). The difficulty in establishing the conceptual background of the language in 3:25a is caused by the use of this language which is adopting new significance in Christian circles, and the fact that Paul is tying this language so firmly to his thesis concerning the righteousness of God (see excursus 1 for an explanation of the type of traditional language Paul used). It is no surprise therefore

that there is such a diversity of opinion concerning the nature of the cultic language in this verse, if indeed the language is considered cultic at all.⁴⁶ We need, therefore, to look more closely at *ἱλαστήριον* in Rom 3:25.

We view *ἱλαστήριον* more closely below, but first we suggest tentatively a translation and amplified translation of the relative clause that reflects our initial observations: whom God set forth as the (means of ?) propitiatory atonement through faith by means of his blood. This initial translation, though, does not reflect the eschatological framework, nor the implicit links with the cultus produced by the use of cultic language. To suggest such connotations, our amplified translation is as follows: whom God set forth as the propitiating one by means of his own blood shed in sacrificial death (a propitiatory and propitiation [cultic atonement associated with the mercy seat]) available to and effective by means of faith.

2. *ἱλαστήριον*: Used with Reference to the Place of Atonement in the Old Testament Cultus; Preliminary Observations

ἱλαστήριος, -α, -ον is used with reference to monuments because of their conciliating or appeasing function (Lyonnet, Sabourin, SRS, pp. 155-156, noting Inscr. Cos 81, 347; Josephus, Ant. 16.7.1 [Loeb 8, pp. 280-281]; and Dio Chrysostomus) . Lyonnet also refers to 4 Macc 17:20-22 which we will discuss below, and a 2nd century papyrus fragment that seems to refer to sacrificial victims [*τοῖς θεοῖς ἱλαστή[ριό]υς θυσίας ἄξιω[θε?]ντες ἐπιτελεῖσθαι* - PFay. No. 337, Col. I. 3-5 [p. 313].

ἱλαστήριος, -α, -ον is not, however, a frequent word in

Hellenistic texts (generally speaking), and that is true for substantival uses of the word (LSMJ, p. 828).

As has been mentioned, *ἐλαστήριον* can translate or refer to לַיָּדְוָה (LXX - Exod 25:17 - לַיָּדְוָה , 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 31:7, 35:12, 38:5 - לַיָּדְוָה , 7, 7, 8; Lev 16:2, 2, 13, 14, 14, 15, 15; Num 7:89). In these texts *ἐλαστήριον* is used substantivally with the article, except for Exod 25:17 LXX where *ἐλαστήριον ἐπίθεμα* translates לַיָּדְוָה (MT).

The association with the ark and specifically the lid of the ark is confirmed by each use of *ἐλαστήριον* by Philo: speaking of the Cherubim "inclining" *πρὸς τὸ ἐλαστήριον* Cher. 25 [Loeb 2, pp. 24-25]; the phrase *ἀνωθεν τοῦ ἐλαστηριοῦ* is used in Quis Her. 166 [Loeb 4, pp. 366-367], and Fug. 101 [Loeb 5, pp. 64-65] with reference to Exod 25:21 and the place where God will speak; in a context of speaking of the cities of refuge, where Philo is giving symbolic interpretations, he labels the lid of the ark as *ἐλαστήριον, τὸ ἐπίθεμα τῆς κιβωτοῦ - καλεῖ δὲ αὐτὸ ἐλαστήριον* - this precedes the reference in Fug. 101 mentioned above, but this is presented separately because of its anarthrous state, Fug. 100 [Loeb 5, pp. 64-65]; a similar interpretation as in Fug. 100 is found in Mos. ii. 95 [Loeb 6, pp. 496-497] where the lid of the ark is called in the light of the holy books *ἐλαστήριον*, note also 97 - *τὸ δ' ἐπίθεμα . . . ἐλαστήριον*, and is a symbol of *τῆς ἰσχύος τοῦ Θεοῦ δυνάμεις* [both references in Mos. ii. are anarthrous].

Τὸ ἐλαστήριον is used with reference to the lid of the ark in Hebrews 9:5. The writer states that elaboration concerning the details of the worship and the

this text as "and by means of the blood of those pious ones, even their propitiatory death, the divine providence preserved afflicted Israel". Thus, the text is similar to Rom 3:25 in the use of *ἱλαστήριος* and *αἷμα* together, and there are a number of similar concepts in the context:

"(i) Both contexts declare that the wrath of God is active. (ii) Both refer to the shedding of blood and the surrender of life. (iii) The death in both cases deals with sin. (iv) 4 Maccabees regards the deaths as the means of bringing about deliverance, and Rom. 3 declares that the death of Christ effects a liberating redemption. (v) Both passages interpret death as being vicarious. (vi) In both cases, it is God who provides the means of atonement or propitiation". (footnote 47)

At the same time the dissimilarities are enough to put in question any dependence, while allowing for some basic conceptual agreements. The martyrological emphasis of 4 Maccabees, and its Hellenistic treatment of the death of Eleazar, the seven brothers and their mother is a different type of apologetic than that presented by Paul. Paul demonstrates the righteousness before God and of God, which Christ as *ἱλαστήριον* indicates and enables. We would suggest that Paul is not commending Jesus' faithfulness unto death in Rom 3:21-26, and then viewing the propitiatory effect of it; Paul is declaring the righteousness of God in justifying through faith, which is the case because God presented Christ as *ἱλαστήριον*. Although interpretation is difficult, we would suggest that the absence of *θάνατος* in Rom 3:25, and the anarthrous use of *ἱλαστήριον* points to Paul's emphasis on the role of Christ within God's purposeful righteous redeeming activity (3:24). The placing of *διὰ πίστεως* in this context indicates Paul's distinctive concern, in contrast to 4 Maccabees. Paul uses *ἐν* with reference to Jesus' blood,

whereas 4 Maccabees has *διὰ*. These differences along with the use of *προτίθαραι* may indicate that Paul views the death of Jesus differently than a propitiatory martyrdom. It was a provision of God, and stood as an eschatological revelatory event. The significance of the deaths in these two pericopes is quite different, one affecting deliverance from affliction that Israel had experienced, and the other bringing in justification for all who believe. Although 4 Macc 17:22 presents a most important use of the adjective *ἱλαστήριος*, Paul's use of *ἱλαστήριον*, for the reasons we have expressed above, seems to indicate that Paul had something else in mind. The liturgical flavour, and the theological density of Rom 3:21-26, with the signs of Pauline creativity, make this pericope distinct from 4 Macc 17:22.⁴⁸ Also, Paul's thought is more complex, with the overlapping of a number of concepts, rather than a martyrological framework.

We emphasize to conclude this brief overview that *ἱλαστήριος* when used substantivally can describe or refer to an object or act that functions to propitiate wrath or to atone for sin (or both). In the case of the LXX uses, it can be used to identify the object and place which God provided where He met with His people and where the ultimate cultic act of atonement with blood took place (Philo and Hebrews would support this). Therefore the word often becomes a descriptive appellative for the lid of the ark in light of its role in the cultus. Even in Exod 25:17 the function of the *ἐπίθαραι* is seemingly referred to by the adjective *ἱλαστήριον* which may suggest that the shift from adjectival to substantival usage is

that of function to that which functions. The idea of locality can be associated with the word,⁴⁹ and that is indeed the case in the LXX, where the spatially defined cultus is being referred to, and the centre of that cultus. But, in Rom 3:25, where Christ is the referent with his life's blood, the local idea is not emphasized in the sense of where the sacrificial blood was shed, or sprinkled. The only spatial dimension is Christ himself, who in a sense becomes the place where God's righteousness is revealed and his redemption accomplished, or the one who reveals God's righteousness and accomplishes his just redemptive atonement by being ἱλαστήριον. Within this framework, it is God's activity in setting forth Christ as ἱλαστήριον that is Paul's emphasis.

Christ's role transcends the local-cultic sphere. The διὰ πίστεως phrase makes local ideas, at least in the most literal sense, difficult to maintain. Within the framework of Law, the means of atonement, which implicitly called for propitiation of God's wrath, was a spatial-temporal-cultic reality. In Christ, atonement was presented, made available, through a person and a historical event. The temporal element of this atonement must be viewed as one historical event that is permanently effective through faith. God's provision of Christ supplied the means, the place, person, and sacrifice of atonement that allows for justification (eschatological acquittal).

We need now to consider further the possibility that Paul was actually referring to the OT propitiatory or mercy seat, or was alluding to it at least by way of contrast. If this was the case, then Paul was using a word

with OT cultic connotations (along with $\alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$) to explain God's revelation of His righteousness and to defend his gospel of justification by faith.

3. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$: Used with Reference to the Place of Atonement in the OT Cultus; Defended and Further Explained

a) Leon Morris' Argument Against a "Mercy Seat" Interpretation

Basic objections to the idea that Paul has the mercy seat in mind have been listed and developed carefully by Leon Morris in "The Meaning of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ In Romans III. 25".⁵⁰

(1) Morris discusses the absence of the article to show that " $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ does not necessarily denote the mercy seat" (p. 36). Although this is true, Lyonnet notes that one would expect the anarthrous use of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, because "it is treated as predicate".⁵¹ Lyonnet uses Philo as evidence for this anarthrous use of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ when referring explicitly to the mercy seat. Furthermore, the agreement of $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ with $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ is clear, and the article is unnecessary, if a substantival usage could have been understood. In light of the LXX usage, it is possible that many would recognise the OT connotations, especially if this connection had already been made in early tradition or worship. If it is allowed that the word $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ describes Christ and is made definite by $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \alpha\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha\tau\epsilon$, then the article is not needed. Paul could have been aware of the Greek OT cultic usage of $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ and he used the word to describe Christ's role within God's revelation of His righteousness. If this was so, then Paul was speaking of an atonement set forth now by means of the blood of Christ, a

propitiatory available to faith.⁵²

(2) Morris states that "it seems better to regard *ἱλαστήριον* as denoting 'means of propitiation' than a place" (p. 37). We have already suggested that in Paul's use of *ἱλαστήριον* in relation to Christ the spatial significance is not stressed, but at the same time Christ is God's provision for atonement. We would suggest, furthermore, that concepts of expiation and propitiation were closely tied to space and objects (as well as sacrifice) in the ancient world of which *ἱλαστήριον* can be an example.⁵³ We note also that in Lev 17:11 it is the blood that makes atonement, but specifically blood upon the altar. Place and means of atonement are united within the atonement ritual. On the Day of Atonement, the blood sprinkled upon and before the "atonement cover" (NIV) was a crucial aspect of the atonement ritual for the High Priest, his household, and all Israel (Lev 16:17). The meeting place of God and Israel (Exod 25:22) is atoned for with the blood within the Day of Atonement ritual, because the sins of Israel affect even the centre of the cultic presence of God. Even as the "atonement cover" (NIV) itself is atoned for, it becomes part of the means of atonement for the sins of the people of Israel. Thus, the place is united with the means through the blood rite. Likewise, Christ, by God's sovereign presentation, is the propitiatory one through faith, by means of his own blood. He is the cultus centre, that functions to atone, because of his own blood. If there is some truth to this interpretation, then the event character of the atonement should probably be stressed, because the Day of Atonement

made such a close connection between sacrifice and the mercy seat possible. The aorist verb (*προέθετο*) would seem to allow for this.

(3) Morris argues that the mentioning of the Law and the Prophets in Rom 3:21 is not decisive as a pointer to the Day of Atonement (p. 37). This is true, but it certainly suggests that Paul is thinking in relation to the OT. Paul is viewing the action of God in Christ on an eschatological level, which involves its agreement with the OT witness (3:21), and the establishing of the Law (3:31). It is reasonable within this framework to suggest that an aspect of the OT witness to God's righteousness is the OT cultus itself. Paul does not use this phrase concerning the Law and the Prophets witness elsewhere, so it is difficult to know precisely what he is referring to. Most likely it is a general reference to the OT with Rom 1:17 giving an example of the OT's witness to the righteousness of God. But the cultus as a witness to God's covenant and righteousness may be included (note Lev 16:2,7,13 LXX and the use of *μαρτύριον*).

(4) Morris counters T. W. Manson's confession framework for understanding Rom 1-3 (" *ἸΛΑΧΤΗΡΙΟΝ* ", JTS 46 [1945], 1-10). We are not adopting each aspect of Manson's creative thesis, but it seems relevant that Paul places all of humanity under sin and guilty before God in 1:18-3:20, 23. Although this does not explicitly reflect the Day of Atonement ritual itself, which Manson suggests is behind the confession of this section, it does declare the need for God's provision of a universal and just atonement that is parallel to although broader than the

atonement associated with the OT cultus.

In m. Yoma 8:8-9 the Day of atonement is that which deals with suspended sins (transgressions unforgiven [note Rom 3:25c]) and Godward sins. It is the ultimate life-time provision for just atonement, which was to be accompanied with the appropriate and necessary repentance. Paul's confession of the human condition and his declaration of the righteous provision of propitiatory atonement in Christ is an eschatological expansion on the OT atonement provision, as the account in m. Yoma is an expansion in view of the loss of the cultus. Both are associated with the centre of the OT sacrificial system and cultic calendar, but Paul's expansion focuses on the new revelation of God's righteousness in Christ, which is to be received by faith. The cultic ideas are a part of Paul's broader explanation of God's righteousness, and are left undeveloped, as opposed to the interest in and preservation of ritual procedure in the Rabbinic material.

Furthermore, we note the emphasis on sin in Romans, which may be related to Paul's use of cultic language (47 uses of ἁμαρτία, with 41 uses in 5:12-8:10, 17 uses in the rest of the Pauline corpus). This is specifically sin against the background of God's wrath, and in view of God's δικαίωμα (1:32) and His Law (3:19-20). Cultic language connected with the problem of sins (3:25a-c) could easily be expressed with the Day of Atonement in mind.

(5) Morris also denies the need to stress αὐτοῦ because it is in the emphatic position. The stressing of its emphatic position is not crucial to our thesis. We do

suggest, though, regardless of grammatical labelling, that the meaning is emphatic. It emphasizes the role of Christ within God's provision that demonstrates His righteousness (note ὄν, and ἱλαστήριον, and αὐτοῦ all point to Christ functioning within a framework that demonstrates God's righteousness). Thus, αὐτοῦ is not emphatic because of its grammatical position alone, which could suggest this, but because Christ functioning as ἱλαστήριον is equated with the source of the sacrificial blood. In Christ the ultimate event of cultic mediation takes place by means of his own blood.

(6) Morris discounts the importance of the patristic evidence in favour of Paul's reference to the mercy seat (p. 38). Such evidence needs to be viewed with caution, but it certainly does not damage our perspective, since there is a definite tradition of comparing Christ to the mercy seat or propitiatory.⁵⁴

(7) Lastly on the negative side, Morris states his fear of a "morass of subjectivity" (p. 39), if interpretations just proceed on the basis of what would be "appropriate" (p. 39), or "natural" (p. 38). He mentions this particularly in reference to the work of Sanday and Headlam, and with lesser scepticism the work of Anders Nygren. This is, of course, a legitimate concern, but it seems to us that the content of this text calls for reasonable exegetical guesswork.

b) Leon Morris' Argument for a "Means of Atonement" Interpretation and Responses

Morris then turns to positive evidence for interpreting ἱλαστήριον as a "means of atonement" (pp. 39-43). The general meaning "a propitiation" is preferred to "the

propitiation". The basis for this is: 1) the meaning of the word outside the OT; 2) the fact that the LXX usage does not always mean mercy seat; 3) the dissimilarity to the context in Hebrews, where τὸ ἱλαστήριον is used for the mercy seat; and 4) the difference of ἱλαστήριον to τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν in 1 Cor 5:7, which has the pronoun and the article explaining it as a direct reference to the paschal lamb (pp. 39-40).

Briefly, in relation to 1) and 2), we have already suggested above that ἱλαστήριον could be interpreted in a number of ways, but we prefer to interpret the word in the light of its predominant OT usage, even if "means of atonement" is the resulting translation. The further evidence that Morris uses concerning Jewish authors like Josephus, Philo, (and Joseph Klausner) does not seem to add any conclusive reason against Paul's allusion or reference (in some sense) to the OT cultus and mercy seat here. We admit that the word is used rarely, and that Josephus does not refer to the mercy seat, but Philo does, and he speaks of ἱλαστήριον without the article in reference to the mercy seat (as noted above).

It is Morris' third and fourth points that we need to comment further on. Paul is not involved in the type of reflective critique of the cultus in light of the death and resurrection of Christ that is evidenced in Hebrews. Having admitted this, Paul's use of unusual liturgical language for him may suggest an awareness of and reference to such cultic themes (note excursus 1). One must account for the cultic language, although it is tightly placed within the argument.⁵⁵ Here Paul uses

cultic language to enhance an argument that is not developing cultic ideas. Lyonnet has suggested that "a Jew could hardly allude to the forgiveness of God by means of a sacrifice without thinking of the rite of blood over or toward the propitiatory".⁵⁶ Although this is probably an overstatement, if Paul is speaking of sacrificial blood and he also uses the LXX word for the mercy seat, then it is likely that OT atonement ideas are present. Morris later insists that Romans does not move "in the sphere of Levitical symbolism, and a reference to the ἱλαστήριον here would be out of character" (p. 40). We would suggest, though, that it is reasonable for Paul, within the context of 3:21-26, to use a theologically significant word that has specific OT cultic connotations. Paul is defining his gospel in Romans with the help of OT texts (1:17 and the use of the OT throughout the letter, particularly the LXX text, noting 3:10-18 before this section).⁵⁷ Paul also reveals particular interest in speaking of the Law and Israel in relation to his gospel (esp. 2:17-4:25, and 9-11), and he pointedly addresses the Jew (2:17) in his apologetic, and both Jew and Gentile are under sin (3:9). There is a legal and Jewish emphasis to Paul's argument. Paul, furthermore, does refer to ἡ λατρεία as one of Israel's significant privileges (9:4), which can be seen in contrast to the false worship of those "given over" by God in 1:25. Paul also explicitly uses the language of worship and cult to describe his own ministry (1:9, 15:16). Words and ideas from the cultic sphere are used elsewhere at significant points in the letter (12:1, and possibly 5:9 and 8:3). Use of cultic

language would not be out of place in 3:25. Morris is looking for a contextual reference to the Day of Atonement ritual or a development of this thought to clarify the reference to the mercy seat (p. 41). We will consider some evidence from the context below, but it may be that Paul is deliberately using language that is traditional and possibly already known in Christian circles at Rome. It could also be that as W. D. Davies has said, Paul has used sacrificial ideas here, but left them "inchoate".⁵⁸ The emphases of the letter, in the light of its recipients, would allow for such a reference, even if the immediate context does not suggest the development of cultic ideas. Paul is using the relative clause in 3:25 to support ideas in 3:23-24. In such a context it is reasonable, even if not totally satisfying, to assume that Paul has used language from the Levitical cultus without developing the associated concepts. That ἑλοσθηρίον and δέμα are so significantly connected in Lev 16 in relation to the forgiveness of sin, and the fact that "blood" was a part of early liturgical language emphasizing the significance of Christ's death makes an allusion possible.

Concerning τὸ πάσχα ἡμῶν (1 Cor 5:7), we suggest that the διὰ πίστεως phrase in 3:25 functions similarly to ἡμῶν in 1 Cor 5:7. They both define the cultic reference as now relevant to Christ and the community of faith (generally speaking). Thus, the issue is the article again, which we have already considered. One could ask if there are any indications in the context of 1 Cor 5:7 that would cause one to expect such a cultic reference. Such references as 1 Cor 3:17, 6:19, 9:13, 10:16-20, and 11:25

may be appealed to, but they are no more directly significant than what we have suggested concerning Romans.

Morris raises the important question concerning the image used if mercy seat is referred to. It is not suggested here, though, that Paul has a vivid picture of Christ as victim-priest-mercy seat with each visualized separately and completed by him. Rather Christ is the means of righteousness by faith in a way that can be described cultically. He integrates as it were, under the purposeful direction of God, the mediating function of the cultus, which is expressed in terms of atonement associated with the mercy seat and sacrificial blood. Christ is the means of atonement, an atonement understood in terms of the cultus. In the background may be the Day of Atonement ritual itself, when the different aspects of the cultus were joined in the ritual process which was viewed as bringing about forgiveness. It was as the blood rite of the sin-offering was accomplished on and before the lid of the ark that the holy place and the people were atoned for (purified). Christ atones for sins by means of his own blood, his own blood being as the blood of the sin-offering (Rom 8:3) sprinkled before and upon the mercy seat.⁵⁹ But, in fact, the cultic image is not developed.

What is most important in the Rom 3:21-26 context is that it is Christ's role within God's display of his righteousness that directs in the cultic language used and in turn the cultic language concretely expresses the way Christ has demonstrated the righteousness of God. Thus, the parallel with the OT cultus affirms God's righteousness in a familiar way, which is Paul's concern. The

nature of the atonement is not developed. Rather the atonement is referred to in order to explain God's righteousness and justification. Paul has used concrete words to express Christ's role within God's revelation of His righteousness. Within this context Paul is using language that would remind his readers of God's provision of atonement for His covenant people. A vivid historical image is not presented. The language is too tightly tied into the broader argument for that; therefore cultic ideas are not developed. But, one can speak of the use of *ἱλαστήριον* here as antonomastic, because an understood substantival adjective, often used for the OT propitiatory, describes the role of Christ as the meeting place of God's forgiveness and justice.⁶⁰ At the same time, it is a word with more general connotations that are in keeping with what Paul is seeking to state.

Although an allusion (at least) to the mercy seat would seem to be appropriate in view of Paul's argument here, Morris raises the further objection that the mercy seat was in fact a piece of history ("past history", p. 41), since it was not present during the second Temple period. The sprinkling of blood was maintained (m. Yoma 5:3,4), but there was no *לַבְיֹטֵן* (p. 41). But Paul may be drawing his thought from the OT directly or early tradition and not from current practice,⁶¹ and current practice would not deter such a reference. In essence Morris (similarly to Deissmann) is stating that a reference to *ἱλαστήριον* here would be an obscure one.⁶² We suggest, though, that the OT and synagogue worship itself kept the cultus in the minds of people influenced by

Judaism. The use of ἰλαστήριον need not be viewed as an obscure cultic reference, especially if cultic language was gaining usage within early Christian tradition.

Morris suggests that προτίθημι is not compatible with a reference to mercy seat (p. 42). T. W. Manson, on the other hand, has suggested a deliberate contrast between the public nature of Christ being put forward and the hiddenness of the mercy seat in the Holy of Holies.⁶³

With qualification, we suggest that Manson has drawn attention to an interesting possibility concerning Paul's argument, given the fact that any contrasts with the cultus itself are implicit, and not drawn out by Paul.

προτίθημι itself is determined by the theological and eschatological emphases of the text, and not any cultic image as such. God has put forward Christ; he is the one by whom atonement is made available to faith. If there is an implicit contrast with the cultus in view of this public setting forth of Christ, then the emphasis is on the presentation of an atonement through faith. The positive declaration of redemption (3:24) and forgiveness in an ultimate way (3:25c), which comprises justification (eschatological acquittal), is now revealed and is now for all who believe. Atonement is not limited in an institutional way. The setting forth of Christ brings about an implicit contrast between the before and now in God's purpose.

Lastly, Morris refers to 4 Macc 17:22, emphasizing similarities between the passages (p. 43). This functions to cast more doubt on the concrete reference to mercy seat in Rom 3:25. We state simply at this point that the

argument in Romans seems to be more closely tied to the OT than that of 4 Maccabees. The martyrological understanding of Paul's argument is similar, but probably not what Paul is presenting here.

4. A Clarification of Interpretation

We now state our view against the background of this interaction with Morris' instructive objections. The relative clause in 3:25a clarifies the nature of the ἀπολύτρωσις which is in Christ Jesus. This is principally God's gracious action in Christ Jesus to forgive sins. This forgiveness was accomplished because God set forth Christ as the ultimate means of atonement through faith (for believers), by means of his sacrificial death. This was done in parallel fashion to the OT cultus, in that God provided the cultus and the cultic means and event, as it were, but it was done in contrast to the OT cultus in that God set forth or displayed Christ in the propitiatory and atoning event. This propitiatory and atoning event which took place by means of Christ's blood within God's revelation of His righteousness allows Paul to speak of Christ as "mercy seat" through faith. In this faith - cultus, if one can speak of it as such, the temporal setting forth of Christ in his blood becomes the permanent means of atonement through faith.

This cultic language is used to affirm that God has demonstrated His righteousness, that He has done this in the present, and that this has made clear that God is just and the justifier of those who have faith in Jesus. The eschatological action of God breaks through the spacial, ritual, and national categories, and determines the mode

of the new cultus as it were. Thus, there is ambiguity in the image used if one presses it too far. It is God's eschatological acquittal, which is forgiveness in Christ, that receives the cultic model.

It is our contention that the cultic language within the context of the pericope allows for both an expiatory and propitiatory role in this forgiveness. The action is indeed God's, and the result is redemption, which here speaks of forgiveness. Thus, expiation is implied. This forgiveness functions, though, within the framework of God's eschatological judgment. Christ, at the same time, enables the just forgiveness of sins demonstrating the righteousness of God by enabling God to make proleptic acquittal justly. This Godward aspect of Christ's role includes the idea of propitiation. As in the cultic model, where a way of forgiveness was provided (expiation), this would make no sense unless the effects of sin or punishment and wrath were not realities and therefore dealt with (propitiation). It is the need for justification and the need for this to be accomplished justly that calls for Christ's role as *ἰλαστήριον*.

Obviously, Paul did not consciously reflect on each aspect of these words as we have. Nor would his readers have visualized all the background matter that we have been concerned with. They probably would have sensed some familiarity with the language though, and sensed the theological depth of the apostle as he moved from significant concept to significant concept strengthening his point. It is our opinion that Paul was using liturgical language that was already gaining Christian usage. Paul

adopted and adapted this language to support his main thesis (see excursus 1 for a defence of this suggestion). From what we know of Rome, it is not unlikely that this language was familiar there. At such a crucial section of his letter, Paul is probably appealing to cultic ideas among others to support his argument in a way that would tie into the tradition already known in Rome. The use of this cultic language was not completely obscure, but rather illustrative of his main point in a way that would enhance his argument.

E. Further Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Rom 3:25

1. Concerning the Metaphorical Nature of the Cultic Language

Although Paul does not develop a metaphor with his use of cultic language, and therefore there is little "visualisation",⁶⁴ the metaphorical nature of the language still can be suggested, and described. If one assumes a degree of familiarity with the concepts expressed, which we have suggested was the case, then the words probably depend upon associated concepts for their impact within Paul's argument. We recognise that the level of the cultic significance of the language is hard to assess, and that the interpretation just offered clearly demands that Paul has used the word ἱλαστήριον very carefully and with many associated ideas. We suggest therefore, that if there is an implicit allusion or metaphorical contrast with the OT propitiatory, then ideas of God's righteousness and covenantal provision associated with the cultus would be transferred to the present demonstration of God's righteousness

in Christ.

To clarify further the emphasis of the language we will use Christine Brooke-Rose's classification of a fourth noun metaphor, which is described as "a direct statement involving a third party: C makes A into B".⁶⁵ In 3:25a, God (c) sets forth Christ (a) as *ἱλαστήριον* (b). It is only within the framework of God's sovereign action that Christ is spoken of as *ἱλαστήριον*. It is in view of God's purpose that the death of Christ functions as a sacrifice, and in this way God "makes" Christ propitiatory or atoning through faith. Christ (the means of propitiatory atonement represented by *ἱλαστήριον*) was presented in his atoning role by means of his own blood. The event character of God's provision should be stressed, therefore, because it was on the Day of Atonement that the *ἱλαστήριον* was sprinkled with sacrificial blood as part of the atonement ritual. This allows for the direct association of *ἱλαστήριον* and *αἵμα*, and the resulting general thrust of the relative clause. Paul is using concrete language to express the ultimate nature of God's atonement available now to all who believe, concrete cultic language that points beyond itself to God's provision for atonement. Paul's language, at the same time, is probably elliptical in the sense that he has not filled out linguistically or conceptually what is implied by the words used.⁶⁶ The elliptical nature of the relative clause is understandable in the light of its supportive role in Paul's broader argument in 3:21-26. Also, its declarative style and its cumulative strength due to the progression of supportive clauses has allowed for the use

of words that would need further explanation in other contexts. This may help to clarify why Paul does not express a complete cultic picture, although there is much suggested by his words. It is God's purpose, expressed in His eschatological presentation of Christ, that Christ be atoning and propitiatory (just as sacrificial functions performed on and before the mercy seat on the Day of Atonement were atoning and propitiatory) for all who believe, and Christ fulfilled this role by means of His own blood (sacrificial death). Granted that we are theologizing in view of Paul's use of metaphorical language, it still seems to us that this is a legitimate way to present what Paul means by this cultic language that suggests a possible mixture of images.

If one is to ask what type of metaphorical comparison is being made, it is a "pragmatic " comparison.⁶⁷ This is what G. B. Caird identifies as that in which the "activity or result of one thing" is being compared to "with that of another".⁶⁸ The effect or result of God's activity in setting forth Christ is similar to that of the effect of the God ordained cultus. The role of Christ within God's eschatological judgment forgiveness is comparable to that of the cultus, although not identical.

The function of the language is "both informative and cognitive".⁶⁹ It functions to explain further Paul's main thesis. At the same time it is "cohesive" in the sense that it helps to form agreement between Paul and his readers.⁷⁰ Paul does this by drawing on language of worship and liturgy that was familiar to his readers. The language affirms the unity of the heritage of both Paul

and his readers, and the unity of the Christian tradition in which they stand. At the axis of his argument, this was the time for Paul to support his thesis with accepted and authoritative language and ideas, instead of questionable argumentation.

2. Concerning Possible Implications with Regard to the Cultus Itself.

The language that Paul used, in a broad sense, functioned to modify "the tradition" related to Jewish institutions.⁷¹ This may be part of a growing Jewish-Christian tradition particularly developed in certain communities. The OT cultus is perceived in a different way without any explicit critique or defence of it. Paul has "collocated"⁷² words in 3:25 that are not usually connected and therefore meaning is modified. This can be viewed, even within a growing tradition, as an innovation in meaning,⁷³ especially in relation to Jewish liturgical uses of cultic language. The innovation is not in the idea of human non-cultic activity (death) being viewed as atoning in some sense, but innovative in its role in the eschatological justification by faith framework. This places a theological framework around Christ that interprets his death as an event of ultimate saving significance according to God's own "now" revelation. Understanding of this, though, especially within an apologetic context, is dependent upon the heritage of basic ideas, here cultic ideas, and is aided by the growing Jewish-Christian tradition. On this basis Paul's argument is supported and clarified.

With these general comments in mind, it is helpful to

return to the suggestions of M. Hengel and B. F. Meyer concerning the strength of implicit statements concerning the Jerusalem cultus.⁷⁴ Hengel states that 3:21-26 reveals that Paul describes the death of Jesus "in categories associated with the end of the temple cult".⁷⁵ He adds that such language "would be well understood in Rome".⁷⁶ Meyer comments that by implication "the whole economy of ritual Torah and temple" are relegated "to the role of 'type'".⁷⁷ "Temple and Torah could claim no independent significance", since according to this text, "the forgiveness of sins had awaited the unique and unrepeatable ד'ג'יג'ו of Golgotha".⁷⁸ Meyer sees this type of teaching as "the signature of the ἐλληνιστικὴ ", and notes the "radical eschatological effects of the Easter event".⁷⁹ We have already noted the eschatological emphasis of the text, and now it is the matter of the continuing role of the Temple that we must consider further in light of this text.

If one is looking for an aspect of Paul's thought that seems to implicitly question the soteriological significance of the Temple, then the following needs to be mentioned: God's present manifestation of his righteousness in Christ is for Paul inextricably linked to gospel proclamation, and specifically Gentile mission and inclusion in the people of God. Atonement in Christ is fundamental to an eschatological justification that has broken into history, and is available to all who believe. The very fact of proclamation to the Gentiles means that God has acted in an ultimate way in Christ, that reveals the extending of the provision of forgiveness for Israel.

This idea of universal and eschatological "atonement" expresses the fact that God is one (3:29-30) and that with God οὐ ἐστὶν διαστολή (3:22, also 2:11, 10:12). The gospel expresses the beginning of the fulfillment of God's soteriological purpose according to His character. God's soteriological purpose is now revealed in the gospel, and the Christ-event that is proclaimed. Paul's involvement in this proclamation, inextricably connected to the present Lordship of Christ, ensured the shift of the soteriological centre of his religion to Christ, and faith in him. The Temple and Law receive their roles in light of this perspective. The Temple could still be respected (Rom 9:4), and involved in as a historically God-given institution (note Acts 21:26). Soteriology, though, was now focused on Christ. In a sense, Christ had out-dated the cultus, enabling it to be a type of God's new soteriological activity.⁸⁰ This would not keep Paul from attempting to be a Jew to the Jews, and therefore open to involvement in the life of physical Israel, including Temple practice. Paul maintained concern for his own people, ever aware of his Jewishness (Rom 9:3-4, 11:1, 11-15), a heritage that he saw as continuous with the people of God in Christ. But, Paul could distinguish his calling from his Jewish heritage in polemical situations (Gal 1:11-15, Phil 3:4-12). Christ, and Paul's calling in Christ, became the centre of his life and the source of self-definition. Paul's understanding of Christ and his own mission set the priorities that guided his thinking and practice. It is therefore, within the eschatological framework linked with Christ's Lordship and the call to

the nations that one must discuss Paul's response to Jewish institutions.

Clearly, though, Paul does not polemicize concerning the Temple. He does not mention the Temple in Romans, and he is not making an explicit critique of the cultus. It is important to remember Paul's care in discussing the Law in Romans, although it too is evaluated in light of God's revelation of righteousness in Christ (esp. 3:19-21, 10:1-4). Implicit within this teaching concerning the Law is a perspective on the cultus, but this may not reveal how Paul in practice related to the Temple, nor why. It is significant that the Temple was not an important issue in the Gentile mission. Paul's lack of direct teaching concerning the Temple suggests that it was not an issue.⁸¹ Thus, the Temple could not have been a threat to Paul's soteriology, but must have been viewed in the light of it. Paul in short does not seem concerned with the nature of the Temple itself, nor does he suggest that it has any role in the life of the church.

At the same time, we agree with K. Weiss' warnings concerning reading too much into Paul's metaphorical uses of cultic language cultus.⁸² Paul did not say that the Temple was now irrelevant, even if his soteriology and accompanying mission deny the importance of the Temple for Gentiles. We have to agree with Meyer that Israel's cultus (and possibly the Temple by association) does seem to take on the role of a 'type' of the provision of forgiveness that is in Christ, but Hengel's position may be too strong, since Paul is not explicit in his language. Surely Paul believed that Christ was the τέλος of the

cultus in regard to righteousness, but he does not state this type of idea in 3:25. In such compressed language, reflecting liturgical use, Paul's language has gained a positive meaning in relation to Christ that blurs the negative implications concerning the cultus. His argument controls how far we can take implicit critique, and in this context the historical cultus and the present Temple are not challenged directly. In any case, it must be remembered that the Temple itself functioned in the life of Judaism in a broader capacity than that of being the centre of sacrificial atonement. And Paul could refer to cultic ideas associated with the Temple that did not draw attention to the Temple itself. After all, if Paul did have the Day of Atonement ritual in mind as discussed in Lev 16, the present Temple as an institution need not have been prominent in his thinking. Paul could have implicitly drawn parallels and contrasts with God's provision for atonement on the Day of Atonement (as expressed in the OT) without speaking of the present Temple.

3. Concerning the Gospel, and Gospel Ministry

3:21-26 is the core of Paul's thesis, and therefore the centre and basis of his gospel proclamation. In this context *διὰ πίστεως* is a pregnant phrase that points beyond the immediate emphasis of the text to the gospel proclamation itself. Implicit within the revelation of God's righteousness and the setting forth of Christ is the gospel proclamation that makes both accessible to faith. In 3:21-26 the explicit mention of the mediating role of gospel proclamation is absent. There is no mention of

human agency in keeping with Paul's theocentric perspective. We suggest, though, that the use of $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ presupposes the fact of gospel proclamation. It is interesting to note in the light of this absence of human agency that the cultic image of priest, or priestly mediation is absent from 3:25 as well. It is unlikely that Paul was thinking of his specific role when he used $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$; although it is in keeping with such a role as defined later (15:16-21). In 3:21-26, this is not his concern. The use of $\delta\iota\grave{\alpha}$ $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ does indicate how closely the gospel is associated with its proclamation and the obedience of faith in response to it. Faith is part of the theocentric and eschatological perspective of Paul, clarifying the essence of justification (see below on 5:9 for further discussion) as being of God's grace, and not within a Law-works framework. Faith is unashamedly Paul's sine qua non of the people of God (within Romans such sections as 4:1-25, 9:30-10:21, and 11:16b-24 make this clear). In light of the eschatological revelation of God faith takes on a specific and urgent focus: the gospel itself (10:9-17 is a section of text that illustrates the close connection between faith and the proclamation).

It is Paul's calling to bring about the obedience of faith among the Gentiles (1:5); through him Christ brings about the obedience of the Gentiles (15:18). Explicit defence of Paul's apostleship is delayed until 15:16-21. In 15:16, Paul specifically uses the priestly role to present the significance of his calling and ministry. Thus, it is no surprise that Paul does not seem to equate Christ with the agency of the priest directly. Christ is

viewed in relation to ἱλαστήριον. This leaves the priestly role for self-description, a role that is indeed crucial in the bringing about of salvation within the purpose of God (15:16 in light of 11:13ff, and noting 10:17). How one should view these uses of cultic language together, or if one should, is a matter that must be addressed after we have considered other relevant texts.

Excursus 1: The Use of Traditional Material in Romans 3:24-26

1. The Recent Discussion

The various theories concerning pre-Pauline material in 3:24-26 betray the difficulty of the pericope both grammatically and theologically. It is right to remember that the intense interest in identifying such tradition and redaction is recent, and has not been assumed by all,⁸³ but many scholars now think that Paul is using words and phrases that are not only uncharacteristic, but have a definite pre-history; a hymn, liturgical material, or creedal or formulaic expression. The diversity of suggestions concerning the nature of the pre-Pauline material, and what Paul has altered or corrected does indicate the speculative, albeit necessary nature of such studies.⁸⁴ Ben F. Meyer, in response to Heinrich Schlier's questions concerning a pre-Pauline material hypothesis, gives a reason for considering the possibility:

"recourse to 'traditional formula' as the explanation of a sudden concentration of hapax legomena is not a necessity but an explanatory convenience, not an apodictic certainty but a more or less plausible way of accounting for what would otherwise appear to be a compact but erratic block solemnly but nonetheless awkwardly weighting the letter's first climactic passage". (footnote 85)

Meyer's subsequent words seem fair in light of his perspective:

"an accurate measure of how plausible this 'explanatory convenience' is would take account of the datum that at least some of the awkwardness is required and that, more clearly than accounts offered so far, the hypothesis of pre-Pauline material generates enough explanatory power to meet the requirements".
(footnote 86)

Meyer was right to respond to Schlier's questions because they are part of determining the nature of the pre-Pauline material itself.⁸⁷ For, although dictional peculiarities and grammatical ambiguities are frequent in this section of material, "a fixed tradition"⁸⁸ needs to be isolated if the suggestion of a pre-Pauline formula is to be profitable. It is important to ask, what difference would the use of some form of traditional material make in the particular context to the readers at Rome? Would the readership recognise the use of traditional material here? And if they did, what would that mean for what Paul is presenting in 3:21-26? 3:21-26 will be heard as Paul's words by the recipients of the letter, even if the language is familiar or betrays a quotation. This is stated because Paul gives no clear indication that he is quoting, and because there is no suggestion concerning a pre-Pauline formula in 3:24-26 that does not also postulate Pauline additions, or possible corrections and clarifications. Thus, Paul's own language would seem to be present within this unusual section of the pericope.

Two basic models concerning traditional material in 3:24-26 have dominated discussion: that suggested by Rudolf Bultmann,⁸⁹ popularized by Ernst Käsemann, and that suggested by Eduard Lohse, which has received more support

recently.⁹⁰ Kasemann (et al.,) considers *δικαιούμενοι* as the starting place of the formula, noting the grammatical problem of the participle and the uncharacteristic use of *ἀπολύτρωσις*.⁹¹ Within this general view, *διὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ χάριτι* are still considered as Pauline elements. Lohse (et al.,) thinks that *ὅν* (3:25) indicates the beginning of traditional material.⁹² S. K. Williams, following in the perspective of Lohse, points out that all the hapax legomena and major grammatical ambiguities appear in 25-26a.⁹³ Still a Pauline addition is usually supposed for *διὰ πίστεως*,⁹⁴ and at least part of 26b and 26c if it is not seen as completely Pauline.

Most importantly, diversity of opinion is evident not only concerning what elements are Pauline additions to the tradition,⁹⁵ but also the nature of the traditional material, its source, and its meaning before Paul used it. In short, the material has been labelled as Eucharistic,⁹⁶ baptismal,⁹⁷ and martyrological,⁹⁸ and there is varied opinion as to its origins and use in the early church.

2. A Suggestion for Exegesis in Context

We are not seeking to add to the possible theories concerning the nature of a pre-Pauline formula. Rather, we want to take into account the contributions of previous attempts, but to propose an alternative. This is presented below in five related conclusions.

(1) There is enough evidence to suggest that Paul is being theologically creative in an uncharacteristic way in 3:24-26, or at least is using words and combinations of words that are unusual for him (hapax legomena for Paul; *ἰλαστήριον*, *πάρσις*, *προγίνωμα*; unusual words - *διὰ τὴν*,

προτίθημι, ἑνδείξεις, ἡμέτερον, ἀνοχή; also unusual phrases - ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ αἵματι, διὰ τὰν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἐν τῇ ἀνοχῇ). The general character of the pericope with its defining nature, the repetition of words and phrases, and the building up of prepositional phrases adds to the distinctive nature of the whole pericope within its context in Romans.

(2) It is almost impossible, though, to be confident about a precise formula, since whatever may have been used, if pre-Pauline, seems to have received alteration. One could suggest that all of 3:24-26 is pre-Pauline, but this does seem unlikely, and no one has been content to see all of vss. 24-26 as pre-Pauline, or identifiably non-Pauline.

(3) Heinrich Schlier's perspective is preferred here; allowing for traditional ideas and language, but not suggesting that Paul is actually quoting a particular piece of tradition.⁹⁹ It seems that Paul, in presenting this theological thesis, used language in a liturgical way; statements that are repetitive further defining previous statements, formal in tone and possibly having an LXX flavour. This is understandable in view of the subject matter, God's righteousness as demonstrated in the gospel. Such a subject may have caused Paul to draw on the language of early Christian worship to explain his thesis, and to support it. More specifically, it would seem likely that Paul is drawing on language that he assumes has significance to his readers in Rome. The theological density of the section may suggest that Paul expected familiarity with terms pregnant with meaning;

especially *δικαιοσύνη* , *ἀπολύτρωσις*, and *ἑλεσθήριον* .

If Paul was using a specific piece of tradition, we would view 25-26a as the probable extent of it, with B. F. Meyer's view of much interest.¹⁰⁰ It seems more likely, though, that whatever traditional ideas were in Paul's mind, they have been adopted and adapted by Paul in the creation of his own apologetic.

(4) Paul's use of liturgical or "religious" language acts to confirm the traditional basis of his thesis. Paul cannot appeal to teaching he has already passed on. He needs to appeal to common tradition that would be known at Rome. Paul makes mention of the teaching already received at Rome, explicitly (6:17, 15:14-15), and implicitly (1:8, 16:19). In line with the purposes of the letter, this type of appeal to familiar and authoritative language would be natural, and probably deliberate. For Paul to express his own ideas within a framework of traditional motifs acts to confirm his teaching.

(5) Suggestions concerning parallels to Paul's language are always tentative, unless of course Paul is quoting a known source. Our suggestion in this respect is no different in its tentative nature. In line with the suggestions above, and our understanding of the church at Rome, we would suggest that Paul is drawing on Jewish-Christian ideas that may be similar and preliminary to the sort of teaching represented in Hebrews (especially chapter 9). Thus, we are suggesting that Jewish-Christian use of cultic language, particularly to explain forgiveness of sins may have had early circulation, even at Rome. Respect for Jewish institutions may have been common as

the argument of Hebrews suggests.¹⁰¹ Such ideas, as Hengel and Meyer have suggested,¹⁰² may have been earlier than Paul's letter to Rome, with Hebrews reflecting a particular post-Pauline extrapolation of them in view of increased crisis in Jewish-Christian self-definition. Of most significance dictionally is the use of τὸ ἱλαστήριον (9:5), ἀπολύτρωσις (9:13), ἄϊμα (2:14; 9:7,12,13,14,18,20, 21,22,25; 10:4,19,29; 11:28; 12:4,24; 13:11,12,20), and νυνὶ δέ (9:26 also 8:6). Hebrews is pre-occupied with Levitical ideas and institutions in a way dissimilar to Romans, but there seems to be some similarity in the interest in cultic concepts (note λατρεία [9:1,6], and εἰς τὸ λατρεύειν Θεῷ ζῶντι [9:14 in view of 9:9] and compare with Rom 1:9; 12:1 in view of 9:4). The significance of ἄϊμα in Hebrews is clear, and this is something that Paul reveals in two significant parallel phrases in Rom 3:25 and 5:9. The mediating role of Christ in terms of redemption, and specifically a redemption that is associated with the forgiveness of sins is worthy of note (Heb 9:15, Rom 3:24). That this forgiveness is seen as relevant to sins...παράβασις (Heb 9:15), could reflect what is behind Paul's emphasis in Rom 3:25-26a, relegating the past period to one in which God had passed over sins in His patience. The differences are clear and we do not want to erase them. The writer of Hebrews is much more explicit in his use of cultic language, as he is in his development of the new covenant theme. Also, the idea of replacement and eschatological surpassing of the old covenant is more clearly stated. Paul seems rather to speak in terms of continuity with Israel, and of eschatological expansion

and 're-definition' in the light of the revelation of God's purpose as revealed in Christ. In other words, Paul does not use cultic language with the same overt polemical thrust as the writer of Hebrews. The parallels must be evaluated carefully, therefore, but both documents may illustrate familiarity with cultic concepts and ideas at Rome.¹⁰³

It may be too much to suggest that such language could identify particular groups or the traditions of these groups,¹⁰⁴ although a likely source would be teaching of the Jewish mission, or early Jewish-Christian teaching that would have been known in Rome. But Paul's illustrative and explanatory use of cultic language, especially assuming his own creative role in presentation, makes it difficult to identify the way cultic language may have been used in the tradition(s) received at Rome. The conclusion here is that Paul's religious language, including his cultic language (3:24-26), is traditional in character, and was probably present in the tradition and worship of the Christians at Rome.

Excursus 2: $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}$ in Paul (Outside of Romans) and in the New Testament

It is interesting to note the most similar uses of $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}$ in the Pauline corpus occur in Colossians and Ephesians, which are usually considered to be written after Romans. The possibility that Colossians and Ephesians were written from Rome may suggest that this type of vocabulary maintained its significance for Paul and the church at Rome. At the same time it is apparent that in Col 1:20 $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and Eph 2:13

ἐν τῷ αἵματι τοῦ χριστοῦ . . . the emphasis is on the reconcilia-
 tion gained through the death of Christ, which is more
 in keeping with the thought of Rom 5:1-11, and 11:11-15,
 than 3:21-26 (although it is artificial to separate
 these). That is not to say that sacrificial connotation
 has been removed, but that the emphasis is not on justi-
 fication. In Eph 1:7, there are a number of concepts com-
 pressed together in this doxological introduction to the
 letter. Redemption and forgiveness of sins are connected
 to the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ , and this is
 according to the grace of God. In all three references
 mentioned above justification language is lacking, and
 explicit cultic meaning to the word αἷμα is not
 developed, but cultic connotations are present and are
 maintained by way of the relation of ideas (e. g.,
 forgiveness of sins and sacrificial blood). Because
 these verses, and especially Eph 1:7 may be liturgical
 formulations, they seem to preserve the type of sacrifi-
 cial connotations alluded to above, although such is not
 their emphasis.

The most significant use of αἷμα by Paul, before
 the writing of Romans is that in the Last Supper tradition
 (1 Cor 11:25). This piece of tradition reflects a sacri-
 ficial interpretation of the death of Jesus -at least at
 the covenantal level- and one significant for Christian
 worship practices. Paul is undoubtedly aware of the
 potential significance of blood in this context, but he
 does not exploit any sacrificial meaning, except in the
 discussion concerning idolatry (1 Cor 10:16). Here, the
 Eucharistic cup is viewed as part of the celebration of

the Eucharist that identifies one with the death of Christ, indeed it can be viewed as ritual involvement in the death of Christ. (For further discussion on 1 Cor 11:25, see above on O. Schmitz and H. Wenschkewitz). References in Paul that are less significant for this discussion are Rom 3:15 (blood-shed), and three uses of the idiom "flesh and blood" (Gal 1:16; 1 Cor 15:50; Eph 6:12). Although these are not crucial to cultic language, this idiom does indicate the basic elements of physical existence.

The above references, and the lack of other ones indicate that the references to $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ in Rom 3:25 and 5:9 must be looked at carefully in view of Paul's emphases in context. $A\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ is not a common word for Paul, and it appears in texts that suggest that it maintained cultic associations, but they were not exploited by Paul. At the same time, as the survey below will suggest, there was a wide development of the sacrificial connotations among others, and thus Paul could probably use $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ knowing that the basic associations with sacrificial blood would be understood.

The following is an overview of the NT uses of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$. Significant uses of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ are found in the Hebrews. Heb 9:7, 12, 25, and 13:11 speak of sacrificial blood in relation to the Day of Atonement, and 9:13 and 10:4 more general concepts related to sacrificial blood. Heb 9:12, 14, 10:19, and 13:12 speak of the blood of Christ in relation to the blood presented on the Day of Atonement. Heb 9:18, 19, 20, and 21 refer to blood in connection with the blood of the covenant, with 9:22 declaring the general cultic-covenantal principle - no forgiveness without the

shedding of blood. The death of Jesus is described in relation to the new covenant in 10:29, 12:24 (explicit comparison with the blood of Abel is made in this verse also), and 13:20. Other references include Moses' involvement in the Passover (11:28), an explicit martyrological nuance in the light of suffering (12:4), and a reference to Jesus' humanity in terms of flesh and blood (2:14). Thus, the significance of the death of Christ is developed in connection with sacrificial blood within different aspects of the argument, thereby declaring the true forgiveness made possible, and Christ's role as mediator of the new covenant.

The synoptics contain three uses of $\alpha\dot{\iota}\mu\alpha$ in Last Supper pericopes in which the blood is associated with the new covenant (Matt 23:30; Mark 14:24; Luke 22:20). There are a number of references that have martyrological significance when speaking of death (Matt 23:30, 25:35³, and probably the following since the ultimate reference of $\alpha\dot{\iota}\mu\alpha$ is the death of Christ 27:4,24,25, also Luke 11:50, 51). Other references include Matt 27:6, and 8 speaking of blood money and the Field of Blood, Luke 22:44 speaking of sweat like drops of blood, Luke 13:11 - the blood of the Galileans (their deaths), and Matt 16:27 in which the expression "flesh and blood" is used. General uses are found in Mark 5:25,29, and Luke 8:43,44.

References in John are limited to the section concerning the flesh and blood of the Son of Man (6:53,54,55,56), the reference to descent in 1:13, and the water and blood from Jesus' wound (19:34), which is developed in 1 John 5:6², and 8. 1 John 1:7 speaks of the cleansing of

sin, which refers to the forgiveness that is available through the death of Christ. This last text seems to maintain sacrificial connotations.

In Revelation there are a number of martyrological uses of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ (6:10, 16:6, 17:6², 18:24, 19:2), general or apocalyptic uses (6:12, 8:7,8, 11:6, 14:20, 16:3,4,6), one with explicit redemptive meaning (5:9), and the blood of the Lamb, which is implicitly sacrificial but has an apocalyptic nuance (7:14, 12:11, 19:13). $A\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ in 1:5 seems to have a redemptive significance, although the context and the idea of freedom from sin suggests sacrificial meaning as well (1:5-6).

1 Peter has two uses of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$, both referring to the death of Christ. The first speaks of the fact that those chosen by God are chosen to gain the effect of Christ's death (1:2). This may represent new covenant language similar to Hebrews 9:15-22, and 12:24, or the language of forgiveness and cleansing (as in Heb 10:22). In either case the idea of sprinkling of blood seems to have received a further nuance in relation to Christian baptism, although the concept of sprinkling is probably still seen in view of covenant enacting blood. 1:19 describes the death of Christ with a mixture of redemptive and sacrificial terms, the sacrificial terms emphasizing the quality of the sacrificial victim.

There are only two references in Acts, where the death of Christ is spoken of with the use of $\alpha\hat{\iota}\mu\alpha$ (5:28 which has to do with blood guilt, and 20:28 which is redemptive in connotation). A use in a martyrological context is that of 22:20. Other uses include the

Jerusalem ban on blood (15:20,29, 21:25), Paul's claim of fulfilled responsibility (18:6, 20:26), prophecy quoted from Joel 2:19, 20, and a reference to the Field of Blood (1:19). Thus, there is no explicit reference to cultic blood in relation to the death of Christ.

In viewing Paul against this background it is most interesting that he uses $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ in relation to justification in Romans, something he does not do elsewhere. If some of the cultic and covenantal ideas expressed in Hebrews are close at hand for Paul, these may be part of Paul's concept of justification.¹⁰⁵ At the same time, the diversity of material relevant to the use of the word indicates that we are having to seek for Paul's particular nuance in his use of the word $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ among a number of significant options.

The position of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha\tau\iota$ in 3:25 does add credibility to the idea that the $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ - phrase indicates the direction of the faith (through faith in his blood). Any combination of these prepositional phrases would be unusual for Paul, so we must allow for this possibility. It seems, though, that the separation of faith and blood in 5:1 and 5:9 may indicate that Paul is not describing faith by the addition of the phrase "in his blood", rather both prepositional phrases are describing $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$. Thus, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ is described first as being through faith, and then in terms of blood. Paul may be adapting traditional language (1 Cor 11:25) with covenantal and sacrificial significance to speak specifically of the nature of God's justification of sinners.

Footnotes

¹On the issue of the presence or absence of the article $\tau\eta\varsigma$, we have followed the reading of NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE, 26th edition of the E. Nestle and E. Nestle text, edited by K. Aland, M. Black, C. M. Martini, B. M. Metzger, and A. Wikgren (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979), which is the same as the reading in the 25th edition of the Nestle-Aland text followed in The Greek New Testament, 3rd edition, K. Aland, M. Black, C. M. Martini, B. M. Metzger, and A. Wikgren (London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975). Support for this reading is given in Metzger's TCGNT, p. 508. We will proceed with the reading $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, suggesting the later addition of $\tau\eta\varsigma$, pointing back to $\delta\iota\alpha\ \pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in 3:22. It is better for us to work with a clear text than to work with a word in brackets, despite the questionable reading. (The complete omission of $\delta\iota\alpha$ [$\tau\eta\varsigma$] $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ from A and 2127 is precisely that, and not a good reading [Metzger, TCGNT, p. 508].)

We choose this reading although we recognise that the evidence is not convincing for either the inclusion or exclusion of $\tau\eta\varsigma$ as a survey of critical texts will indicate: including $\tau\eta\varsigma$; J. J. Wettstein, Novum Testament Graecum, vol. 2, (Amsterdam: ex Officina Dommeriana, 1752), p. 40; J. J. Griesbach, Novum Testament Graece, vol. 1, (Leipzig: Sumtibus G. J. Göschen, 1803); Hermann F. von Soden, Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt her gestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte; vol. 2, Teil, Text mit Apparat (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), p. 666; excluding $\tau\eta\varsigma$; S. P. Tregelles, The Greek New Testament, part 4, Romans to 2 Thessalonians (London: Macmillan and Co., 1857-1879), p. 681; Constantinus Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece, vol. 2, 8th ed., (Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872), p. 378; Brooke F. Westcott, and Fenton J. A. Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 356; and George D. Kilpatrick with Erwin Nestle, Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ, 2nd ed., (London: British and Foreign Bible Societies, 1958), p. 475.

²William S. Campbell, "Romans III As a Key to the Structure and Thought of the Letter", NovT 23 (1, 1981) 22-40 (p. 24).

³Käsemann titles his discussion of 3:21-26 in Romans "The Thesis", which indicates its significance in the argument (p. 91).

⁴There are 9 references to God in 3:21-26, 5 uses of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, and 4 pronouns. There are four uses of $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$, 2 uses of the verb $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\acute{\omega}$, and one use of $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$.

⁵ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (3:22), Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3:24), $\acute{\omicron}\nu$ (3:25), and Ἰησοῦ (3:26), all indicating the significance of Christ in relation to faith, deliverance (redemption, forgiveness), and the demonstration of God's righteousness. Christ is therefore central to this righteousness, but the focus is on the righteousness of God itself. $\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ (used

3 times) and πιστεύω (used once) are also significant, especially in contrast to the opening words of the pericope (Νῦν δὲ ὑπὸ νόμου). The prominence of δικαιοσύνη should be noted (3:22,23 and 24 implicitly).

The variant readings to Ἰησοῦ (3:26) in the 26th Nestle-Aland text (and all the texts noted in note 1) seem well explained by Metzger, TCGNT, p. 509. In 3:22, εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας is to be preferred to ἐπὶ πάντας, and preferred to εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας (despite Anders Nygren's argument for the latter based on some good textual witnesses, Commentary on Romans, translated by C. Rasmussen, (London: SCM Press, 1952), pp. 150-152. For support of the choice in this study, see Metzger's TCGNT, p. 508.

⁶Robin Scroggs, "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11", in Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity (Essays in Honor of William David Davies), edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976) 271-298 (p. 276).

⁷Ibid., p. 276.

⁸Ibid., p. 275, and pp. 275-281. Scroggs is thus suggesting a rhetorical pre-history to most of the material in 1-11.

⁹Ibid., pp. 281-289, "A Homily on the New Life in Christ". 1:16-4:25, and 9-11 in their present form and positioning aid in the affirmation of God's righteousness and justification of men through faith in Christ *even if* they existed in a separate form within a different context.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 276.

¹¹The content of 3:19-20, and the continuing emphasis on faith in 3:27-31, and the discussion of Abraham in 4 seems a very appropriate setting for the pericope. There is no difficulty in relation to the consistency of subject matter. On the rhetorical connections between these sections, see Stowers' The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans, pp. 155-174.

¹²This is not a major part of Scroggs study, so he cannot be faulted for not developing his work along the lines of our concern.

¹³The distinctives may have little to do with the rhetorical pre-history of the surrounding material. In fact, one can argue for the earlier history of 3:21-26, or part of it, which suggests that the relationship between 3:21-26 and its textual environment is not clear outside of their presence together as written.

¹⁴Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans", p. 168. Noting the rhetorical function of 1:16-17 as "transitus" may indicate further the significance of 3:21-26 as a focal point in Paul's argument (pp. 168-169).

¹⁵White, The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter, p. 85.

¹⁶Moulton and Milligan, VGNT, p. 657.

¹⁷This is a theme that Paul will expound later, leading into his discussion of life in the Spirit (7:1-8:17).

¹⁸4:25 leads into the next section with its formulaic statement of forgiveness and justification in relation to the death and resurrection of Christ. 5:1-11, viewed very simplistically, is a summary section and transitional at the same time (see next chapter). 5:12-21 is distinctive in its specific Adam-Christ typological argument, but ties into the broader argument thematically in terms of the reign of grace, righteousness in and through Christ, and the antithesis of sin to obedience.

¹⁹A recent study on this text and issue is C. T. Rhyne's Faith Establishes the Law, SBLDS 55 (Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1981).

²⁰The Law, as an issue, becomes the meeting place of continuity and discontinuity in the history of salvation. Studies that have recently been significant in assessing Paul's understanding of the Law are: E. P. Sanders, "On Fulfilling the Law in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism" in Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube, edited by E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, W. D. Davies, (Oxford: OUP, 1978), pp. 103-126; C. E. B. Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 845-870, the first part based on earlier work, "St. Paul and the Law", SJTh 17 (1964) 43-68; E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 1-167. Less well known, but helpful for our perspective, is the study of G. Eldon Ladd, "Paul and the Law", in Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson, edited by J. McDowell Richards, (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1968), 50-67.

²¹Here we have circumcision in mind (2:25-29), although Paul's argument suggests that the implications are much broader than the issue of circumcision. It is the definition of $\acute{\omicron}$... Ἰουδαίος that is at stake, and later the definition of Israel (9:6).

²²Amidst all the discussion of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ , Cranfield's argument, and especially his treatment of δικαιοσύνη in Rom 3:21-26 is most convincing (Romans vol. 1, pp. 91-102, vol. 2, pp. 202-203, 211-214). Cranfield's perspective is that " Θεοῦ is a genitive of origin and that δικαιοσύνη refers to man's righteous status which is the result of God's action of justifying" (Romans vol. 1, p. 97). This he holds for 3:21-22, while viewing $\text{τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ}$ (3:25-26) as referring to "God's own righteousness" especially because of "the reference to God's being righteous in the last part of v. 26" (Romans vol. 1, p. 202). If Paul sought to tie 3:21 into 3:20, the understanding of δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ that

Cranfield suggests is most plausible. In 3:20, the inability of the Law to justify man before God is stated, leading Paul to claim that the knowledge of sin is what is gained through the Law. 3:21-22 is in contrast to 3:20, stating that apart from the Law, a righteousness before God, or "the righteousness which is sent from God has been revealed" (BAG, p. 860), or has been made known. Verse 22 identifies the righteousness as by means of faith in Christ Jesus for all who believe. This righteousness is one that man in some sense appropriates or is included in, not by works of the Law, but by faith in Christ. In view of 3:20, and 2:5-16 (which has certain parallels to 3:21-24), this seems to be speaking about a justified state before God. We call this the present reception of an eschatological acquittal from God. The fact that this is God's action, and can be viewed as "power" or "God's saving activity, which is presented as a gift" does not necessarily change the emphasis in Rom 3:21-26 (Ernst Kasemann, "The Righteousness of God" in Paul" in New Testament Questions of Today translated by W. J. Montague [London: SCM Press, 1969] 168-182, (pp. 170, 172). It must be noted that it is in or by means of the gospel (which is the power of God for salvation) that the righteousness before or from God is revealed as being from faith to faith. The power of God that brings about salvation is what the gospel is and does, a gospel that declares that righteousness before God is a matter of faith, due to God's action in Christ. Whatever aspects of God's power are associated with the righteousness revealed in Christ (Kasemann), in 1:17 and 3:21-22 we want to stress the forensic nature of righteousness (Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, pp. 82-162; J. A. Ziesler, The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquiry SNTS 20 (Cambridge: CUP, 1972), on Romans, pp. 186-211).

The activity of justification (*δικαιούμενοι* - 3:24) is speaking of the *πάντες* of 3:23, and reveals that God has made justification a gift. In 3:25-26, there is a shift in emphasis, with "righteousness" referring to God's own righteousness, God being "in the right" (Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 158), because of his activity implied in 3:24 and explained in 3:25-26. The phrase *εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιῶντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ* (3:26c), taking *καὶ* as a regular copulative, states in brief the two aspects of righteousness that Paul has presented in 3:21-26b. God is righteous in what he has done, and he justifies man on the basis of faith in Jesus. Thus, God's eschatological acquittal on the basis of faith, which is the righteous status or situation that is revealed in the gospel, proves that God Himself is just. This is because of the way he brought this about in Christ (3:24-25a). This understanding of righteousness is supported by Rom 10:3; Phil 3:9; and 2 Cor 5:21 (here the meaning "those that are justified" in Christ).

θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην in Rom 3:5 is often mentioned when a subjective genitive is sought for in relation to God's righteousness, and this is indeed an example of this. This is a concern of Paul (as 3:25-26 shows), but we do not think this is the case in 3:21-22. Sanday and Headlam

note that in 3:22, the relationship of righteousness "to the human recipient is quite unmistakable" (Romans p. 25). They add later, "the righteousness of which the Apostle is speaking not only proceeds from God but it is the righteousness of God Himself" (Romans p. 26). In Romans the stress is on the fact that this righteousness is something that is actual to men through faith and not Law (note esp. 3:21-4:25, and 9:30-10:10:13 where 20 of 31 uses of *δικαιοσύνη* are found and 7 of 13 uses of *δικαιῶν*).

²³The only use of *πίστις* in 1:18-3:20 is in 3:3. Other uses in Romans are found in 1:5,8,12,17(3), 9:30,32, 10:6,8,17, 11:20, 12:3,6, 14:1,22,23, (16:26).

We recognise the possibility of the subjective genitive, speaking of Christ's own faith, but prefer the objective genitive (Arland Hultgren speaks of an objective genitive affected by Semitic influence, thus being a "Genitive of quality" ["The Pistis Christou Formulation in Paul" NovT 22, 3, July 1980, 248-263 (p. 263)]; Hultgren helpfully presents arguments for the subjective genitive [pp. 250-253] before his own position is presented [pp. 253-263]).

It seems to us that Paul is comparing *πίστις* and *νόμος* in Romans as aspects or potential means of justification (note 3:21-22, 27-31). Faith is central to Paul's concern, because it is central to his understanding of acceptance of eschatological acquittal and therefore righteous standing. Paul is arguing for what we might term, along with Anthony Thiselton, "the grammar of the concept" of righteousness or justification (The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein [Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980], p. 424). He is denying that there is any intrinsic relationship between doing works of the Law and justification, but affirming that faith is part of what justification means in the present (and therefore righteousness). Paul does not argue this as a philosophical theologian, but as a missionary theologian explaining and defending the gospel he preaches.

We interpret *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* in 3:22 as the object of faith, clarifying the necessary direction of faith for righteousness. (In contrast to 3:22, 10:4 teaches that Christ is the end of the Law as regards righteousness for all who believe. It is for those who believe, that Christ is the means of righteousness, not those who pursue righteousness on the basis of their own works of the Law (10:3). Thus, Paul's argument is that faith in Christ, rather than works of the Law is part of God's justification.) We view *διὰ πίστεως* in 3:25 as meaning "through faith", the faith of believers in Christ. Paul is bringing the principle of the need for faith into the centre of his discussion here. We translate *τὸ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ* as "the one because of faith in Jesus" (see BAG, p. 234 on *ἐκ*).

In response to the subjective genitive argument, Paul's exemplum argument in 4:1-25 does not seem to point to Abraham's faith as ultimately efficacious for his seed, but that the faith of Abraham must be shared or appropriated (4:12,16). 4:23-24 seems to indicate a comparison

of faith, and states the necessity of belief. Ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 is evidently the faith of the believer, not Christ or Abraham. We maintain the same type of understanding for Gal 2:16,26; 3:14,24,26, especially when one notes the hearing of faith (3:2) and the following argument (3:2-14).

²⁴Axiom of impartiality studied by Jouette M. Bassler, Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom SBLDS 59, (Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1982), pp. 121-156 for the significance of Romans 2:11. See also, "Divine Impartiality in Paul's Letter to the Romans", NovT, 26 (1, 1984), 43-58.

²⁵Although clearly an eschatological concept in Paul, Rom 2:7,10, 8:18; 1 Thess 2:12; Phil 3:19-21, one needs to keep in mind how Paul brings eschatological ideas into the present, as in 2 Cor 3:7-4:17, and Col 1:27. Also the present dimension can be seen in the sin of Rom 1:27, and the reference to the inheritance of Israel (Rom 9:4). For eschatological ideas associated see 4 Ezra 7:122, 2 Apoc. Bar. 51:1,3, 54:21; 3 Apoc. Bar. 4:16 (Greek), Isaiah 43:7.

²⁶Δικαιούμενοι probably refers back to πάντας, and can be treated as an indicative verb (BDF discusses this under anacoluthon, p. 245).

²⁷NT uses are Rom 3:24, 8:23; 1 Cor 1:30; Col 1:14; Eph 1:7,14, 4:30; Heb 9:15, 11:35, Luke 21:28. Uses of ἀπολύτρωσις that have a future or apocalyptic element are found in Rom 8:23, Eph 1:7,14 and Luke 21:28.

²⁸Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, p. 76, prefers the "Exodus pattern" as a "path to interpretation". For ἀπολύτρωσις see Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings, pp. 69, 71-76 below as GWHM; LSMJ, p. 208; BAG, p. 95; Geoffrey Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon (Oxford: OUP, 1961-1968), p. 201; Friedrich Buschel, "ἀπολύτρωσις", TDNT, 4, pp. 351-356; Colin Brown, "Redemption", NIDNTTh, 189-200 (pp. 199-200).

²⁹Lampe, A Patristic Greek Lexicon, p. 201 gives evidence from patristic sources for connection with baptism. Kasemann, Romans p. 96, notes the liturgical aspect. Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer 5th ed., (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978) views it as part of the "abendmahlsliturgie", p. 150; Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol 1, p. 189, notes traditional motif, and prefers the Exodus-deliverance concept to slave manumission.

³⁰Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 208.

³¹Ibid., p. 208.

³²Vincent Taylor, in "Great Texts Reconsidered" ExpTim 50 (April, 1939) 295-330 (p. 297), suggests "demonstration" or "proof". Barrett notes (Romans, p. 78) that ἐνδείξις has the same ambiguity in Greek as does

the English word "demonstrate". To us the stress seems to be on ideas of showing, revealing, displaying, more than proving in a formal sense; see also BAG, p. 262, LSMJ, p. 558.

³³A helpful discussion of the *διὰ*- clause, including the meaning of *παρῆς*, is presented by Sam K. Williams in Jesus' Death as a Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept HDR 2 (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975), pp. 19-34. Although we do not follow Williams' broader interpretation, his noting of the "negative" idea in the clause suggesting the need for God's action is one we agree with (note pp. 28-29). Much of his discussion is responding to the work of W. G. Kümmel, "*παρῆς* and *ἕνεκεν*. A Contribution to the Understanding of the Pauline Doctrine of Justification." (Translated by J. E. Crouch) Journal for Theology and the Church 3 (1967) 1-13.

The following stress or allow for a difference between *παρῆς* and *ἕνεκεν*: Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 90, Taylor, "Great Texts Reconsidered", p. 298, Nygren, Romans, pp. 159-160, Barrett, Romans, p. 79, Leenhardt, Romans, p. 107, Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 211, Schlier, Römerbrief, p. 113, Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, p. 197. Not stressing a difference between *παρῆς* and *ἕνεκεν*: Käsemann, Romans, p. 98, and Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 204.

³⁴Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 211; BAG, p. 77.

³⁵There is an element of defence in Paul's argument here. Leenhardt's (Romans, p. 107) comments concerning m. Yoma 8:8 are significant. He notes that the idea of sins not being dealt with until the appointed time was not unusual, and in fact it was demonstrated on the Day of Atonement. In this respect, the Day of Atonement signified that God must respond to sin, but there was a built-in dimension that pointed to His patience each year. Thus, the Day of Atonement pointed to God's mercy and His justice.

³⁶The phrase is similar to J. Christiaan Beker's phrase "proleptic realization" (p. 128) in Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980).

³⁷Note in the following verses: *εἰς αὐτοῦ . . . τοῦ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα .*

³⁸LSMJ, p. 1536.

³⁹BAG, p. 729, with the latter meaning of "plan, purpose, intend", note Rom 1:13 and Eph 1:9.

⁴⁰MM, p. 554; the reading of "offered" is tempting theologically in view of the sacrificial overtones. Although this is possible, this is not a preferred reading or translation, and has little support. In any case "to offer" need not be sacrificial. Barrett allows for this meaning (Romans, p. 77) when he suggests that the verb

may have the active meaning of offering sacrifice. This cultic context may have influenced Paul's choice of this word, but it still need not be sacrificial in the narrow sense.

⁴¹We usually speak of ἱλαστήριον rather than ἱλαστήριος since we are specifically interested in the word as it functions substantivally. We recognise, though, that ἱλαστήριον is a form of the adjective ἱλαστήριος. Helpful are the following lexical and dictionary listings: LSMJ, p. 823, BAG p. 376, MM p. 303, G. Adolf Deissmann, "The Mercy Seat" in EncBib, vol 3, col. 3027-3035, SB, vol. 3, 165-185, Friedrich Büschel, "ἱλαστήριον" in TDNT, vol. 3, pp. 320-323, Hans Georg Link, and Colin Brown, "ἱλάσσομαι" in NIDNTTh, vol. 3, 148-166. Outside of commentaries and works primarily interested in tradition history, the following need to be mentioned: G. A. Deissmann, "ἱλαστήριος and ἱλαστήριον", in Biblical Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity translated by Alexander Grieve, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), pp. 124-135, also "ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΣ und ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ: Eine lexikalische Studie", ZNW 4 (1903) 193-212; Rommuald Mollaun, St. Paul's Conception of ἱλαστήριον according to Romans 3:25: An Historic-Exegetical Investigation New Testament Studies 4 (Washington D. C.: CUAP, 1923); Hastings Rashdall, The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology (London: Macmillan and Co., 1925), pp. 130-132; Charles H. Dodd, "ἸΛΑΣΚΕΣΘΑΙ, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint", JTS, 32 (1931) 352-360; Manson, "ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ", 1-10; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology 4th ed., (Phila.: Fortress Press, 1980), first ed. (1948) is the same on ἱλαστήριον, pp. 232-242; Leon Morris, "The Use of ἱλασκεισθαι etc. in Biblical Greek", ExpTim 62, 8 (May 1951) 227-233, "The Meaning of ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ in Romans III:25", NTS 2 (1956), 33-43, and most recently Morris has restated his case in The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983), pp. 151-176, esp. pp. 166-170; Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955), pp. 150-152; Roger Nicole, "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation" WSJ 17 (1955) 117-157, and more recently "Hilaskesthai Revisited" EvQ 49, 3 (1977) 173-177; Hill, GWHM, pp. 23-48; T. C. G. Thornton, "Propitiation or Expiation? ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός in Romans and I John", ExpTim 80, 2 (1968) 53-55; Stanislav Lyonnet, Leopold Sabourin, Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study Analecta Biblica 48 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970), pp. 155-166, noted below as SRS; David Greenwood, "Jesus as Hilasterion in Romans 3:25", BThB, 3 (1973), 316-322; Paul L. Bremer, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Christ According to Romans 1-8" (Ph. D. Diss.: Princeton, 1974), 102-144; C. M. Robuck Jr., "What is the Meaning of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25?", Studia Biblica et Theologica 4 (1974), 21-36; Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event; Norman H. Young, "C. H. Dodd, 'Hilaskesthai' and his Critics", EvQ 48

(1976), 67-78; Kenneth Grayston, "'Hilaskesthai and Related Words in LXX" NTS 27 (1980-1981) 640-656; Martin, Reconciliation, pp. 85-89, 241-243; Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen, pp. 350-354, the whole work is on the Hebrew .

⁴²Deissmann, "The Mercy Seat", col. 3029.

⁴³Vincent Taylor suggests "as a means of atonement" as a definition of ἱλαστήριον, "Great Texts Reconsidered", p. 297, also in The Atonement in New Testament Teaching 2nd ed. (London: The Epworth Press, 1954), p. 91. This is obviously a general definition, but it is close to the sense of the word ἱλαστήριον for two reasons: 1) it connotes the broader aspects of sacrificial forgiveness and mediation, and 2) within an OT context it has a definite association with the locus of the atonement. Taylor strongly prefers ideas of expiation to those of propitiation with reference to C. H. Dodd, whereas we would want to see propitiation and expiation as included within Paul's concept of atonement. This is especially the case since ideas of God's wrath and eschatological judgment are close at hand (1:18-3:20, esp. 2:4-16, and 5:1-11, esp. 5:9-11, and note the implications of no condemnation 8:1-4). The idea is not a temporal one as such, with anger turning to pleasure, but God's righteous provision for forgiveness in the context of the revelation of His wrath. This implicitly calls for the condemnation of sin in the flesh (8:3-4). In the sense that Christ provided for the just condemnation of sin, and allowed for life in the Spirit which implicitly pleases God (8:8), Christ provided propitiation of wrath in judgment, and expiation of sin needing forgiveness.

⁴⁴Lyonnet, and Sabourin, SRS, pp. 157-159.

⁴⁵See Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 102-106 for careful study allowing for the place of sacrificial words and ideas, including ἵμα .

⁴⁶If the martyrological emphasis suggested by Rashdall (The Idea of the Atonement in Christian Theology, pp. 130-132), and developed by E. Lohse (Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, pp. 149-154), Hill (GWHM, esp. pp. 47-48), and Williams (Jesus' Death as a Saving Event) is correct, then there is really little explicitly cultic meaning to the pericope. One could still suggest, though, that martyrological concepts, within a Jewish sphere at least, were a development from ideas instilled by a history of cultic practice, or at least maintain parallel and overlapping concepts. If this is the case, then cultic ideas may still be appealed to as tertium comparationis.

⁴⁷Also see Hill, GWHM, p. 43; Link, and Brown, " ἱλάσασθαι ", pp. 164-166; and Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event.

⁴⁸This is clearly a majority perspective, especially in commentaries written on Romans.

⁴⁹Mollaun, St. Paul's Conception of ἱλαστήριον according to Rom III:25, pp. 88, 96-98. See also, Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, p. 155, referring to atoning monument inscriptions; Cos 81, 347.

⁵⁰More recently, The Atonement, pp. 166-170.

⁵¹Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, p. 161.

⁵²For Paul's use of the article with significant words, see GNTG, III, pp. 175-177.

⁵³Mollaun, St. Paul's Concept of ἱλαστήριον According to Rom. III:25, conclusion on this issue on p. 88, and stated in reference to Rom 3:25 on pp. 96-97; also the well known article of T. W. Manson, "ἸΛΑCΤΗΡΙΟΝ"; Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, pp. 155-166. Also maintaining the possibility of local significance to the word are Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol 1, pp. 190-194, and Nygren, Romans, pp. 156-158.

⁵⁴For summary, Mollaun, St. Paul's Concept of ἱλαστήριον According to Rom. III:25, pp. 25-42, and briefly E. H. Gifford, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, reprint from the "Speaker's Commentary", originally published in 1877 (Minneapolis, Minn.: The James Family, 1977), p. 97.

⁵⁵This phenomenon has led to the emphasis on such cultic language by Nygren, Romans, pp. 156-158; also Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 102-106, and Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, pp. 190-195, to mention a few that give cultic language particular prominence in their discussion.

⁵⁶Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, p. 163.

⁵⁷For Paul's use of the OT, E. Earle Ellis' Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957), pp. 150-151, where Ellis charts the OT quotations by Paul. Romans reveals particular prominence in terms of OT usage, and the LXX is often in agreement with Pauline quotations. More recently on the subject is Gerd Riese's work, "Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im Römerbrief: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Schrift Auslegung" (Diss., München, 1977). Note Catena in 3:10-18 just before this pericope, the reference to the Law and the Prophets (3:21), and the example of Abraham to follow with Gen 15:16 and Psalm 31:1-2 LXX playing a significant role in Paul's argument.

⁵⁸Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, p. 242.

⁵⁹If the image still seems difficult, besides keeping in mind the low degree of visualization called for in such a context, one ought to keep in mind the picture in Hebrews, where the role of the sacrifice (or at least sacrificial blood) and the High Priest are blended together (9:11-15). A point noted by P. Stuhlmacher in his lectures at Fuller Theological Seminary, (Pasadena, California) October 13, 1983 [tape 4].

⁶⁰Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, p. 164; and see OED, vol. 1, p. 377 on antonomasia.

⁶¹This was part of Paul's active hermeneutic with the OT; note Rom 15:4, 1 Cor 10:11.

⁶²Morris, "The Meaning of ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ in Rom III:25", pp. 40-41; Deissmann, Biblical Studies, p. 132.

⁶³Manson, "ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ", p. 5; also Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 237-242; and Martin, Reconciliation, p. 241.

⁶⁴George B. Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible (London: Duckworth, 1980), pp. 149-153.

⁶⁵Christine Brooke-Rose, A Grammar of Metaphor (London: Secker & Warburg, 1958), p. 24. We recognise that in this situation (Rom 3:25) there is an aspect of Brooke-Rose's second ("The Pointing Formulae: the proper term A is mentioned, then replaced by the metaphor B with some demonstrative expression pointing back to the proper term") and fourth noun metaphors. We stress the fourth noun metaphor ("The link with 'To Make'"), not so much for careful grammatical analysis as a simple attempt to view the way the word ἰλαστήριον functions in the context. The emphasis is on God's revelation, justification, and setting forth of Christ. Thus, the word seems best understood within this context of God's purposeful presenting (making) of Christ as ἰλαστήριον διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι.

⁶⁶Moises Silva speaks of an ellipsis as "a semantic change consisting in the use of a phrase for the whole phrase" (Biblical Words & their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics [Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, 1983], p. 192). Silva's discussion of ellipsis, metonymy, and metaphor is helpful, pp. 82-86. Within a context like Rom 3:21-26 which involves movement from one idea to another the likelihood of elliptical language is great, especially if traditional language is used.

⁶⁷Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible, p. 147.

⁶⁸Ibid., p. 147. ⁶⁹Ibid., p. 153.

⁷⁰Ibid., pp. 32-36.

⁷¹Robert W. Funk, Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God: The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology (New York: Harper and Row, 1966), pp. 138-139.

⁷²Argus McIntosh, "Pattern and Ranges", Language, 37, 3 (1961) 325-337, (p. 335).

⁷³Ibid., p. 336. This is not an innovation in the sense of ideas of atonement being transferred to death or martyrdom as we see in 4 Macc 17:22, 6:28-30, or even

Isaiah 53:4-12 (10); nor is it an innovation in relation to community righteousness or obedience and purity, note 1 QS 3:11 ff., and 9:3-6 (Hermann Lichtenberger, "Atonement and Sacrifice in the Qumran Community" in Approaches to Ancient Judaism, vol. 2, ed. by William S. Green, BUBJS 9 [Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1980] 159-171, and esp. pp. 161-164). We are thinking in terms of Paul's particular emphasis: the gospel of justification by faith.

⁷⁴Hengel, The Atonement, pp. 47-52, and "The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ", pp. 463-464; Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 206.

⁷⁵Hengel, "The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ", p. 463.

⁷⁶Ibid., p. 463.

⁷⁷Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 206.

⁷⁸Ibid., p. 206. ⁷⁹Ibid., p. 206.

⁸⁰1 Cor 3:16-17 and 2 Cor 6:16 speak of the community as temple, not in the light of its atoning role as such, but its call to purity because of God's presence through Christ (note the individual's body is spoken of as temple also because it is God's possession, 1 Cor 6:19-20). W. D. Davies noted the difficulties with the texts above (Gospel and Land, p. 193), although it does seem to us that Paul is thinking in terms of the Temple in Jerusalem in connection with ethical directives. These texts do not necessarily represent a replacement theme, but are a part of ethical exhortations that include cultic language as one would find in OT, inter-testamental Jewish literature, Philo, and at Qumran. What is distinctive is of course the fact that Christ's mediation has provided the situation that makes such language of God's presence and the need for purity appropriate for Christians. Identifying the church as the Temple is the same (in general) as identifying the church as the people of God. Thus, this language does have a labelling and identifying role.

⁸¹If the Temple were an issue, we can only hypothesize Paul's perspective. It may not have been far removed from his attitude towards circumcision: Rom 2:25-29, 3:30, 4:9-12; Gal 2:7-12, 5:6; 1 Cor 7:18-19; Phil 3:3-5; Col 2:11-13, 3:11; Eph 2:11.

⁸²Weiss, "Paulus - Priester", p. 362.

⁸³Note especially Cranfield, Romans vol. 1, pp. 200-201, note 1, and Schlier, Römerbrief, p. 107, note 8. An argument against the distinctiveness of the material and against the use of pre-Pauline tradition is given by John Piper, in "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God in Romans" JSNT, 7 (1980) 2-32, (pp. 4-10). He is dependent on Cranfield, Schlier, and Otto Kuss, Der Römerbrief, vol. 1, (Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet,

1957), pp. 160-161.

⁸⁴Bo Reicke's strong words concerning the matter of tradition and redaction in the study of Paul's letters indicate the potentially arbitrary conclusions at the end of the day without careful controls, in "Paul's Understanding of Righteousness" in Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson ed. by J. McDowell Richards, (Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1968), p. 41. He states, "all reconstructions based upon analysis of his sayings will necessarily be a priori statements and depend upon the scholar's individual taste". He also states, "neither can anybody know exactly how he [Paul] has changed the material". He is concerned over the trend in recent scholarship, "today the result is also endless disagreement about verses and half-verses, if not mere reproduction of what some renowned scholar has already written about their authenticity or non-authenticity". Such comments do point to the need for particular care in seeking to do redactional studies on the Pauline material, although his pessimism could be directed at other types of textual analysis as well.

⁸⁵Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 199.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 199.

⁸⁷Ibid., p. 199. Meyer presents Schlier's questions as follows: "first, to what genre does the alleged 'formula' or 'tradition' belong, and from what context did it derive? Second, why should Paul have lapsed in mid-sentence into the citation of a formula? Third, does the appearance of an idea which Paul otherwise expresses rarely or not at all (e. g. $\delta\acute{\iota}\mu\alpha$, $\xi\lambda\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, $\lambda\iota\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, etc.) necessarily indicate the adoption of a fixed tradition?"

⁸⁸Ibid., p. 199.

⁸⁹Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1, p. 46; Ernst Käsemann's treatment of this text first appeared in "Zum Verständnis von Röm. 3:24-26" in ZNW, 43, (1950-1951) 150-154. Similar to Kasemann is the position of A. M. Hunter, Paul and His Predecessors (London: SCM Press, 1961), pp. 120-122; John Reumann, "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God: Pauline Reinterpretation in Romans 3.21-31" Int 20 (1966) 432-452; and Martin, Reconciliation, pp. 81-89. Charles H. Talbert agrees in principle that non-Pauline material is in 3:24-26, but he views it, except for a few Pauline elements, as post-Pauline, "A Non-Pauline Fragment at Romans 3 24-26" JBL 85 (1966) 287-296.

⁹⁰Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, pp. 149-154, esp. 150; other supporters of Lohse's perspective are Meyer (in general), "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 204, Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event, esp. pp. 5-19, Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, pp. 183, 190, Michel, Der Brief an die Römer,

p. 147, Bernd Janowski, Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament WMZANT 55 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1982), pp. 350-354. For an overview of studies (especially German) see Herbert Koch, "Römer 3,21-31 in der Paulusinterpretation der letzten 150 Jahre" (Diss.: Göttingen, 1971), pp. 107-134.

⁹¹Käsemann, "Zum Verständnis von Römer 3 24-26" as main proponent.

⁹²Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, p. 150.

⁹³Especially Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event, pp. 12-19.

⁹⁴An exception to this is the thesis of Alfons Pluta, Gottes Bundestreue: Ein Schlüsselbegriff in Rom 3:25a (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969), p. 107, where he sees *διὰ πίστεως* as part of the original tradition focusing on God's covenantal faithfulness.

⁹⁵Within 25-26a it is common for *διὰ πίστεως* to be the only Pauline element, although Meyer also suggests *εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ*, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 204.

⁹⁶Käsemann, Romans, p. 100, note bibliography; Martin, Reconciliation, p. 86.

⁹⁷Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 206; also Ferdinand Hahn, "Taufe und Rechtfertigung. Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Theologie in ihrer Vor- und Nachgeschichte" in Rechtfertigung ed. Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pohlmann, Peter Stuhlmacher (Tübingen/Göttingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1976) 95-124 (pp. 112-115).

⁹⁸Lohse, Märtyrer und Gottesknecht, p. 152; Hill, GWHM, pp. 47-48, linking ideas associated with the feast of Dedication; and Williams, Jesus' Death as a Saving Event. Williams connection of Rom 3:25 to 4 Macc 17:22 is central to his broader thesis of the Hellenistic origins of the idea of Jesus' death as having saving significance.

⁹⁹Schlier, Römerbrief, p. 107, note 8; Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, pp. 200-201, note 1.

¹⁰⁰Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 204; "ὃν προέθετο ὁ θεὸς ἑλαστήριον ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ αἱματι διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν τῶν προγεγονότων ἁμαρτημάτων ἐν τῇ ἰσχυρῇ τοῦ θεοῦ".

¹⁰¹One internal piece of evidence for the connection of Hebrews with Rome, or at least Italy, is Heb 13:24.

¹⁰²Hengel, The Atonement, pp. 51-52, and "The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ", pp. 463-464; Meyer, "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", p. 206.

¹⁰³One thinks also of 1 Peter, and the possibility

that 1 Peter 2:4-10 reflects the same prominence of sacrificial and cultic language.

¹⁰⁴Meyer, in "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a", suggests the ἑλληνοισταί as the type of group associated with this sort of language and theology. This was the group "gathered around Stephen (Acts 6-8) and sharing with him - in sharp contrast to the Aramaic-speaking Jewish Christians originally gathered around the twelve - an uncompromisingly critical stance toward temple and Torah" (p. 206).

¹⁰⁵On αἷμα in the NT, see J. Behm, "αἷμα, αἱματεκχυσῖα", in TDNT, vol. 1, pp. 172-177, and F. Laubach, G. R. Beasley-Murray, and H. Bietenhard, "Blood, Sprinkled, Strangled", in NIDNTTh, vol. 1, pp. 220-226.

CHAPTER III

CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL:

II. ROMANS 5:9

A. Summary of Interpretation

Paul's use of ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ in 5:9 conveys a sacrificial understanding of Jesus' death, closely associated with justification within Paul's argument, and reminiscent of Paul's cultic thought in 3:25. In 3:25 the atoning or propitiatory role or function of Christ as set forth by God (by means of his blood) is stated to explain and defend Paul's argument about God's righteousness and justification, whereas in 5:9 the cultic thought is expressed as part of the concept of justification. Furthermore, within a context where justification is seen as parallel to reconciliation and logically leading to salvation, the cultic thought is not emphasized. At the same time, one can speak of the metaphorical meaning and cultic meaning of αἷμα in this context, as in 3:25, because sacrificial ideas are conveyed by the use of the word.

B. The Context

The significance of the phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ can only be presented in view of the change of context

from 3:21-26.¹ This will help to clarify the particular role cultic language may have in Paul's argument concerning the power of the gospel (1:16-11:36), and more specifically in this significant part of it (5:1-11).

1. Romans 5:1-11 Within Romans

Romans 5:1-11 is a transitional section within Paul's argument in 1:16-11:36. It follows on directly from 1:16-4:25, continuing a number of Paul's significant themes.² At the same time, 5:1 seems to bring the whole preceding argument to bear on the forthcoming declaration.³ It presents the results of the previous argument in a climactic way, using the framework of reconciliation. This new framework is present not only because Paul desires to express previous thought differently, but because chapters 5-8 are a development on the previous section, containing new emphases.⁴ The fact that Paul introduces the subject of future salvation (σωτησόμεθα 5:9,10), indicates that Paul has reached a new stage in the argument, even though it may have been implicit in the earlier section. This interest in salvation reaches its climax in 11:26-32. Paul introduces the body of his letter in such a way that he must demonstrate the adequacy of his gospel in terms of salvation (σωτηρία 1:16). The agenda has been set, and Paul has been moving towards his goal all along. The transition to this aspect of the argument is made with reconciliation language, which broadens the case already presented.

5:1-11 declares the situation of the believer, following justification through Christ. This allows for the believer's present boast in God. The mediating role

of Christ is emphasized, indeed the mediating role of the Lord (5:1,9), although the section maintains a theocentric perspective (5:1,2,5,8,10,11). The emphasis on Christ's Lordship actually begins in 4:24 with the raising of the Lord from the dead (note 1:3-4). The relative clause to follow, commonly thought of as traditional, cryptically expresses the justification associated with the death and resurrection of Jesus the Lord. The common denominator with the Abraham section is faith in the God who brings life out of death and its connection with God's justification or reckoning which results in righteousness (4:22-25). This for the gospel means faith in the God "who raised Jesus the Lord from the dead" (4:24), which speaks of the Christian's justification. This leads to 5:1 in which there is the declaration of what the Lord has gained for those who believe.⁵

2. Romans 5:1-11: The Context of 5:9

The significance of what we consider to be sacrificial language, ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, needs to be seen within Paul's emphasis on the situation of the believer, that results from justification (5:1,9). Through Christ there is peace with God (5:1), access to the realm of grace, and confident expectation and boasting on the basis of the hope of God's glory (5:2, compare 3:23). This boasting in God (5:2-3,11, compare 3:27, 4:2-4) is valid during present experience which indeed nurtures and supports this hope (5:3-5). This is a confident hope (5:5, note 1:16, 9:33, 10:11). The use of καυχώμαι (5:2,3,11) suggests that this is crucial to Paul's understanding of the result of justification. The believer

can boast in God in the present (5:3), because of the future (5:2), and because of what God has done and demonstrated through Christ in the past (5:6-10). The climax of 5:3-5,⁶ affirms the validity of the believer's boast, because of the love of God (subjective or genitive of origin) that is experienced by the believer by means of the Holy Spirit (5:5).⁷ Specific cultic language is not evident in 5:1-5, although *δικαίωθεύτε... ἐκ πίστεως* (5:1) probably points back to 3:21-26, especially if seen in parallel with *δικαίωθεύτε... ἐν τῇ αἱματι αὐτοῦ* (5:9).⁸

The boast in God declared in 5:1-5 is supported by 5:6-8, because of its affirmation of the love of God. The death of Christ demonstrates the love of God (5:8) in a similar fashion to how it demonstrates the righteousness of God in 3:21-26. Christ's death is the demonstration of God's love, that in some sense the Holy Spirit pours into the life of the believer. It is this love that becomes the certainty of the believer's hope. Paul's transition is clear. What has been expressed in terms of justification (God's purpose/result in Christ's death), becomes further confirmation of Paul's argument now in terms of God's love.

5:9-11, as a unit, concludes this section. The two uses of *ἔτι* (5:9,11) indicate that the implications of the death of Christ are valid in the present time (note 3:21-26). Justification in principle results in salvation from wrath.⁹ Salvation is a future concept here, with justification assuring it. The thought of 3:21-26 is being qualified in terms of salvation language. The change to reconciliation in 5:10 makes explicit what was

already implicit in the declarations of 5:1-8.¹⁰ ἔχθροί further explains in reconciliation language the status of being ἰσθηνός and ἰσβας (5:6), and especially ἁματωλός (5:8). The ἔχθρος now has peace with God (5:1), stands in the realm of grace, and has a confident future hope (5:2). 5:9-11 returns to the thought of these introductory verses, using an explicit reconciliation metaphor, and clarifying the hope in terms of salvation.

R. P. Martin rightly emphasizes ideas of reconciliation throughout the section.¹¹ He suggests that Paul adopts and adapts reconciliation to formulate "his gospel in communicating it to the Gentiles".¹² It is a move away from traditional justification language.¹³ In 3:24-26, Paul "expressed dissatisfaction with the forensic-cultic idiom that limited soteriology to covenant-renewal for the Jewish nation and sought to universalize the scope of Christ's saving deed to include the Gentiles on the basis of faith not covenantal nomism".¹⁴ Thus Martin suggests that Paul purposefully moves beyond the "Old Testament - Judaic tradition", and the "cultic-forensic", to that which "relates to a universal need namely forgiveness and personal relationship;..... both personal and cosmic".¹⁵

We question any dissatisfaction with justification ideas in Romans, and would suggest that cultic language was not put aside as such, but was used to strengthen Paul's argument concerning justification at specific points. One must allow for diversity of expression within Paul's thought and his argument. Paul's movement to the resulting situation of justification calls for language

that is relational, and Paul chooses at this point to emphasize this aspect of the gospel. Reconciliation includes the present experience of peace with God (5:1), the love of God (5:5), and the assurance of salvation (5:2,10), which Paul prophetically indicates is a cosmic reconciliation that still involves Israel.¹⁶ This has been made possible by the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ (4:24-25, 5:9-11).¹⁷ Thus, the believer has a confident boast in God, a boast given to those who are justified (5:1,9). There are two reasons why we suggest that Paul has not at this point shown dissatisfaction with previous language used to declare his gospel. First of all, he has been moving towards the subject of salvation since 1:16. The justification language has played a significant role in reaching this point, and continues to be foundational to what follows (5:1,9). The argument of 5:1-11 mingles ideas of justification and reconciliation in a way that does not evidence dissatisfaction, but rather creative building. Secondly, Paul returns to *δικαιο* - language in 5:16 and it remains significant especially from 5:16 to 8:10, though it is important through to 10:10. The significance of the cultic language within this section of the letter will prove to be closely tied to the language of justification.

C. ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΘΕΤΕΣ νῦν ἐν τῷ κίματι αὐτοῦ in 5:9

Our main concern is with the use of *κίμα* (see excursus 2 of the previous chapter). Most commentators suggest sacrificial connotations explicitly,¹⁸ or view it in connection with 3:24-26 without stating the sacrificial

connotation.¹⁹ L. Morris states that there is no "necessary implication of sacrifice", but that αἷμα is used strictly in parallel with θάνατος.²⁰ H. J. Schoeps suggests that aqedah ideas are present,²¹ and D. E. H. Whiteley sees αἷμα in the context of wrath pointing "back to the original passover".²²

The majority view seems to be correct, a view we support by stressing the connection of 3:21-26 to 5:1, 9. ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΘΕΝΤΗΣ is followed by ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1, and ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ in 5:9. This is reminiscent of διὰ πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι that identifies the nature of ἱλαστήριον, the role of Christ. This is Christ's role within a context that is concerned with righteousness; God's and the believer's righteousness. Paul has not forgotten the argument he has developed in 1:17-4:25, and especially 3:21-4:25. This is still foundational to Paul's thought in 5:1-11, as we have sought to suggest above. The participles ΔΙΚΑΙΟΥΘΕΝΤΗΣ (5:1, 9) point back to this foundation. This is made clear in the parallel constructions in 5:9-10, which reveal how Paul can move from justification language to reconciliation language. In this kal wachomer argumentation, Paul is emphasizing the certainty of salvation in view of justification accomplished and reconciliation experienced.

The casual and unusual argument in 5:6-8, including the use of Χριστός ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν makes it clear that the death of Christ is still the focus of Paul's thought as he leads into verse 9. The direct referent of ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ is the death of Christ as the parallel reading διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ in 5:10 affirms (as Morris

emphasizes). It is by means of, or at the cost of the blood of Christ that the believer has been justified. But, we suggest that the difference between 5:9 and 5:10 needs to be explained beyond the suggestion that they are different ways of referring to the death of Christ. The difference between 5:9 and 5:10 is more than rhetorical, unless one uses the word rhetorical in an extremely broad fashion. The fact that 5:9 and 3:25 are the only uses of αἷμα in relation to the death of Christ in Romans suggests that they be viewed together to see if the connection is important. This is suggested, also, since the only other use of αἷμα in relation to the death of Christ in the Pauline corpus, outside of references to the Lord's supper (I Cor 10:16, 11:25,27), are in Col 1:20; Eph 1:7 and 2:13. This is not a particularly common idiom for Paul. Paul could easily speak of the death of Christ or the cross of Christ without reference to the blood, as he has done in 4:24-25, 5:6-8,10. Therefore a particular emphasis because of αἷμα needs to be considered.

The phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, referring to the death of Christ, signifies the means of justification that has already received cultic description (3:25). The cultic metaphor again is not developed nor visualized in 5:9, but the sacrificial character of the death of Christ as it functioned within God's purpose of justification is what is being alluded to. The close association of the blood with the propitiatory, and indeed the necessity for sacrificial blood to be shed and presented for atonement, for the forgiveness of sins, surely provided the perspective from which to view the death of Christ within the purpose

of God.²³ The shift in eschatological perspective, the focusing on future salvation in 5:9, limits sacrificial ideas to the background (tertium comparationis). Salvation from wrath through Christ can be seen as parallel to the justifying activity of God in presenting Christ as ἱλαστήριον available and accomplished in the blood of Christ. The phrase ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς, which stands out in the text, identifies the need for future salvation, with ὀργή here retaining its future sense (contrast 1:18). This is ensured, because of present justification. Thus behind the assurance of salvation is the eschatological acquittal declared in the present through faith in Christ, whose death is the ground of justification. And as 3:25 has stated, this is accomplished because Christ functions as ἱλαστήριον in the God-man relationship,²⁴ by means of his blood. In 5:9, only αἷμα is drawn on in relation to previous cultic language. Αὐτός is located after αἷμα rather than before. Whatever the stylistic reasons may be for the change, this would seem to indicate that Paul has drawn on the sacrificial aspect of his cultic thought, and the rest is implicit now in justification itself. Thus, the cultic thought is not stressed, and any metaphorical tension that may have accounted for the more emphatic αὐτοῦ in 3:25 is not sensed any more.

The death-life axis in 5:10 (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου . . . , ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ), already seen in 4:25 (παρεδόθη, ἠγέρθη), is not as explicit in 5:9, but it is probably implicit (ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, δι' αὐτοῦ). The emphasis in 5:9 is on the accomplishment of the death of Christ and the assurance of salvation that is based upon it. The δι' αὐτοῦ

continues the idea of mediation that is present in ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ, and stated generally in 5:1 and 5:11. Ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ in 5:10 is difficult, but probably is used to emphasize the death-life pattern already referred to in 4:25. It is the fact of the resurrection life of Christ, joined with his death, that is the assurance of salvation (5:10), as it is the assurance of justification in 4:25.²⁵

It is tempting to view the use of ζωῇ, and the absence of ὄργη (5:10) as particularly appropriate because of the movement from justification to reconciliation. Also, in another context, Paul associates resurrection with reconciliation in an apocalyptic fashion (11:15), indicating almost a causal relationship between reconciliation and resurrection. The change of thought is not substantial from 5:9 to 5:10 though, since the death of Christ is fundamental to the accomplishing of reconciliation (5:10). Reconciliation is a present experience through Christ, and will lead to salvation because of the resurrection life of Christ. Although the sacrificial allusion of 5:9 is gone, one need not assume that θάνατος, when used of the death of Christ, removes any sacrificial connotations already established. The type of reconciliation accomplished had to do with the past enmity of believers, which included the status of being sinners (5:8). It is in a situation caused by sin that gives the death of Christ its particular significance (3:23-26, 5:6-8). Sacrificial ideas, associated with forgiveness, already established in 3:21-26, probably still remain in the use of reconciliation language. It is suggested here, though, that the idea of the life given in sacrifice is

not associated with ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ . This is a reference to the fact and implications of the resurrection life of Christ.

F. F. Bruce suggests that Paul expands on the significance of Christ's resurrection life in 6:8 ff.²⁶ F. J. Leenhardt views such ideas as already implicit in 5:1-11:

"what justification permits reconciliation foreshadows. As he participates in the life of the Risen Christ, the believer is assured of attaining the end which the love of God proposes to him, namely salvation".
(Footnote 27)

The resurrection of Christ is not just a fact, or an assurance of salvation, but something that affects the experience of the believer. It is even as the believer experiences the resurrection life of Christ in the present, as described in 5:1-11, that he has confidence in the salvation to come. The cryptic character of 5:9-11 makes it difficult to know how much extrapolating is legitimate. It does seem that Paul is moving beyond the fact of the resurrection life of Christ. As we have noted, reconciliation is associated broadly with resurrection (11:15), and aspects of the resurrection life are seen by Paul to begin in the present through faith in Christ.

The juxtaposition of justification and reconciliation to salvation stretches the logic of Paul's soteriology, and therefore reveals Paul's emphasis. Although salvation is a definite hope, and in that sense Paul can speak of it as already experienced (8:24), the experience of the believer is one of awaiting ultimate salvation. Within the context, the two phrases ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ (5:9), and ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ (5:10) are parallel in a particular sense. It is in or through the blood of Christ (5:9) that the

believer (5:1) is justified. The sacrificial death of Christ is the death of all men, but is to be recognised for what it means by the believer in the present (note 2 Cor 5:14). It is in the life of Christ, a life reckoned to the believer by faith based upon the reckoning of the death of Christ through faith, that salvation is assured. Event -death and resurrection of Christ- and appropriation of event by faith are implicit in both. Thus, now is the time for boasting in God. The believer stands in the grace of God. Justification and reconciliation are accomplished. Salvation is secured.

D. The Implications of the Use of
cultic language in 5:9

What Paul says in 5:9 is based especially upon 3:21-26. $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}$ signifies the role of Christ's death as a means of justification established by God. The death of Christ functions in the God-man relationship as a sacrifice. It establishes a basis for forgiveness, allowing for justification in a way commensurate with God's righteousness and will. A possible referent is the sacrificial blood of a sin-offering (note Rom 8:3), which can be associated with the mercy seat, and was so central to the Day of Atonement. More generally, though, Christ's blood signifies the means of forgiveness made available to the believer. $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}$ in connection with the death of Christ speaks of the function of that death within God's purpose of establishing a just means of justification.

General references to the death of Christ surround this use of $\hat{\alpha}\hat{\iota}\hat{\mu}\hat{\alpha}$ (5:6-8,10). The sacrificial aspect of

Christ's death is not being emphasized. It is probable that the focus on the love of God demonstrated in the death of Christ does not have the same connection with cultic ideas as does the demonstration of the righteousness of God in Romans. The sacrificial aspect of the death of Christ need not be absent completely from ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἠπέθανεν in 5:8, and from διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ in 5:10,²⁸ but previous argumentation is not being referred to directly. It is only presupposed as justification is presupposed behind ideas of reconciliation in Romans.

Thus, cultic ideas add significant content to the forensic perspective implicit in δικαιο - language in Romans, although it may not be as intrinsic to other frameworks within which the death of Christ may be viewed. E. P. Sanders has stated that "'righteousness by faith'... is not any one doctrine", but is "the heuristic category employed by Paul against the notion that obedience to the law is necessary".²⁹ It is a "negative" category, meaning that Paul does not give a precise "positive definition of what it means to be 'righteous' by faith".³⁰ For the purposes of our argument we would qualify Sanders' statement by saying that righteousness by faith is a heuristic category that has implications that suggest basic content. We suggest that 3:25 and 5:9 reveal that cultic ideas add content to this heuristic category within the argument of Romans. Paul is stating that one is justified by faith in Christ in the present (3:26), which means that one's sins are reckoned as forgiven by God through the event of the sacrificial death of Christ (3:23-25). This forgiveness

is what is meant by "redemption" in Christ Jesus (3:24). This is explained in cultic terms: God presented an atonement by means of sacrificial blood effective through faith, and thus by God's grace there is the forgiveness of sins.³¹ By the intermingling of concepts, the language of justification, which is used negatively in argumentation, does receive positive content, although not careful definition. This is what is alluded to in 5:9, which indicates the place that cultic ideas have in helping Paul argue for justification by faith, and simultaneously for his gospel as the power of God for salvation.³²

In 5:1-11, positive statements are made concerning the meaning of justification in terms of peace, grace, and the accomplishment of reconciliation (5:1-11). Paul moves away from justification language to explain the benefits of it. (If this is what R. P. Martin means by Paul's movement to reconciliation language in 5:1-11 [see above], and what E. P. Sanders means by justification by faith having no positive content, then we admit dependence on their insights, although we may not agree with their emphases). In 5:9, Paul only alludes back to his primary thesis concerning justification (1:17, 3:21-26). The sacrificial model is alluded to also, because it is particularly relevant to the declaring of the righteousness of God, which is intrinsic to the idea of justification.³³ This connection is shown particularly by way of contrast with the argument of 5:1-11, which Paul develops along reconciliation lines.

Lastly, if one can judge from this evidence, it would seem that the explicit sacrificial description of

the mediation of Christ seems to focus on his death, regardless of other cultic connotations of his broader mediation and Lordship. This may prove to be important in evaluating Paul's theological use of sacrificial language after we have considered other texts.

Footnotes

¹The theological significance of 5:1-11 within Romans is substantial. Because cultic language plays a minor role in 5:1-11, and does not add a lot of new information beyond what has been noted in relation to 3:25, this material will be treated briefly. Being such a significant section, though, it does demand attention.

²See R. P. Martin for a careful study of 5:1-11, Reconciliation, pp. 127-154, esp. pp. 136-140. Also see, Warren W. Crump's thorough study, "The Structure and Soteriology of Romans in Light of the Function of 5:1-11 in the Argument of the Epistle", (Diss: Princeton Theological Seminary, 1979).

³Even 3:27-4:25 can be viewed as continuous with 3:21-26, and leading into 5:1. 3:27-4:25 can be viewed as "dialogical exchange and exemplum", picking up parts of the thesis already developed and supporting it through this diatribal-type argumentation. Thus, the whole section from 1:17-4:25 is unified, and leads into 5:1-11. (See S. K. Stowers, The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans, pp. 155-174; quotation above, p. 155.

⁴Nils Dahl has demonstrated connections between 5:1-11 and 8:1-39, indicating that 5:1-11 is connected to this section of the letter; "Two notes on Romans 5", pp. 37-42, whereas pp. 43-48 deal with 5:12-21; also in Studies in Paul, pp. 88-90.

⁵Thus, the Lord's people participate in their Lord's life and the rule of grace. N. T. Wright's dissertation, "The Messiah and His People: A Study in Pauline Theology with Particular Reference to the Argument of the Epistle to the Romans" (D. Phil, Oxford, 1980), sees the whole section, chapters 5-8, as illustrating how the people of the Messiah obtain the blessing and promises due to Israel by virtue of the Messiah. Regardless of the place of Israel in Paul's thought at this point, the idea of participation in the Lord's death/resurrection and rule seems to be in Paul's mind. See pp. 133-168.

⁶C. E. B. Cranfield speaks of language here that is "reminiscent of the OT", in Romans, vol. 1, p. 262. Note LXX, Psalms 21:6, 24:3, 20, 118:116; Isaiah 28:16.

⁷Gal. 4:4-7 indicates that the experience of the Spirit is the sign of sonship, made available by God's sending of his son to redeem (note Rom 8:3-4). In Rom 5:5, and 6-8 the realization of God's love via the Spirit is, in a sense, an indication of sonship, because of its confirmation of God's future salvation.

⁸The locative ideas in 5:2, speaking of the position of the believer in the 'realm' of grace, may suggest ideas of access into the presence of God Himself. If that is the case, then Paul's language concerning grace and the hope of God's glory may indicate how closely eschatological ideas and cultic ones can be.

⁹This is shown by the principle of the greater to the lesser, kal wachomer. Thus, salvation follows justification in principle, because of the logic of the greater to the lesser.

¹⁰5:10 has the only uses of καταλλάσσω in Romans. καταλλαγή appears in 5:11, and 11:15.

¹¹Martin, Reconciliation, pp. 135-154.

¹²Ibid., p. 153

¹³Ibid., pp. 80-89. Here Paul is adapting traditional justification language, according to Martin.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 153. ¹⁵Ibid., p. 153

¹⁶καταλλαγή in 11:15 indicates the breadth of the term, and its association with final resurrection. Thus, salvation is not far from the eschatological significance of reconciliation.

¹⁷The significance of the death and resurrection of Jesus cannot be overstated in respect to Romans. In this respect, Rom 4:25 must be seen as particularly significant, since there is the meeting of formulaic expression, and justification language.

¹⁸Studies that refer to the sacrificial connotations of in 5:9 include: O. Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, pp. 224-226; H. Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 119; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, pp. 232ff.; R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1, p. 295; J. D. G. Dunn, 'Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus', in Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday, p. 133; H. N. Ridderbos, 'The earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul' in Reconciliation and Hope, article translated by J. W. Deenick, pp. 79-80, R. J. Daly, Christian Sacrifice, Daly places 3:25 and 5:9 together on p. 119 and p. 433, and deals with the section on p. 237); M. Hengel, The Atonement, pp. 45ff.; R. P. Martin, Reconciliation, pp. 136-137; commentators who state sacrificial connotations include Otto Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 183; Barrett, Romans, p. 107; Leenhardt, Romans, p. 137; F. F. Bruce, Romans, p.124; Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 1, p. 297; also, by referring to Hebrews 9:22 sacrificial connotations are suggested by Sanday and Headlam, Romans, pp. 128-129.

¹⁹The following may also suggest sacrificial connotations, but they do not state it as such explicitly; J. Murray notes the forensic connections between 3:25 and 5:9, Romans, vol. 1, pp. 169-171; C. E. B. Cranfield ties 5:9 directly into the significance of 3:24-26, which he has interpreted sacrificially, Romans, vol. 1, 1975), p. 266; H. Schlier focuses on the reference to the cross implied by in Römerbrief, p. 155; E. Käsemann

notes the similarity of "the liturgical metaphor of the blood of Jesus" in 5:9 and 3:25, Romans, p. 138.

²⁰The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross, (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Press, 1955), pp. 118-119.

²¹Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, translated by Harold Knight (London: Lutterworth Press, 1961), translated p. 147. It does not seem necessary to appeal to agedah ideas here. We agree, in general, with the caution expressed by P. R. Davies and B. D. Chilton concerning the tradition history of agedah ideas ("The Aqedah: A Revised Tradition History" CBQ 40 (1978) 514-546).

²²The Theology of St. Paul, (Oxford; Blackwell, 1964), p. 141. There could certainly be some connotations of the Passover, but the general OT notion of the need for and the function of sacrificial blood is what seems to be joined to the event of the death of Christ (Lev 17:11, Heb 9:22).

²³R. J. Daly emphasises the connection of the blood rite with atonement in the O. T.; see Christian Sacrifice, pp. 87-136. "The cultic use of blood and the rites of atonement were closely associated with one another, especially in the latter stages of the OT" (p. 134).

²⁴Sykes, in "Sacrifice in NT and Christian Theology", p. 73, notes the sin-wrath-judgment context of justification in both 3:25, and 5:9. In 5:9, though, the wrath is future judgment so the idea is that "those who would otherwise expect to be condemned will not be condemned" (p. 73). From the point of view of justification this took place in Christ in the past and is entered into by faith (entrance into the realm or state of grace). From the perspective of the experience of grace, this still involves the future salvation from the wrath to come.

²⁵The significance of the death and resurrection can be seen in the way death and life become central to Paul's discussion in 5:9-8:39, especially in countering anti-nomian type arguments.

²⁶Bruce, Romans, pp. 124-125.

²⁷Leenhardt, Romans, p. 138.

²⁸Martin allows for the significance of sacrificial-cultic ideas in the rationale behind reconciliation, even if it is not central to Paul's proclamation of his gospel (Reconciliation, p. 150-154). This seems plausible, since there are no fine lines drawn between justification and reconciliation. The content given to the idea of justification is carried over into the accomplishment and experience of reconciliation.

²⁹E. P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion, (London; SCM Press, 1977), p. 492.

³⁰Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 472.

³¹Further rationale for this is not given. The sacrificial model, as it were, explains the death of Christ within the righteous purpose of God. There is no explanation of why blood, or sacrificial death should affect the forgiveness of sins, beyond the assumption that God willed it so. The emphasis is that God's righteousness is maintained and declared by the fact that the sacrificial model is appropriate and applicable.

³²The theocentric nature of the cultic explanation of justification is emphasized, since Paul uses other types of illustrations in other contexts. 5:12-21 is an example of this. Here is illustrated how Christ's obedience (i. e. death) gains for the believer the situation and experience of the rule of grace. The Adam typology illustrates how grace overcame sin. In this context God's purpose or character is not being discussed or defended. *θεός* is only referred to once (5:15), and the illustration is not theocentric in its implications.

³³The interpretation above suggests that Paul is using language carefully and deliberately. It supports our suggestion that Paul's usage at 3:25 could be affected by the knowledge of the gospel already present at Rome. By using cultic language, language that is becoming traditional gospel language, the legitimacy of the gospel is affirmed. The cultic language affirms the justice involved in God's eschatological acquittal of believers through faith in Christ.

CHAPTER IV

CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL:

III. ROMANS 8:3

A. Summary of Interpretation

8:1-4 contains a soteriological declaration, as is the case with 3:21-26 and 5:1-11, and one that maintains justification and judgment language. If cultic language can be discerned here, then we can suggest an interesting similarity in the appearance of such words and ideas within this section of the letter (1:[16]18-11:36). We will argue that cultic language may be present in 8:3, and that there may be cultic ideas relevant to the meaning of 8:3-4.

In contrast to the Law's inability, the Law not being able to justify the sinner nor to bring life, God's sending of Christ has resulted in no condemnation and life (life in the Spirit, and the promise of future life) for those in Christ Jesus. The way God has accomplished this is through Christ, condemning sin in the flesh, and thus God has enabled the requirement of the Law to be fulfilled in those that walk according to the Spirit. Death (8:10) and condemnation (8:1), in a sense, have taken place already for those that are in Christ, which means that life in the Spirit is an eschatological reality even

within present bodily existence. The Spirit is to lead one in eschatological or justified existence in the body, an existence in which one can please God. The Spirit is also the guarantee of life after the death of the body.

This eschatological provision of God is partially described with possible reference or allusion to God's provision of the sin-offering in the cultus (8:3). Thus, we take *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* to be an allusion to the sin-offering, indicating that Paul draws on cultic ideas to make his point and defend his gospel in this theocentric pericope. The sin-offering in general dealt with sin, enabling the offerer to live within God's covenantal grace rather than under the threat of condemnation. Such general cultic thought provided a background for Paul's soteriological statement within this apologetic for the ethical coherence of his gospel (esp. 6:1-8:17). Thus, a pragmatic comparison is implicit in the use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, illustrating God's condemning of sin through Christ by referring to the role of the sin-offering. Primarily, the metaphorical comparison is a general one. Thus, the cultic language should not be pressed too far or its role in illuminating the eschatological action of God in Christ is clouded. At the same time, it is reasonable to suggest that other ideas within the section have been coloured by cultic thought as well, and may in fact give insight into the meaning of this difficult text (8:3-4).

B. The Context

We have already noted the fact that Romans 8 is foreshadowed by 5:1-11. Since 5:1-11, Paul has illustrated

the surpassing quality of the sovereignty of grace through Christ in relation to the situation of man because of Adam's transgression (5:12-21). The declarative style common to 5:1-11 and 5:12-21¹ changes to an argumentative-questioning style in 6:1-7:25.² Here Paul defends the gospel against charges by defending its ethical implications, the implications of the sovereignty of grace through Christ. 8:1-30 returns to the declarative style (but note 8:24). Themes from 5:1-11 are reaffirmed, but there is a continuation of the emphasis on sin, death, flesh, and Law (and converse ideas) that has developed in 5:12-7:25.³ Chapter 8 itself ends with a triumphant series of rhetorical questions in 8:31-35 and the affirmation of the love of God. This is a love that cannot fail in the midst of the period of hope that is the situation of God's people (8:18-39, 5:2-8). Those that hope are part of God's definite salvation (8:24), a plan that culminates in glorification (8:28-30, 5:2, 3:23).⁴

8:1-4 declares the fact that there is no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus (8:1). This seems to be the foundation for the following discussion, which proceeds to discuss life in the Spirit and the Christian hope.

C. Περὶ Ἄμαρτίας

1. Paul's Use of Περὶ Ἄμαρτίας.⁵

This is the only assured use of the phrase Περὶ Ἄμαρτίας in the Pauline corpus. The only other possible use of Περὶ with Ἄμαρτία is found in certain texts of Gal 1:4⁶, although the preferred reading seems to be ὑπέρ.⁷ Even so, the preposition is followed by τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν.

which needs to be viewed differently from the singular ἁμαρτία. The Gal 1:4 reference is reminiscent of the traditional statement concerning the death of Christ in 1 Cor 15:3 *Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφάς*. Although there is some conceptual similarity between 1 Cor 15:3 and Rom 8:3-4, in Rom 8:3-4 Paul seems to be creative, and may be adapting traditional language for his argument at this transitional point in the section (8:1-4),⁸ rather than passing on a known tradition.

A text that needs to be mentioned in relation to Rom 8:3-4 is 2 Cor 5:21 (*τὸν μὴ γνόντα ἁμαρτίαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς γυνώμεθα δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ*). The contrast and interchange between ἁμαρτία and δικαιοσύνη sets the structure for this text which may have an allusion to the ΠΧΦΠ sacrifice in it.⁹ At the same time the flow of thought is similar to that in Rom 8:3. Both texts have a theocentric perspective, which may be significant for the choice of words made. Within this perspective Paul affirms the appropriate state of Christ - the wording suggesting his sinlessness. Then Christ's role is described in relation to sin (note the singular of ἁμαρτία, and the lack of the article). Lastly, the resulting effect of the role of Christ is presented with the use of δικαιο - (forensic) language. Against the background of this progression of thought in both texts, one must consider a basic conceptual connection between *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* and *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν*. The similarity between these texts suggests to us that Paul's unique use of the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* may have similar meaning to its parallel in 2 Cor 5:21.¹⁰ One needs to consider,

therefore, a possible reference to the ΠΧΘΠ sacrifice in the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, just as there may be a similar allusion in 2 Cor 5:21. (It may be that cultic thought, expressed in texts like Rom 8:3-4 and 2 Cor 5:21, could be implicit in the phrase ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, or ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν as well, but this cannot be our concern here.)

2. LXX Occurrences of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*

In the LXX *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* without any other descriptive words usually refers to sin-offering or, in other words, sacrifice for sin. *Περὶ ἁμαρτίας* or *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* with various uses of the article and/or *εἰς* is the regular translation of ΠΧΘΠ, ΠΧΘΠζ, or ΠΚΘΠζ. Two notable exceptions are 4 Kings 12:16 LXX and Isa 53:10 LXX, where *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is the translation of ΠΨχ (see note 9). Even in these texts, though, the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* still seems to be cultic, although we recognise the difficulty of Isa 53:10. Usually in the LXX *περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας* occurs: 1) with the article before the phrase - with or without the article before ἁμαρτία¹¹ (Lev 5:8, 6:23 πάντα τὰ, 7:7, 9:7 σου, 9:22, 10:17, 10:19² one with αὐτῶν, 14:13², 14:19; Num 6:16 αὐτοῦ, 29:11 τῆς ἐξελάσεως; 2 Chr 29:25; 2 Macc 2:11), 2) with the animal, object or blood involved in the sacrifice - with or without the article before ἁμαρτία (Lev 4:3 αὐτοῦ, 4:14, 5:6, 5:11, 8:2, 8:14, 9:2, 9:8, 9:10, 9:15 τοῦ λαοῦ, 10:16, 12:6, 16:3, 16:6, 16:9, 16:11 τὸν αὐτοῦ, 16:15, τὸν περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ 16:27², Num 7:87, 8:8, 15:27, 4 Kgs 12:17, 2 Chr 29:21, 29:23, 2 Esdr 6:17, 8:35, Bar 1:10), 3) or with some form of *εἰς* (Lev 5:7 αὐτοῦ, 9:3, 12:8, 14:22, 14:31 τὴν μίαν, 15:15, 15:30 τὴν μίαν, 23:19; Num 6:11, 7:16, 7:22, 7:28,

7:40, 7:46, 7:52, 7:58, 7:64, 7:70, 7:76, 7:82, 8:12
 ἕνα , 15:24, 28:15, 28:22, 28:30, 29:5, 29:11, 29:16,
 29:19, 29:22, 29:25, 29:28, 29:31, 29:34, 29:38; Job 1:5
 περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν - all of these are without the
 article before ἁμαρτία). Often uses of περὶ (τῆς)
 ἁμαρτίας are within lists of sacrifices, or formulaic
 phrases (Lev 7:7 note 6:10, 7:37, 9:7, 9:22, 10:19, 12:8,
 14:13², 14:22, 14:31, 15:15, 15:30; Num 6:11, 6:16, 7:16,
 7:22, 7:28, 7:40, 7:46, 7:52, 7:58, 7:64, 7:70, 7:76,
 7:82, 15:24, 28:15, 28:22, 28:30, 29:5, 29:11, 29:16,
 29:19, 29:22, 29:25, 29:28, 29:31, 29:34, 29:38; 2 Chr
 29:24; Ps 39:7).¹²

The evidence suggests that περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας
 identified more than the purpose of a particular sacri-
 fice; it became, and was at times, the designation of a
 particular sacrifice. A few references indicate this
 clearly (Lev 5:6, 5:11, 7:37, 9:2, 16:19; Num 15:25 an
 unusual text; Ps 39:7; Job 1:5, Bar 1:10).¹³ As with the
 word ΠΧΘΠ, ἁμαρτία itself can and does refer to the
 sacrifice for sin, and not just sin (Lev 4:8, 4:21, 4:24,
 4:25, 4:32², 6:10, 6:18, and note 2 Cor 5:21). Thus it is
 not just the phrase περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας that can refer to
 the sacrifice, but ἁμαρτία itself, thus signifying the
 association of the purpose of the sacrifice with the
 sacrifice itself in such a way that it becomes a technical
 term for the sacrifice. Specific pronouns are used or
 other qualifying words to indicate that the word
 is used generally and with the word περὶ (Exod 32:30;
 Lev 4:3, 4:35, 5:6, 5:10, 5:13, 19:22; Deut 9:18 pl.
 περὶ πασῶν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν ; 3 Kgs 15:30 pl., 16:13 pl.

πρωῶν + ; Tob 3:5 pl. + μου ; Sir 28:4 pl. δέεται , 39:5 pl. αὐτοῦ ; Lam 3:39 + αὐτοῦ ; Dan LXX 4:24, 4:31 pl. + σου [Daniel references as in HR]). Although there are a number of ambiguous cases, it does seem that if sin or sins are referred to, the context will point in this direction. If *περὶ* + *ἁμαρτία* is used in these contexts, it will be qualified accordingly. Thus, we indicate here a clear pattern of usage within the LXX, and especially Leviticus and Numbers. We agree, therefore, with the statement of N.T. Wright, " *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* should usually be translated either "sin-offering" or "as a sin-offering".¹⁴

3. Philo's Use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*

The usage illustrated by the LXX is continued by Philo.¹⁵ Especially significant are two uses of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. In Spec. Leg. i. 190 [Loeb 7, pp. 208-209] Philo identifies a sacrifice by calling it *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (ὅς καλεῖται μὲν περὶ ἁμαρτίας). A similar use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is found in Spec. Leg. i. 226 [Loeb 7, pp. 230-231] (ἢ καλεῖται περὶ ἁμαρτίας). Of the references cited by Mayer, there are no uses of *περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας* that are not a reference to the sin-offering¹⁶, except for the phrase *περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἧς ἥμαρτε*, an actual quote in Mut. 233 [Loeb 5, pp. 262-263], which still is describing the purpose of an offering. Thus, Philo witnesses to the technical use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, and the use of such language in relation to offerings for sin.

4. The NT Evidence Outside of Paul's Writings

The New Testament evidence is limited, but presents us with a number of significant texts. Although there is

more diversity than in the LXX or Philo, the evidence continues to show that it is most likely that Paul's use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* retains some type of cultic reference or allusion.

a) Hebrews

The starting place in discussing the evidence in Hebrews is to note the two quotations of Ps 39:7 LXX, which include the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (10:6,8).¹⁷ Following these quotations and a second reference to Jeremiah's new covenant (10:16-17, 8:8-12; Jer 31:33-34, note LXX which differs 38:33) the writer states *ὅπου δὲ ἄφεσις τούτων, οὐκέτι προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας* (10:18).¹⁸ Probably under the influence of the text quoted (in 10:6,8) the writer speaks of the lack of the need for a sin-offering, because of the forgiveness that Christ has accomplished. Christ's one sacrifice for sins is contrasted with the continuous and multiple sacrifices of the priests, which testify to the inability of such sacrifices truly to deal with sins (*ἀίτινες οὐδέποτε δύναται περιελθεῖν ἁμαρτίας* 10:11, and note 10:12). Christ's sacrifice is seen as a sacrifice bringing about the forgiveness of sins that indeed makes a sin-offering unnecessary and obsolete. As is stated later, if Christ is rejected no *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ... θυσία* is left (10:26). The argument is not just a temporal one, but consists in the fact that the priesthood of Christ and his sacrifice indicate that the cultus reminded Israel of sins, sins that it was not ultimately capable of dealing with (*ἀδύνατον γὰρ αἷμα ταύρων καὶ τράχων ἀραιεῖν ἁμαρτίας* 10:4 - a statement that needs to be compared to Rom 8:3a

and the inability of the Law). The distinctive of Christ's sacrifice is further explicated in a way that relegates sacrifices to a place of significance only merited by the fact of the Law's requirement (*Θυσίαν οὐκ ἠθέλησας* 10:5-10). Christ's covenant enacting priestly and sacrificial activity provides a way of forgiveness that sets aside the previous one, and therefore intrinsically testifies to its shortcomings.¹⁹

The writer does not consistently use the technical sacrificial language, although it is used at times. And although he doesn't consistently exploit the sacrificial rationale behind Christ's death, sacrificial thought permeates such discussion.²⁰

b) 1 Peter

1 Peter 3:18 is difficult to use as evidence in view of the uncertainty of the textual tradition.²¹ Assuming the N-A 26 text the *περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἕπαθεν* reading may be sacrificial, possibly by way of connections with the idea of the suffering of the righteous one. Servant themes are prominent in 1 Peter 2:21-25, which may suggest the source or framework for understanding ideas of sacrificial suffering. The use of ἕπαθεν may indicate some type of contrast with the continuing cult (3:18), although it clearly speaks of the finality of the suffering of Christ for sins. But there is no textual evidence for the use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* despite other similarities.

c) The Johannine Material

The Johannine material provides a number of texts that need attention. There are three uses of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* which are connected to the verb ἔλεγχω (8:46, 16:8,9).²²

These are general references to sin, but this construction seems peculiar to this verb. 15:22 speaks of guilt for sin, stating that because of the Son's presence the world has no excuse for their sin (ἁμαρτιᾶν οὐκ εἴχουσιν νῦν δεῖ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν). The pronoun αὐτῶν must be noticed here, since sin itself is obviously the referent here, and not sin-offering.

In 1 John 2:2 Jesus Christ the righteous one is described as " αὐτός ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δεῖ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου ". In 1 John 4:10 a similar reference occurs: love is expressed in the fact that " αὐτός ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ ἀπέστειλαν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἱλασθῆναι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ". In both texts the sins of the people are referred to in the plural,²³ " περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ", a phrase clarifying the role of ἱλασμός. The idea of God sending the Son that is connected to 1 John 4:10 makes this text a particularly significant parallel to Rom 8:3. In both texts there is the connection of God's sending of the Son, and the purpose/result of the Son's mission, which involves dealing with sin.²⁴ Ἰλασμός is a cultic term that at least refers to the atoning²⁵ role of Christ, and could be a specific reference to sin-offering.²⁶ The whole phrase ἱλασθῆναι περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ... could be translated "means of expiation/propitiation for our sins" or "as a sin-offering to deal with our sins". Paul's use of περὶ ἁμαρτίας seems to have the same type of emphasis, and if ἱλασμός is an allusion to the sin-offering, the parallel may be conceptually similar indeed.

The main point in our comparison must be, though, that the plural of ἁμαρτία, and the use of the pronoun (1 John 2:2, 4:10) indicate the dictional difference between these texts and Rom 8:3. This is the case, although we suggest the conceptual similarity of the texts, and especially 1 John 4:10 to Rom 8:3. This is a basic similarity that is aided by the sending language,²⁷ and the identifying of Christ as God's Son.²⁸

5. Preliminary Conclusion

The evidence suggests that the possibility of Paul's use of περὶ ἁμαρτίας retaining some of its common "sin-offering" or (sacrifice) for sin meaning needs to be considered. LXX and Philonic usage is clear. The NT evidence, although presenting some diversity, does not reveal any clear alternatives that could be called parallel to the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3. Two directions of interpretation may be suggested by using 1 John 4:10 as an example. Either Paul is using περὶ ἁμαρτίας in the sense of περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (a phrase that may have sacrificial meaning anyway), and he uses περὶ, the singular and no pronoun because of the context (something he does not do elsewhere), or περὶ ἁμαρτίας is similar to ἑλεσθὲν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν and retains specific cultic connotation. The above evidence allows for the latter, although the context must now be considered.

D. Περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3

It is the lack of clear evidence from the context that has challenged the relevance of the conclusion

above. O. Schmitz was so convinced concerning the lack of any cultic significance to *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* that he did not use it in his assessment of Paul's use of cultic language.²⁹ Schmitz's reasoning is two-fold: 1) the meaning of the two uses of *ἁμαρτία* before and after, when combined with *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* make a reference to the sin-offering impossible (ausgeschlossen), 2) the connection with atonement is impossible anyway since the context is only concerned with the cancellation of the power of sin.³⁰ Schmitz does not consider the possibility of metaphorical language here, not allowing for Pauline adaptation. H. Wenschkewitz considers the possibility of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* meaning "sin-offering" in view of LXX usage, but his conclusion is similar to that of Schmitz.³¹ He translates *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* with the general meaning "'um der Sunde'".³² A number of significant commentators have followed in this general disregard for sacrificial language in Rom 8:3.³³ Thus, we will need to consider carefully the context of 8:3 to see if a use of cultic language is unlikely or impossible. It is important to state first of all, though, that a number of writers have concluded that *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in Rom 8:3 is a reference to the sin-offering and/or has cultic connotations,³⁴ or they at least appeal to the LXX background in a limited way.³⁵ Indeed, there seems to be no consensus against or for this position, although few have sought to defend it in any detail.³⁶

Two comments that need to be made by way of introduction here. First of all, if one allows for the possibility that Paul may use cultic language in an adapted and

modified way to fit his argument, then it is not just other cultic language that we must discover in context. Although, it is an admittedly subjective viewpoint, we must consider the type of argument Paul is pursuing and evaluate whether or not he has used cultic language or cultic concepts within it. As we have noted, Paul is quite capable of using cultic language without other significant cultic terms in the context (1:9, 3:25, 5:9, and we will note 11:16, 12:1, 15:16). Secondly, we are not considering the phrase without regard for Paul's use of the preposition itself. In fact, a study of Pauline usage suggests that this Rom 8:3 usage is unusual indeed. *Περί* is used regularly with verbs of thanking, praying, knowing, persuading, or hearing. It is not used with verbs of sending like *πέμπω* or *ἀποστέλλω* by Paul. It can have a formal literary role of identifying the matter under discussion (1 Cor 7:1, 7:25, 8:1, 8:4, 12:1, 16:1, 16:12; 2 Cor 9:1; 1 Thess 4:9), which further illustrates its meaning of "concerning", or "with reference to".³⁷ There are only three uses of *περί* that follow *καί* (Col 4:3; 1 Thess 5:25; Tit 3:8), and none of these can parallel the pausal sense or syntactical position of *περί* in Rom 8:3. This is significant, since it is the role of *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* within the sentence that must finally decide the matter. And we can say from Pauline usage that the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* does not follow Pauline usage of the preposition. Although we have to allow for the possibility of a very unusual use of the word *περί* according to Pauline usage, it is no surprise that two studies, that have considered *περί* in general, have suggested that *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is at

least an allusion to the sin-offering in Rom 8:3.³⁸

Rom 8:1-4 acts as a transitional section because it brings to a climax Paul's discussion concerning the Law, and leads into Paul's explication of life in the Spirit. Paul has been heading in this direction since 5:1-11, but he has chosen to travel by way of the issues related to sin and death (5:12-6:23), and the Law (7:1-25). 8:3-4 seems to summarize Paul's previous discussion concerning the Law (3a). It then clarifies the significance of Christ within the purpose of God because of the inability of the Law (3b-4a), and transfers Paul's discussion from Law in light of kerygma in general, to Law in light of the Spirit in particular (4b).

The unconnected phrase τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νομοῦ ἐν ᾧ ἠνοθέει διὰ τῆς σαρκός states the thrust of Paul's argument in 7:7-25.³⁹ The Law is not sin, not the agent of death; it is ἀδύνατος in that it is made ineffectual through the flesh. Its ἀδύνατος⁴⁰ status is explained by what God has done in Christ (8:4). The Law was unable to bring about the fulfillment of its δικαίωμα in life in the flesh. Having stated the position of the Law clearly, Paul then presents another thesis-type statement in Romans, which can be viewed in parallel with Paul's declaration in 5:1-11, which is indeed a further development on 1:16-17 and 3:21-26. One needs especially to return to Paul's statement in 1:16 concerning the gospel. The gospel is δύναμις γὰρ Θεοῦ . . . εἰς σωτηρίαν . The statement concerning the Law in 8:3a implicitly identifies the gospel, stated cryptically in 8:3b, as the power of God. This would appear to be a significant aspect of Paul's thesis

in 1:16-11:36. It is Paul's argument against the charge of the gospel's seeming antinomian character that functions as a path to the further declaration of the gospel as the power of God (especially 6:1 to 8:11). This Paul accomplishes, while at the same time showing that the Law is not the power of God for salvation.

In language that reminds one of Gal 4:4, and may indeed be familiar or traditional Christian language,⁴¹ Paul presents God's action in bringing about the judgment of sin in the flesh, an action that involved the mission of Christ. One could move directly from *ὁ Θεός* to *κατέκρινεν* without the loss of the major idea of the text. Paul desires, though, to place the mission of Christ within this theological framework to indicate the validity of the gospel in view of the inability of the Law. The agent or cause of the Law's inability, the flesh, is the sphere within which Christ was sent. The word *ὁμοίωμα* is used to indicate that Christ is not to be completely equated with the *ἐν ... σαρκινός* of 7:14-25 (see Phil 2:7 for more general Christological implications). Christ was indeed *κατὰ σάρκα* (Rom 1:3), but this did not disable him so that he could not accomplish the mission God had for him. In fact, the fact that sin was condemned *ἐν τῇ σαρκί* indicates that Christ had to be in the flesh in some real sense.⁴² This solidarity with the flesh (in some sense) is stated in terms of mankind (*ἄνθρωπος*) in 5:12-21. The obvious concern as can be seen by Paul's choice of words in both 5:12-21 and 8:3-4 is to keep Christ from a similar accusation that has just been rendered against Adam and *ἄνθρωπος* (in 5:12-14),

and against flesh and the Law (8:3).

A further comparison with Gal 4:4-5 and Gal 3:13-14 is helpful. In Gal 4:4, Paul speaks of God sending His son, *γενόμενον ἐκ θυναδικός, γενόμενον ὑπὸ νόμον.* The purpose and result is that God sets free those *ὑπὸ νόμον.* Thus the description of Christ indicates that He was sent as man under Law so as to bring about the freeing of men under Law. This points back to the stronger language in Gal 3:13. Here, Christ is the subject, and he has freed *ἡμῶν* from the curse of the Law by becoming a curse *ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*.⁴³ It is significant to note that in both Gal 3:14, and Gal 4:5-7 the result of the role of Christ, involves the Spirit of God. Thus, there is a transition from being under the Law or the curse of the Law to receiving Sonship which is indicated by the Spirit's presence, or receiving the promise of the Spirit.⁴⁴ Christ is the agent of change that allows this transition to take place because of his representative mission for men. The parallel to Rom 8:3 is significant. Christ is sent in a manner related to the predicament of men (in the likeness of sinful flesh) *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, and through his mission God "pronounces his sentence" on sin in the flesh in order that the just requirement of the Law might be fulfilled.⁴⁵ This fulfilling of the Law is seen as accomplished in those who walk according to the Spirit. Paul elaborates further in 8:5-17, but 8:4 indicates the same type of transition we saw above in Gal 4:4-7 and Gal 3:13-14.

The distinctiveness of Rom 8:3-4 in relation to the Galatian texts is the explicit emphasis on sin, which is

in keeping with the context.⁴⁶ Thus the mission of Christ is explicitly presented in reference to sin as in 2 Cor 5:21. The fact that through Christ the just requirement, or claim of the Law can now be fulfilled points back to 8:1, and the fact that for those in Christ Jesus there is no condemnation. This is expressed in terms of being freed, which is not far removed from what we saw in Gal 4:4-7 and 3:13-14 in 8:2. The freedom that is in Christ means a movement from sin and death to life in the Spirit, which is brought about by the Spirit of life.⁴⁷ The movement in 8:2 is explained in terms of the mission of Christ in 8:3-4. It is the distinctive emphasis on sin in the context of Paul's defence of the gospel in relation to the Law that must be kept in mind when evaluating the particular description of the role of Christ that Paul offers.

Paul seems to add the phrase *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* to his statement in 8:3-4 in view of the significant emphasis on sin in the context. It indicates the role of Christ in relation to the particular predicament of man that has been emphasized in Romans. Having stated the evidence above, and in view of the cultic language used to further define the role of Christ within a theological framework in 3:25, we suggest that this is indeed a use of cultic language. God sent His son with reference to sin, to deal with sin, or as a sin offering. If the first two translations are used, it must be kept in mind that the word sacrifice is implied, and *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* may maintain the sense connected with its sacrificial denotation. The phrase is explanatory in almost an aside manner, and Paul does not explicitly attempt to develop sacrificial ideas

in this context.

Christ's role is that of enabling the fulfillment of the Law for those who walk according to the Spirit, an enabling that presupposes in Paul's thought the judgment of sin in the flesh. One possible model or illustration for this concept is the sin-offering, because it was a provision of God for the elimination of the effects of sin, at least in a cultic-legal sense. According to Lev 10:17, the sin-offering was given "to the priests to take away the guilt of the community by making atonement for them before the Lord" (NIV).⁴⁸ Even in cases where the sacrificial victim was burned outside the camp, the sacrifice was brought in the first[/]place because of guilt (Lev 4:3, 4:13). Philo notes that the sin-offering was "assigned... for the avoidance of evils" (Spec. Leg. i. 196, Loeb 7, pp. 212-213). It was given "for the healing of tres[^]passes which the soul has committed" (Spec. Leg. i. 197 Loeb 7, pp. 212-213). It was necessary "since even the perfect man, in so far as he is a created being, never escapes from sinning" (Spec. Leg. i. 252 Loeb 7, pp. 244-245). Thus, regardless of the more technical nuances, the sin-offering was seen as a sacrifice that dealt with sin, and its guilt before God. Paul's point in context is the absence of condemnation for those in Christ Jesus, because they have been freed from sin and death. This was accomplished in Christ and fulfilled through the Spirit of life. This transition, stated in 8:2, was dependent upon the sentencing and punishing (judgment) of sin in the flesh, which Christ in the likeness of sinful flesh brought about. The sin-offering may be alluded to by Paul in relation to

God's eschatological judgment on sin and condemnation that took place in Christ. Paul does not develop a sacrificial soteriology; his soteriology is broader than this. We are not suggesting that Paul develops a sacrificial rationale here, but that the use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* is explanatory and indicates the possible background for some of Paul's concepts in context.

Περὶ ἁμαρτίας may be thought of as ellipsis in that it stands for *Θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, but this could have been understood because of the connotations of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*. This may be a Pauline innovation, since it looks like an added descriptive term, and there is no evidence of it being used in other early Christian sources that may antedate or be contemporary with Paul.⁴⁹

Although speculative, it may be helpful to indicate further why this use of cultic language is not lacking general contextual relevance. First of all, we note Philo's interpretation of the sin-offering in Spec. Leg. i. 193,

"by the sin-offering he [God] warned them against continuing in sin, for he who asks for absolution of the sins he has committed is not so lost a wretch as to embark on other new offences at the very time when he asks remission of the old" [Loeb 7, pp. 210-211].

Philo speaks of the ethical implications of the sin-offering here, noting the contradictions implicit in accepting forgiveness, while embarking on a pattern of sinful behaviour. It may be that within this section that defends the gospel against charges of practical and theoretical antinomianism, this cultic term could have been in mind because of its ethical implications and connections. This is a sacrifice for sin that deals with the weakness

of the flesh, and was part of the *δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου*. The fact that this is accomplished for those who walk in the Spirit indicates the direct connection of lives pleasing to God to the purposeful provision of God. The fact that Paul uses cultic language elsewhere to enhance ethical teaching indicates that Paul can and did do this (Rom 12:1-2; 1 Cor 5:7-8, Eph 5:2; note also Phil 4:18 although this is in response to what has already been done). Thus, the ethical implication of this cultic term may have made it particularly appropriate to Paul's argument about the implicit call to righteousness in the gospel. This possibility is dependent on Philo, though, and needs more direct evidence from Romans.

More evidence is provided from the context of Romans, according to N. T. Wright.⁵⁰ Wright notes that "sin-offering covers sinful actions which the sinner either did not know he was committing, or did not know were sinful: in principle he wanted to keep the Law, but through ignorance, or against his will, he failed".⁵¹ Wright ties this into the Romans context by suggesting that the inability of the Law in 8:3 refers directly to 7:14-25.⁵² The man in 7:14-25 is caught in a situation of committing unwillful sins or sins of ignorance (7:15-20 especially). Wright suggests that "the remedy which the Old Testament offers for this very condition is the sin-offering", and this context prepares the way for the role of Christ as sin-offering.⁵³

Although such an argument is difficult to prove, it seems reasonable that the portrayal of the *ἐν ... σαρκενός* (whoever is included) could prepare for the reference to

the sin-offering. This portrayal affirms the πνευματικός status of the Law, while presenting the σάρκινος nature of the ἔγω, who is enslaved under sin. Sin dwells in the ἔγω (7:17). Nothing good dwells in the flesh of the ἔγω. Sin is therefore viewed as operative within the ἔγω as a ruling power (7:20). No matter what intentions there may be to obey the Law of God (7:22), the fact of the rule of sin in the bodily sphere (members) ensures a wretched state (7:23-24). The summary of the situation is that the Law of God is operative in the mind, but the Law of sin (in the sense of a sovereign power or sin as made sovereign by the Law) is served in the flesh (7:25).

The helplessness of ἔγω σάρκινός, needing deliverance from the enslavement of the body where sin's power and judgment is operative, is an appropriate setting for this explanatory description of Christ as περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Christ within God's purpose functions to deal with sin, sin that enslaves man because of his weakness in the flesh. Thus, the fact that Paul has a developed concept of sin here need not argue against the use of a cultic phrase. As Leenhardt states,

"the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, as is shown at great length by the argument in ch. 6, is intended precisely, on the anthropological plane, thus to destroy the power of sin by the destruction of the "body of sin". (footnote 54)

This does not deny a sacrificial meaning to the phrase; it is a meaning that is expanded because of the eschatological role of the death of Christ, and therefore the use of the phrase must be viewed as metaphorical. Through Christ sin is condemned, and the new way of the Spirit is made available, a way in which one can please God. This

is the role of an eschatological sin-offering. It is appropriate to the enslaved situation of man in the flesh, and in no sense allows for ethical slackness, but instead brings in life in the Spirit so that man can bear fruit to God. In this way, the gospel is implicitly affirmed as that which is beyond ethical reproach, since through it man can please God.⁵⁵

We cannot be sure that the readership at Rome uniformly and immediately would have understood the use of *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* as an explicit reference to the sacrifice (LXX). Those familiar with LXX-type translations of the Torah could have recognised this meaning, and they would probably include the leadership of the Christian congregations at Rome. Such readers would have to go through the immediate process of interpreting metaphorical language, but ideas already presented in Rom 3:25 (and 5:9) would have prepared the way. Sacrificial connotations could have remained with *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* while the actual referent of the phrase changes from the cultic sin-offering to that of Christ himself within the purposeful mission granted by God.

E. Further Implications of Cultic Language Within This Context

Evidence is suggested now for the influence of sacrificial and/or cultic thought in context. Here we are not so much interested in cultic language as such, but in the possibility that cultic ideas associated with the *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* role of Christ may be found in Rom 8:3-4. To do this we will consider briefly three different elements within the 2 verses:

1) ἐν ὁμοιότητι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας, 2) κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί, 3) ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νομοῦ πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σὰρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα.

1. Ἐν ὁμοιότητι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας

The phrase itself is not cultic, but the tension of maintaining likeness to flesh, but not having sin, may reflect a cultic way of thinking. Clearly this text has an incarnational parallel in Phil 2:7, and we do not doubt the similar emphasis on solidarity with humanity implicit in this phrase. One may consider the solidarity with man to be a sufficient rationale for this statement, but it is at least valid to consider a cultic parallel to this incarnational soteriology.

The blood in the Jewish cultus was significant, because it was the life of the flesh (Lev 17:11-14 LXX). The sin-offering was a sacrifice of flesh, with a significant blood rite (Lev 4-5). The animal was to be *ζῴωνος* (Lev 4:3,14,23,28,32 LXX) as was standard for sacrificial victims. The fact that the sacrifice was to be of flesh, but to be *ζῴωνος* is possibly a similar concept to that preserved by the use of *ὁμοίωμα* in 8:3. The word itself has no particular cultic history. We are just suggesting that it holds this tension of solidarity and distinction that was true of sin-offering victims.⁵⁶

For Christ to be sent *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*, it was necessary for him to be of flesh, but not of sinful flesh. In general terms Christ was *κατὰ σὰρκα* (1:3), but he was not *πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν* (7:14). When the suitability for Christ's role within God's purpose is being affirmed, there is the possibility that cultic ideas are in Paul's

mind, since he uses the phrase *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* to suggest that purpose. It may be that ideas of solidarity and representation (flesh), and the need for distinctive suitability (implicit purity), are at least aided by cultic ideas, if not a model for the incarnational perspective.

2. *κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*

This phrase speaks of the sentencing and punishing of sin in the realm of the flesh. We are interpreting *ἐν τῇ σαρκί* as referring to flesh in general or the realm of flesh, although this was accomplished by God through the mission of Christ, and specifically through Christ's flesh. Through the death of Christ, which is implicit within the incarnational perspective, in the likeness of sinful flesh and as a sin-offering, sin was condemned in the flesh.

We are considering here the possibility that Paul is expanding the concept of sin-offering or sacrifice for sin to speak of the eschatological condemnation of sin in the flesh. In what sense the effects of sin were dealt with by the sin-offering is difficult to isolate within the ritual procedure.⁵⁷ Ultimately, it cannot be confined to one aspect of the cultic procedure itself, since each element is dependent on the others as is true for all ritual activity. If one element was to be most significant, though, the blood rite would have to be chosen. The taking of the blood of the sacrificial victim into the tent of meeting on the Day of Atonement (the actual sanctuary), or applying some to the altar and pouring out the rest seems to be the focal point of the cultic procedure.

We admit that we interpret it as such because of the significance placed on the blood, by such texts as Lev 17:11-14, and the sin-offering procedures themselves (especially Lev 4). But, even the blood rite itself points to the interpretative aspect of cultic representation; a representative offered according to the God-given procedure, which functions to "condemn" sin and eliminate its effects, thus allowing for forgiveness. The blood rite expressed what was already implicit in the rest of the ritual, a representative life sacrificed for sin. The cultic ritual enables God to remain in the community, because the sins of the community are ritually "judged" and their effects annulled. Then God, who is Spirit, can dwell with flesh. Admittedly, we have interpreted the cultic ritual in legal or forensic terms, but the mingling or association of forensic and cultic ideas is what we have proposed took place in Rom 3:21-26, and 5:9 (2 Cor 5:21).⁵⁸ Thus, it is reasonable to consider the possibility that Paul could have interpreted Christ's role sacrificially and forensically in light of the eschatological judgment of sin in Christ.⁵⁹

E. Käsemann, speaking of the phrase *κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί*, describes it as containing "the remarkable mythical idea of a condemnation of sin in the flesh of the crucified", and he refers to 2 Cor 5:21 and Col 2:14 as parallels.⁶⁰ What Käsemann refers to as "mythical", and evidently similar to the thought in Gal 3:13-14, we are suggesting is cultic-forensic, and more in parallel with 2 Cor 5:21 than Gal 3:13-14. The very ambiguities connected with the concept of sin being condemned

in the flesh, which remain in a cultic-forensic description of forgiveness are even evident in cultic practice and thought itself. The closest approximation we can offer is that the deity maintained His presence with the community through the elimination of impurities, which in more legal terms was due to the satisfactory judgment of sin through the death of an acceptable representative victim. It may be that Paul himself could view the role of Christ as sin-offering or offering for sin (in general) as not only bringing about the pardon of sin, but also ritually condemning sin and destroying it by means of the representative victim before forgiveness could be granted. Christ brought about the eschatological condemnation of sin in the flesh, and this has opened the way for the justified to please God, those who walk according to the Spirit (the sanctified).

3. ἵνα τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νομοῦ πληρωθῆ ἐν ἡμῖν τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σὰρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα .

The ἵνα clause is a final clause that expresses the purpose and result of God's action in condemning sin through sending Christ.⁶¹ This clause reveals the completeness of Paul's summary statement in 8:3-4 in that it begins with the inadequacy of the Law (implicitly inadequate to bring about salvation), and ends with the Law's requirement being fulfilled on the other side of the mission of Christ in life in the Spirit. The manner in which the requirement of the Law is fulfilled is a difficult issue, which is dependent upon the use of ἐν, and indeed the relationship of the two sections of the clause on either side of ἐν. If the ἐν introduces an instrumental dative, then the idea is that of the

requirement of the Law being fulfilled "by our walking not according to the flesh but according to the Spirit".⁶²

This can either mean; (a) the actual obedience that comes through the Spirit (i. e. obeying the Law through the Spirit), or (b) the very fact of living in the Spirit, which in a teleological sense, or a general sense, becomes the fulfillment of the requirement of the Law. If the second is preferred, then ἐν may also be viewed in a locative sense, since the requirement of the Law is fulfilled in us by our living in the Spirit.

An extension of this latter meaning of the clause, and one we are suggesting, also takes ἐν in a locative sense. Our interpretation allows for the continued although distant significance of cultic thought even into this clause, even though it is viewed within the context of the Law and the just requirement of the Law. In this case τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νομοῦ speaks not only of what is fulfilled in the life of the believer by means of the Spirit, but it also points back to what Paul has presented in 8:3 in a direct way. The fulfilling of the requirement of the Law needs to be seen in view of the role of Christ, a role that is described in terms of sin-offering. If Paul is bringing the role of Christ together with its result in the life of the Christian, then we suggest the flesh/Spirit dichotomy identifies in whom this accomplishment of Christ is appropriated, and it indicates the way the requirement of the Law is fulfilled in the life of the Christian. In this way, the statement of the Law's fulfillment becomes evidence for the gospel's ability to do what the Law could not do itself (both in the present

and in the future resurrection of the body).

The meaning of τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νομοῦ is crucial in this discussion, and difficult.⁶³ The basic meaning of the word δίκαιωμα is that of commandment, requirement, or regulation (BAG, p. 197). In this case, the requirement or commandment of the Law is referred to, meaning the requirement of the Torah.

Noting uses of δίκαιωμα in Romans,⁶⁴ it seems likely that the singular τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ νομοῦ in 8:4 refers to the requirement of the Law - death or condemnation - that Paul has just referred to in 8:3c, and is so clearly referred to at the outset of Paul's argument in 1:32. This is what Christ has brought about (8:3, 5:16,18) through his righteous agency and act. Paul is saying, therefore, that God's condemning of sin in the flesh resulted in death (a legal-cultic equivalent to 6:23), a death that leads directly to life in the Spirit.⁶⁵

Because of the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας, the death being referred to may still include notions of sacrificial death in accordance with the Law, notions which have undoubtedly taken on a legal-forensic meaning. J. D. G. Dunn asks "when Paul says, God sent his Son περὶ ἁμαρτίας 'in order that the just requirement of the law might be fulfilled in us....', does he not include the law of the sin offering as a part of the 'just requirement of the law'?"⁶⁶ It is difficult, though, to think of Paul visualizing different aspects of the Law, and the sin-offering requirement among them. It could be, though, that Paul still has the cultic sacrifice in the background of his argument. Christ's role as sin-offering involved him in a

death that brought about the condemnation of sin. In an ultimate sense Christ as sin-offering did bring about the just requirement of the Law; death for sin 1:32, 6:23, which enables life in the Spirit. This is a concept that Paul even seeks to continue as he moves on to talk about the Spirit. The Spirit is seen as applying the truth of 8:3-4a to the life of the Christian. Broadly speaking the sin-offering role of Christ made life in the Spirit possible, and thus enabled the inner working of the Spirit to destroy sinful practices.⁶⁷ Christ's death then is not only a death for sin, but a death to sin (note Rom 6:1-11), a death appropriated in both dimensions by those that live according to the Spirit. The first dimension (death for sin) can easily be seen as a cultic and forensic idea, whereas the second is Paul's ethical and eschatological extension of the idea, especially in view of antinomian accusations. Christ, in these two ways then accomplished the role of eschatological sin-offering, an accomplishment that the Spirit is both the evidence of and the active agent of in the life of the person baptized with Christ.

Our interpretation receives support by noting the main thrust of Paul's ethical appeal in 6:12-13 based upon 6:1-11. The believer is one who has died with Christ, a fact recognised in baptism, and the person is now to live for God in or with Christ Jesus, considering themselves dead to sin. The believer is to present himself to God as alive from the dead, not allowing sin to reign in the mortal body. This is an idea that is expressed generally and sacrificially in 12:1 as Paul introduces his section

of community ethics. A further confirmation that this is the direction of Paul's thought in 8:4 is seen in 8:10. The believer's union with Christ (however that is understood) results in the death of the body on account of sin. This is because of the death of the body of Christ, a death that involved the judgment of sin in the flesh. Because of justification in Christ the body is forensically and sacrificially dead. (Paul has already established this in chapter 6 and 7:4-6 and ff., and it may be implicit in 12:1). Thus, now the Spirit is the means of life on account of justification. This is the nature of Christian existence. It is intrinsically an eschatological concept, since the believer is to live as if alive from the dead. The Christian hope is that the mortal body will indeed be made alive by the Spirit in the future (8:11,23). The interim period, though, seems to be that time in which for the one in Christ the body is dead (therefore the believer is not bound to the Law), and life must be lived by the Spirit. The Spirit makes true in the realm of experience and ethics what was declared in baptism concerning the believer's death with Christ, and his new life lived to God in anticipation of final resurrection (8:12-14). Thus, the ethical impact of this eschatological theology is expressed in 8:12-14 (as in 6:12-23).

What we are saying is that the requirement of the Law, which may be thought of as righteousness itself on the human level, involves precisely that sin be condemned in the flesh, which means the death of the body, so that life can be lived to God by means of the Spirit. In

a sense, therefore, 8:3-4 restates 8:1-2 with more explicit reference to the role of Christ in relation to the Law. The result of this action of God in Christ is no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus (8:1), and indeed life in the Spirit through the Spirit of life (8:2). The person in Christ is by definition not to walk according to the flesh, since the flesh has been condemned through the death of the body of Christ. Then the Christian is to live to God as if raised with Christ, which is possible through the Spirit that makes real the death and resurrection of Christ in the present. This is predicated upon the fact that Christ has accomplished, indeed he has undergone the requirement of the Law. It is the Spirit, whose role is described in light of what Christ has accomplished, that reverses the situation described in 1:29-32. The Spirit brings about the death or end of the deeds of the body, which is the process that is implicit with His presence, and this means life both now and with the resurrection of the body. Thus, eschatological existence becomes the fulfillment of the requirement of the Law, because the body of sin is judged, and life pleasing to God is made possible as one is led by the Spirit.

We are led to this interpretation, because of the broader aspect of Paul's argument concerning the power of the gospel.⁶⁸ The Law's inability is contrasted with what God has done in Christ (the gospel), who is able to deal with sin. The Law's requirement, including the condemnation of sin and life pleasing to God may in fact be fulfilled in those in Christ, those that walk according to the Spirit. Thus, the gospel moves beyond what the

Law was capable of doing in and of itself. The Law's problem was the weakness of the flesh. The gospel's strength is that the flesh is condemned (through Christ's death), and in Paul's thinking this eschatological truth means that the flesh has lost its power. It has no grounds (especially forensically) on which it can hold those in Christ. The righteousness that the Law demanded is now possible indeed fulfilled in the lives of the believers, because they have died and risen (spiritually) with Christ.

F. Conclusions in Light of Rom 3:25, 5:9, and 8:3

Having viewed these three possible uses of cultic language, we are now in a position to make a few brief observations.

(1) We have suggested that these texts do in fact contain cultic language, and that this language is possibly OT cultic language. Paul used this language in contexts where he expressed basic aspects of God's righteous justification by faith.

(2) We have seen that Paul cannot be described as presenting a sacrificial theology as such. On the other hand, it is significant that Paul used sacrificial thought to further explain and defend his point in context. In this regard, if one allows for our interpretations above, then the sacrificial images implied (we noted that they were not visualized) do not present a clear cultic picture. Their significance is in the way they support the argument in context.

(3) The cultic language used seems to be supportive

of Paul's main thesis concerning the power of the gospel, which he argues in terms of the righteousness of God and justification by faith (1:16-17). This "righteousness" language is given further explanation and content by means of the cultic language. In these texts, where Paul's emphasis is clearly theological (rather than specifically Christological), God's eschatological demonstration of His righteousness in justification by faith is explained partially with ideas of sacrificial atonement (especially clear in 3:25 and 5:9). In 8:3 the same ideas are close at hand, while Paul more clearly indicates how in Christ God has done what the Law could not do in providing for the problem of sin in the flesh (Christ as a sin-offering in a clearly surpassing sense). Although we have suggested that the mercy seat and particularly ideas associated with it are conveyed by ἱλαστήριον, and that sin-offering and particularly ideas associated with it are conveyed by περὶ ἁμαρτίας, it is God's provision of Christ for the just justification of the sinner that is the general referent. Although the general meaning should be stressed, we would classify these uses of cultic language, according to H. W. Attridge, as "metaphorical application of cultic terms to non-cultic activity".⁶⁹ Thus, God's provision of Christ for the just forgiveness of sins is referred to with cultic words. Paul is not drawing attention to the detail of the cultus, but to the way that God's provision in Christ is an eschatological justification that deals with the sins of all who believe. Furthermore, there is an intermingling of cultic and forensic ideas within an eschatological framework,

indicating that the gospel is Paul's concern, and particular language groups or concepts are at the service of his apologetic.

(4) It does seem that it is best to see such cultic language as used because it was known at Rome, and would function to support Paul's argument with this particular audience. The three uses of cultic language, along with Paul's particular emphasis on sin in the letter, and the extensive use of the OT, may indicate that such cultic terms were part of an apologetic prepared for Rome particularly (note the difference from Galatians, especially concerning sin). Thus, the Jewish-Christian roots of the church(es) in Rome, and the need for a defence of the gospel against the antinomian charge, seem to have called forth this type of presentation, which uses cultic ideas to strengthen ideas of justification in Christ.

(5) We suggest that Paul was being creative in using cultic language, *language* becoming traditional Christian language, in support of his argument. We suggest, also, that one need not conclude that these three texts represent the only possible places where cultic ideas may be in Paul's mind. The death of Christ may have been thought of implicitly in sacrificial categories, and such ideas may have carried over to Christian baptism. The texts we have focused on indicate the supportive role of cultic language, as Paul chose to use it, in arguing what really is the thesis of his letter.

Further conclusions about the distinctiveness of the cultic language in Romans must await the study of the texts below. The five points above do seek to indicate

the way that cultic language may have been a significant part of Paul's apologetic for the gospel.

Footnotes

¹On the relation of 5:1-11 to 5:12-21 see A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the Background of 1 Corinthians xv and Romans v 12-21", (Ph. D., Cambridge, 1970), p. 211; also "On Some of the Problems in the interpretation of Romans 5. 12", C. E. B. Cranfield, SJTh, 22 (1969) 324-341 (p. 324). An aspect of the unity between 5:1-11 and 5:12-21 is the gal wachomer argumentation in each section.

²Horace E. Stoessel notes the changing of argumentation throughout the letter, "Notes on Romans 12:1-2 The Renewal of the Mind and Internalizing the Truth", Int, 17, 1963, 161-175 (p. 168.)

³Nils Dahl, Studies in Paul, p. 90.

⁴The aorist ἰσώθημεν declares the definiteness of God's purpose for man, involving the conformity to the image of God's Son. This is definite in view of God's giving of His Son, which speaks of the death of Christ (8:32). Thus, justification is the assurance of glorification and in that respect it is already accomplished (8:32-34).

⁵The omission of καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας by 1912 and Epiph (pt) does not challenge the high probability of its presence in the original text. It reveals, rather, the somewhat redundant nature of the phrase, since at an initial glance it may appear as an explanatory addition.

⁶In texts such as p⁴⁶ vid, Aleph*, A, D, F, G, Psi, (g). See N-A 26.

⁷In texts such as p⁵¹, Aleph¹, B, H, 6, 33, 81, 326, 365, 1175, 1241(s), 2464 al. See N-A 26.

⁸Leander Keck, "The Law and 'The Law of Sin and Death' (Rom 8:1-4): Reflections on the Spirit and Ethics in Paul" in The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H. Silberman, ed. by James L. Crenshaw and Samuel Sandmel, (New York: KTAV Pub. House, 1980) 41-57, (pp. 44-45).

⁹This is the thesis of Sabourin in his work co-authored with Lyonnet, SRS, pp. 248-256. On these pages Sabourin views Rom 8:3 and 2 Cor 5:21 together. An argument is also presented for the possible influence of Isa 53 and the idea of the suffering servant on 2 Cor 5:21 particularly (esp. Isa 53:9-11), although it is not spoken of directly in relation to Rom 8:3. Isa 53 may be a precedent for the use of sacrificial language in relation to the role of God's servant-son, and this in and of itself is significant (especially in view of Rom 4:25 and Isa 53:12 LXX). The use of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Isa 53:10 LXX and the use of δίκαιον - language in Isa 53:11 LXX makes this passage particularly interesting. Thus, we have a precedent for sacrificial language used in relation to the God's servant who has a justifying role "for the many".

It could be that the sacrificial role of Christ is brought to Paul's mind by Isa 53 or the role of the servant, but we leave this as an open possibility. If this is the case, the differences between the $\square\psi\chi$ and the $\Pi\chi\psi\Pi$ are not significant enough to cause a major difference in interpretation in view of the way Paul uses περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom 8:3. Paul is not developing the subtleties of cultic thought. (Even though J. Milgrom emphasizes the differences between the $\square\psi\chi$ and $\Pi\chi\psi\Pi$, he does note that there is a resemblance "in both formulation and function" [Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance SJLA 18 ed. by J. Neusner (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), p. 127].) We will consider the LXX evidence in relation to $\Pi\chi\psi\Pi$, though, since it is the sacrifice usually translated by $\text{περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας}$, and we will pursue reasons why this may have been an appropriate description of the role of God's Son.

¹⁰We use 2 Cor 5:21 to suggest the possibility of cultic language or allusion. Any further dependence on this text would require a more detailed analysis.

¹¹The texts without the article before ἁμαρτία have been underlined in lists 1) and 2).

¹²We have left out of the basic data above the references from Ezekiel (LXX). The confusion between ὑπὲρ and περὶ make the readings from Ezekiel uncertain. The evidence does point to the technical use of either ὑπὲρ or περὶ (with or without the article before ἁμαρτία), which does support our reading of the rest of the evidence. See Ezek 40:39, 42:13, 43:19,21,22,25, 44:29, 45:17,22,23,25, 46:20.

¹³Lev 16:25 has an unusual use of the plural when the fat of the sacrifice is mentioned.

¹⁴"The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8.3" in Studia Biblica 1978: III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors, Edited by Elisabeth A. Livingstone (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980) 453-459 (p. 454). Wright's article surveys the LXX evidence also, with more attention to how it is translating the Hebrew text. Our work above is supplementary to the type of work he has done. We seem to be in agreement on the general pattern of usage as the quotation above suggests.

¹⁵For Philo's use of $\text{περὶ (τῆς) ἁμαρτίας}$ we are dependent upon Gunther Mayer's Index Philoneus (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974), p.248. Josephus does not use the phrase according to Karl H. Rengstorff's A Complete Concordance To Flavius Josephus, Vol. I A - Δ, (Leiden; E. J. Brill, 1973).

¹⁶Fug. 157 (Lev 10:16), 159 (Lev 10:19ff.); Mut. 233, 234 ($\text{ὅτι περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἔστι}$), 248; Spec. Leg. i. 193, 194, 196, 197, 239, 243, 247, 251, 252. Philo's understanding of the sin-offering, and especially his ethical interpretation of it will be referred to below.

¹⁷The matter of the text used by the author of Hebrews is no easy matter, and we are not attempting to simplify matters. When we refer to the LXX here, we are suggesting that the writer was familiar with a Greek text of the Old Testament that at least broadly speaking is similar to the LXX. On this issue see J. C. McCullough's "The Old Testament Quotations In Hebrews", NTS, 26 (1980), 363-379. McCullough suggests that a local version of the OT was used (p. 379). If this was the case, the text is not different from the LXX concerning the sin-offering reference in Ps 39:7.

¹⁸Compare with the reading in the context of warning that is different (10:26 *περὶ* with the plural *ἁμαρτιῶν*).

¹⁹Thus, James W. Thompson's concern to show similarity between Hebrews and the metaphysical critique of the cult in Hellenistic texts needs to be considered ("Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice", JBL, 98/4 (1979), 567-578). One needs to be careful, though, not to allow the perspective of the writer to be placed too quickly within Greek philosophical categories. The parallel is helpful, but surely the difference between Philo and the writer to the Hebrews on this matter is best seen as due to the centrality of Christ within the whole exhortation, and the writer's resultant eschatological perspective, which expresses itself at times in metaphysical categories.

²⁰The writer is not strictly following LXX language in 5:1 and 5:3 when he refers to *Θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν* and *προσφέρειν περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν* discussing the Aaronic priesthood. It is clear, though, that he has in mind various sin-offerings (5:1), and the plural in 5:3 suggests the sin-offerings that are for the people and for the High Priest that need to be offered continuously. This fact presents the background to the statement in 7:27 concerning Christ who does not need to offer up *ὑπὲρ τῶν ἰδίων ἁμαρτιῶν Θυσίας* . It is likely that the sin-offering is in mind specifically in 5:3 and possibly 10:26. That the writer can refer specifically to the sin-offering has been noted above and is confirmed most clearly in 13:11 with the use of... *ἄμα περὶ ἁμαρτίας* . This reference even specifies the particular sin-offering that was not consumed by the priests, but burned. This is shown clearly in Lev 16:27, which may be in the mind of the author, since the Day of Atonement was the centre point of cultic mediation (also Exod 29:14; Lev 4:12, 6:23, 8:17, and 9:11). On the other hand, *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν* probably is a more general reference to the purpose of sacrifice in (5:1, 10:12, and 7:27), and 10:12 and 7:27 may reveal the influence of traditional language concerning the death of Christ. Thus *περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in Hebrews still has sin-offering content, and even the plurals in 5:3, and 10:26 and uses of *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν* can still be used with implicit reference to sacrifice by way of the sacrificial perspective placed on the death of Christ (5:1, 7:27, 10:12).

The sections where the sacrificial procedure and rationale are exploited are 9:11-28, 13:11-12. Note especially the statement in 9:22 within a covenant

context *χωρὶς ἁματεκχυσίας οὐ γίνεται ἰφρσις*. On covenant in Hebrews see J. J. Hughes "Hebrews IX 15ff. And Galatians III 15ff." in NovT, Vol. 21 (1979), 27-96.

²¹Metzger, TCGNT, pp. 692-693.

²²On the meaning of *ἀλέγω* in John and especially 16:8,9 see D. A. Carson's "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11", JBL, vol. 98 (1979), 547-566.

²³The singular of *ἁμαρτία* is used throughout the Johannine material except for John 8:24, 9:34 and 1 John 2:2,12, 3:5, 4:10.

²⁴Rom 8:3 speaks of the nature of the Son so that he is able to deal with sin, which is not present in 1 John 4:10, but note 1 John 1:1-2, 3:5, 4:2-3.

²⁵The matter of expiation verses propitiation does not need special attention at this point. An application of this sacrificial understanding of the death of Christ can be seen in 1 John 1:7.

²⁶BAG, p. 376, LSMJ, p. 828, note especially Ezek 44:27 LXX, Num 5:8 LXX, 2 Macc 3:33.

²⁷*πέμνω* is a significant word in the gospel of John: 1:22,33, 4:34, 5:23,24,30,37, 6:38,39,44, 7:16,18,28, 33, 8:16,18,26,29, 9:4, 12:44,45,49, 13:16,20, 14:24,26, 15:21,26, 16:5,7, 20:21.

²⁸Paul's reference to Christ's Sonship needs to be viewed within Paul's own argumentation (Rom 1:3-4,9, 5:10, 8:3,29,32). This need not be seen as Johannine. Indeed, it can be labelled as Pauline within the context of the argument of Romans.

²⁹Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, on Rom 8:3 see p. 229.

³⁰Ibid., p. 229.

³¹Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 117-118.

³²Ibid., p. 118.

³³Barrett, Romans, p. 156; John Murray, Romans vol. 1, p. 280; Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 382, Cranfield notes others who share this perspective (p. 382); Schlier, Römerbrief, pp. 231, 241-242. Note also, R. M. Spence, "Romans VIII:3", ExpTim, 9 (1898), 479-480; T. C. G. Thornton, "The Meaning of *καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας* in Romans 8.3", JTS, n.s. vol. 22 (1971), 515ff.

³⁴Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, 5th ed. p. 251, although he does not stress this interpretation but does mention scholarly support for it; Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 202-204; Bruce, Romans, p. 161; D. E. H. Whiteley, 'Hard Sayings - VIII', Theology, 1964, 114-116, on Rom 8:3. Whiteley views the sacrificial language as significant,

although the rationale of the sacrifices is different and should not be compared. Most significant is the support given by Ernst H. Riesenfeld in his article on " " in TDNT, vol. 6, pp. 53-56. Concerning the sacrificial connotation he remarks that there is "at least a suggestion of this sense" (p.55). Lyonnet and Sabourin, SRS, pp. 248-256; Daly, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 238-239; Also significant from the grammatical side is Murray J. Harris' comment "given OT usage, the rendering "as a sacrifice for sin" (NEB; similarly RV) seems more apposite", in "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament, NIDNTTh, vol. 3, 1171-1215 (p. 1203); Kasemann, Romans, pp. 214,216 and citing others although he recognises that it is "contested by most others" (p. 216); Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 2, pp. 127-128; Hengel, The Atonement, p. 46. Leon Morris does not appeal to the sacrificial meaning of in Rom 8:3 in either The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1955) or The Cross in the New Testament (Grand Rapids; Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965), but in The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance he allows for the translation "sin offering" (pp. 36,44) and states that "most would agree that the translation can be justified" (p. 44).

³⁵Sanday, and Headlam, Romans, p. 193, but stating "still we need not suppose the phrase here specifically limited to the sense of 'sin-offering.'" (quoted by Black, Romans, p. 114). In the light of this comment we need to say that we are not attempting to argue that Paul has a very narrow view of sin-offering in mind as he uses these words. That would be impossible in the light of the context. The possibility is, though, that he has used a phrase, which can have specific cultic meaning, with broader meaning when expressing the role of Christ.

³⁶A recent study that defends this position is that of N. T. Wright, "The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3" in Studia Biblica 1978: III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors, edited by Elisabeth A. Livingstone, (Sheffield; JSOT Press, 1980) 453-459.

³⁷Numerous Pauline uses take on almost a conventional role in introductions, thanksgivings, requests for prayer, epistolary transitions and conclusions (Rom 1:8, 15:14; 1 Cor 1:4; 2 Cor 1:8; Eph 6:18; Col 1:3, 4:3; 1 Thess 1:2, 3:9; 2 Thess 1:3,11, 2:13).

³⁸Riesenfeld, "περὶ", p. 55; Harris, "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament", p. 1203. See note 32. On the other hand note the contrary view of Archibald T. Robertson (grammar written with W. Hersey Davis) in A New Shorter Grammar of the Greek Testament, 10th edition originally published in 1933, (Grand Rapids; Baker, 1977), pp. 259-260, "It is not certain whether περὶ occurs with the ablative in the New Testament, though that may be true of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3 where 'concerning sin' may mean to remove sin". Also, C. F. D. Moule states "it is not certain whether περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Rom viii. 3 is the technical term =

sin-offering (as in Heb. x. 6, cf. v. 26), or whether it is meant more generally as = to deal with sin, in connexion with sin; but in any case, even the technical sense is clearly derived from the more general one" (An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek [Cambridge: CUP, 1953], p. 63). We are arguing for the plausibility that the "technical sense" of the phrase in Rom 8:3 is not completely lost behind "the more general one".

³⁹Being unconnected this clause is difficult to be sure of grammatically or syntactically. Nominative or accusative absolute may be appropriate labels, but we are satisfied to label it as anacoluthon possibly reflecting semitic construction along the lines of "casus pends"; see BDF, p. 244, note reference to Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, edited and enlarged by E. Kautzsch, 2nd English translation by A. E. Cowley, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910), section 143.

⁴⁰On ἀδύνατος see BAG, p. 18; "powerless" or passive sense "what was impossible for the law". In this context either is appropriate, although we prefer the idea of the law being made powerless, since it seems to be in keeping with the verb ἀποβλέω, and Paul's focus of the blame upon the flesh.

⁴¹Henning Paulsen, Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8 (Neukirchen-Vluyn; Neukirchener Verlag, 1974) pp. 181-182, "Kerygmatische Formulierung (Sendungsaussage)", (p. 182); also Peter von der Osten-Sacken, Römer 8 als Beispiel Paulinischer Soteriologie (Göttingen; Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975), pp. 144-149, speaks of Rom 8:3b ff. as "Sendungsaussage" (p. 144).

⁴²The phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκί (8:3b) can be thought of in the simplest sense - in the physical flesh. The statement concerning the inability of the Law, though, indicates the theological framework within which Paul views the physical flesh. It is the source of weakness that renders the Law powerless as a means of salvation from sin in any sense. It is the weakness of the flesh that calls forth the ethical application of Paul's argument concerning the gospel. In the context of argument concerning the Law, Paul sees nothing good in the flesh (7:18), which is not the case for the νόσος (7:25). The flesh is the place where the law of sin has its potential and actual stronghold and reign (7:25) in the life of the ἄνθρωπος σαρρικός (7:14). Being in the flesh involves having sinful passions aroused by the Law (7:5). This is a situation that Paul argues as different for the Christian (7:4,6). The rationale is that the believer has died to the Law through the body of Christ to bear fruit to God, which involves now serving God in the new way of the Spirit (7:4-6).

This flesh-Spirit contrast is developed in 8:1-17, and especially 8:3-13. The Christian is not ἐν σαρκί, but is ἐν πνεύματι (8:9). The rationale given is similar to that in 7:4-6; through Christ the body is dead, and the Spirit, which gives life, is present (8:10). The way Paul develops this in 8:12-14 indicates that what may

be considered true theologically must in some sense be expressed by a life-style that is lead by the Spirit, and not the flesh. This is a lifestyle that Paul expresses in ethical terms in other places (such as Gal 5:13-6:10, and in Rom 12:1-15:13). We will discuss this further below.

⁴³2 Cor 5:21 is another example of this interchange idea that involves Christ "in some sense" becoming identified with man in his needful situation, so that man can be freed from that situation to participate in what Christ is for man. Morna Hooker develops this idea in "Interchange In Christ", JTS, NS 22 (1971), 349-361; "Interchange and Atonement", BJRL, 60 (1978), 462-481; "Interchange and Suffering" in Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies presented to G. M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar, edited by William Horbury, and Brian McNeil, (Cambridge: CUP, 1981), pp. 70-83. There is a mutual identification between Christ and man that makes Christ's role one of representation. We would add, though, that in the sense that Christ is for man what man could not be for himself Christ becomes more than a representative of what man is. He enables man to become what He himself is. In this regard, ideas of substitution, at least in the sense of ritual identification (e. g., sacrificial representation), are close at hand.

⁴⁴The similar wording to Gal 4:6 in Rom 5:5 indicates even before Paul enters into his main discussion of the Spirit that the Spirit's presence is foundational to the Christian hope and experience.

⁴⁵BAG, p. 413.

⁴⁶Ἄναρτία occurs 47 times in Romans, 41 times in 5:12-8:10, and 17 times in the rest of the Pauline corpus. The emphasis is obvious.

⁴⁷We have purposefully not included any mention of the Law in this sentence, because Paul does not say anything substantive about the Law in the text (8:2). He seems to be using the word νόμος in a general sense, but more importantly it surely is a deliberate play on the word νόμος in view of the main point of his argument: there is no condemnation of the Law for those in Christ Jesus.

⁴⁸As Jacob Milgrom states in "Two Kinds of HATTA'T", VT (1976), 333-337 (p. 333), "Two discrete procedures are prescribed for the hatta't"(underlining is mine). The distinction with reference to the eating or burning of the sacrificial flesh is preserved with a stated principle in Lev 6:23 (compare also Lev 4:11-12, and 4:20-21, with Lev 6:19), and the account in Lev 10:16-20 reveals the two ways of dealing with the "flesh" of the sin-offering, although in this case Eleazar and Ithamar did not act in accordance with their priestly privilege and responsibility. The differences in the blood rite can be seen by comparing the procedures in Lev 4:3-21 with those in Lev 4:22-35. Baruch A. Levine in In the Presence of the

Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel (Leiden; E.J. Brill, 1974), p. 103, sees these distinctions as reflecting two rites: "(1) A purification rite intended to safeguard the sanctuary and its ministering priesthood from contamination" and "(2) A rite intended to expiate certain of the offences of "the people", of Israelites, individually, and even of their nesi'im, the tribal chiefs". He comments concerning the second rite, "in the case of such offenses the threat to the purity of the sanctuary was less direct, although present". This statement is not far removed from the perspective of Milgrom who maintains a unified picture of the hatta't (חַטָּאת) sacrifices, because of his emphasis on the purifying role of such sacrifices. Thus, although he notes the diverse procedures, he still maintains a unity of purpose with the concept of purification. In general it seems that Milgrom's perspective is helpful in that it seeks a cultic explanation for the similarity and diversity in the hatta't rites. Also relevant to this discussion are a number of other studies by Milgrom: "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering", VT, 21 (1971), 237-239; "A Prolegomena to Leviticus 17:11", JBL, 90 (1971), 149-156; "The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance", RB, 82 (1975), 186-205; Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance; and "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly ((Picture of Dorian Gray))", RB, 83 (1976), 390-399. Recently a number of these articles have been brought together with others in a book, Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology SJLA 36, ed. by Jacob Neusner, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983). Having stated our appreciation of the work of Milgrom, for the purposes of this study we will refer to the hatta't as "sin-offering". We do this because of the LXX use of the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας when referring to the hatta't sacrifice.

⁴⁹As Daly states in Christian Sacrifice, p. 237, "Paul does seem to be the originator, or at least the first notable witness, to another aspect of Christian sacrificial thought: the idea that Christ is the sin-offering (for our sins)". See pp. 237-240.

⁵⁰"The Meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8:3', pp. 453-459.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 455. See Lev 4-5, and 22:14; and Wright notes Mishnaic references (m. Sabb. 7:11, 11:6, m. Sanh. 7:8, m. Hor. 2:1-6 and notes by Herbert Danby, The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes (London: OUP, 1933), pp. 111 n. 3, 562 n. 16.), p. 457.

⁵²Ibid., p. 455. ⁵³Ibid., p. 456.

⁵⁴Leenhardt, Romans, p. 204.

⁵⁵Philo's perspective on the sin-offering, including its didactic-ethical significance, may be relevant. The idea of the sin-offering as an impetus to correct moral behaviour is not what Paul has in mind specifically. The eschatological sin-offering is connected with life

pleasing to God, though. Thus, the type of interpretation that Philo offers, which develops the sacrifice's ethical implications, may be familiar to Paul, although the basis of his ethics is different. For, through the death and resurrection of Christ, the believer is to move from sin to righteousness, which is expressed in experience through life in the Spirit.

⁵⁶ Obviously not all sacrifices were of flesh, so we are not suggesting a general principle for all sacrifices. It is the fact that the blood was necessary for atonement that ensured the necessity for flesh involved. We have already sought to show that Paul uses $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ in 3:25 and 5:9 with cultic significance. Although he does not refer to $\alpha\iota\mu\alpha$ here, such previous references indicate the significant role of blood in the cult, which enables its easy transference to Christ's soteriologically significant death. Ideas from 3:25 and 5:9 may not be far from Paul's mind in 8:3-4. This is a real possibility, since Paul is bringing together a number of ideas that have been developed earlier in the letter.

⁵⁷ It does not appear that sin itself was perceived as actually transferred to the flesh of the sacrificial victim in the sin-offering, since whatever touched the flesh of the sin-offering became holy (Lev 6:20), and whenever the flesh was burned it had to take place in a ceremonially pure place (Lev 4:12). [These observations were made by Walter Houston at the Biblical Theology undergraduate seminar at Cambridge University, Michaelmas Term, 1983.] But it was perceived that in the midst of the implicit substitution of a pure cultic representative its ritual death, consumption of its flesh (by fire or by the priests), and the application of its blood, the annulment of the consequences of sins took place, and sin was atoned for.

A recent study supporting the idea of the transfer of sin or impurity to the sacrificial victim is that of Angel Manuel Rodriguez, "Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cult-Related Texts" (D. Th. Diss. Andrews University, Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary, August, 1979). Rodriguez states that "holiness of the flesh of the animal and the transfer of sin to it" were not contradictory. "When there is repentance and confession, the sin-holiness encounter serves to reveal the superiority of holiness. It is through encounter that expiation is achieved" (pp. 305-306). It is actually through the cultic ritual of eating the flesh and the blood rite that sin was transferred to the sanctuary where it was "brought under the controlling power of Yahweh" (p. 258). Sin was thus dealt with finally on the Day of Atonement (pp. 258, 306-307). We agree with the outline of Rodriguez's thesis, but reserve judgment on the actual perception of the transfer of sin. Undoubtedly, through the cultic ritual and representation the sacrifice was for sin, and thus was a victim. A life was offered by a life and for a life. It would seem that the laying on of hands at least suggested substitution, if not this idea of the actual transfer of sin. Rodriguez's suggestion that not only the sin, "but also its penalty" was transferred to

the substitute may be similar to Paul's perspective on at least Christ's sacrificial role (p. 258).

⁵⁸A forensic understanding of cultic phenomena was not presented (to our knowledge) within the OT, although cultic phenomena were dictated by the Law and maintained by the Law. The connection, especially when viewing the role of God's Son in the light of sin and the Law, does not seem difficult, though. The role of God's servant in Isa 53:10 LXX and 53:11 LXX seems to be described both sacrificially and in terms of righteousness. As we have mentioned, this is a significant precedent, although the development of Paul's thought need not be explained by dependence on this text.

⁵⁹James D. G. Dunn, in his article "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", notes the difficulty in fully uncovering the Jewish concept of atonement, but suggests that "it seems likely that Paul himself had a fairly well defined theory of sacrifice" (p. 134). He proceeds by seeking to uncover Paul's understanding of sacrifice by correlating Paul's viewing of Jesus' death "as representative man and in terms of cultic sacrifice" and then further examining the sacrificial ritual itself (p. 134). We have likewise sought to move forward without sensing the need to present ambiguous parallels to Paul's thought at this point. The priority has been to focus on Paul's thought itself. As Dunn recognised, "the exercise is necessarily speculative, but it may help to illuminate Paul's understanding of Jesus' death" (p. 134).

⁶⁰Käsemann, Romans, p. 217.

⁶¹Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 383.

⁶²Ibid., p. 385. For Cranfield this means "by the determination of the direction, the set, of our lives by the Spirit, by our being able again and again to decide for the Spirit against the flesh". In general agreement is Murray, Romans, vol. 1, pp. 283-284.

⁶³See Gottlob Schrenk, "δική, κτλ", TDNT, vol. 2, 174-225, (pp. 219-223); also H. W. M. van de Sandt, "Research into Rom. 8,4a: The Legal Claim of the Law" Bijdragen 37 (1976), 252-269, and "An Explanation of Rom. 8,4a" Bijdragen 37 (1976), 361-378; and C. F. D. Moule, "'Justification' in its Relation to the Condition κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom 8:1-11)" in Battesimo e giustizia in Rom 6 e 8 ed. by Lorenzo De Lorenzi, with M. Bouttier, A. Descamps, E. Dinkler, E. Lohse, C. F. D. Moule, and R. Schnackenburg, and other contributors (Serie Monographici di [[Benedictina]] Sezione Biblio-ecumenica, 2), (Roma: Abbazia S. Paulo fuori le mura, 1974) 177-201, discussion 187-201.

⁶⁴The general meaning, regulations or commands, is used in Rom 2:26, where the plural is used with τοῦ νόμου. Possibly more significant is the use of the singular in Rom 1:32, and 5:16,18. 1:32 speaks of death (θάνατος) as the τὸ δίκαιωμα τοῦ θεοῦ for those who practise the

types of sins stated in the previous verses (1:29-31). Death is the just requirement for those who have been filled (πεπληρωμένους - 1:29) with all the vices and sins that Paul mentions. It is interesting, in seeking to understand any relevance that 1:32 may have to 8:4 that 1:32 can be contrasted with 8:13. In 8:13 life is dependent on the practices of the body τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος being put to death by the Spirit. Here the offering of life seems to be on the basis of the Spirit's work in enabling the putting to death, not of the body (this has already been done in Christ - 8:10), but the practices of the body. Thus one needs to consider whether Paul is thinking negatively in 8:4, and thinking of the legal demand or the just requirement of the Law in condemning sin in the flesh.

The use of δικαίωμα in 5:16 is unusual, and probably is used in contrast to κρίμα and κατάκριμα in the earlier part of the verse (stylistically δώρημα and χάρισμα may have affected the choice of the word as well). Implicit in the meaning of the word is the justification granted by God, but specifically one granted in view of trespasses, which may define the gift provided as Christ's removal of the condemnation of sin (that Adam caused). Thus, the meaning of δικαίωμα in 5:16 is similar to δικαίωσις, but it is closely associated with Christ's agency in removing condemnation, which takes place through Christ's righteous act (5:18). One trespass results in κατάκριμα, one righteous act results in justification (acquittal) leading to life. Here justification is really equated with life, which becomes the opposite of condemnation, which results in death.

⁶⁵Beker, Paul the Apostle, p. 262, "it is his [Paul's] conviction that the Christ-event fulfills (the righteous requirement of) the law (Rom. 8:4) and ends its salvific rule. The sacrificial expiation of Christ achieves what no human being could do, because he suffers in his death "for us" the punishment for sins that the law requires (Gal. 3:13)"; although Beker allows for the close correlation of Christ and love as the fulfilling of the Law (p. 247).

⁶⁶Dunn, "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus", p. 132.

⁶⁷The ethical implications of the sin-offering, as noted by Philo above, may be relevant here. The association of ethical responsibility with the "means of grace" is understandable, and could be used in didactic texts, and texts that have an apologetical thrust as well.

⁶⁸This we suggest is closer to Paul's meaning in this section than alternative interpretations. The importation of the love ethic (Rom 13:8-10), even as the expression of the spiritual Law (7:14, keeping in mind Jer 31:33 f.; and Ezek 36:26 f., see Bruce, Romans, pp. 161-163), which is indeed implicit in the concept of life in the Spirit, seems to miss how the section is tied into Paul's argument that centres so much on the death/life, condemnation/justification pattern in Christ (contra - van de Sandt,

"An Explanation of Rom. 8,4a", p. 378, note his translation "...that the legal claim (namely the agape) of the (kol ... kulah - whole) Law might be fulfilled (e. g. yitqayam - set up) among us, who do not walk according to the flesh but to the Spirit". [Underlinings are in italics in van de Sandt's article].) In Paul's ethical section, the summary of the Law in terms of the love command is significant, but this does not seem to fit into Paul's argument at this point in the letter. We recognise, furthermore, that it would make matters easier to translate τὸ δίκαιῶμα τοῦ νόμου here as "the right intent of the Law", an intention or purpose which Keck views as bringing life itself ("The Law and 'the Law of Sin and Death' (Rom 8:1-4): Reflections on the Spirit and Ethics in Paul", p. 53). Life in the Spirit is indeed the concern of Paul in the following verses, but we would still suggest that in 8:4 he is making the transition to life in the Spirit. The legal language still holds the death aspect of the accomplishment of Christ in mind. This death and resurrection is now fulfilled in the Christian by walking in the Spirit. The idea that walking in the Spirit means the fulfillment of the Law's regulation in the sense of obedience to the Law is also possible, but we think less likely. Within a section where Paul has affirmed that the one in Christ is dead to the Law (7:4-6), and set free from the condemnation of the Law (8:1-2), it is difficult to think that Paul would speak in terms of obedience to the Law's requirement as involving present obligation to the Law. In fact the Spirit fulfills the requirement of the Law in a way that the Law couldn't; he enables the Christian to put to death the deeds of the body (8:13).

⁶⁹Harold W. Attridge, Review of Christian Sacrifice, p. 147.

CHAPTER V

CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE APOLOGETIC FOR THE GOSPEL:

IV. ROMANS 11:16A

A. Summary of Interpretation

Romans 11:16 contains two metaphorical pictures which illustrate and defend Paul's argument concerning God's continued purpose of salvation, which has been worked out historically within Israel. It would be forcing the evidence to suggest that the first fruits image (11:16a) is crucial to this whole discussion. After all, it is the second image (root - branches) that Paul develops, not that of first fruits. Nevertheless, this casual and abrupt image, which we suggest is definitely cultic (Num 15:20-21), indicates the ease with which Paul can use such an image. This is especially the case when issues related to eschatological ministry and response to the gospel are being discussed in context (Rom 1:9, 15:16; Phil 2:17; 2 Thess 2:13; 1 Cor 16:15; Rom 16:5). The text illustrates that Paul could refer to somewhat obscure cultic rituals to clarify his argument, even when he has clarified the Gentiles as his primary audience here (11:13-14). Evidently this was done because of the common general cultic and ritual principle implicit within it, the part's relationship to the whole. In this context this concept

functions to underline the fact that God has not rejected His people; his grace expressed in the present remnant within Israel (possibly the idea of remnant in general including the patriarchs is implicit) - the part - indicates that God has not given up on His people, although they have rejected the gospel - the whole.

By demonstrating that the rejection of the gospel by the majority of the Jews does not challenge the grace of God towards Israel, Paul further affirms the validity of his gospel of grace. It is the gospel of a God who is faithful to His promise, and will save according to His grace and mercy. At the same time, Paul affirms his own ministry within this perspective (11:13-14), not to mention his own reception of God's grace (11:1-2).

This text is not as crucial to our thesis as the previous ones considered in Paul's apologetic for the gospel. It has been included for completeness' sake, as well as the fact that it does indicate again that Paul can use cultic language without warning or explanation.

B. The Context: Romans 9-11

Paul is arguing for the continuity of God's saving purpose and activity within Israel that together reveal His faithfulness, and assure Paul that all Israel will be saved, despite any present evidence to the contrary.¹ Part of Paul's argument involves the defining of Israel itself, since Paul begins by stating that *οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, οὗτοι Ἰσραὴλ* (9:6). Paul makes a further distinction in 9:8 that clarifies the distinction in 9:6; it is not the children of the flesh that are

children of God, but the children of the promise that are reckoned for (λογίζεται εἰς) or considered as seed (descendant[s]) (note 9:30-10:13 in light of 4:1-25). Another line of distinction Paul draws is that between the remnant or the elect, and "the rest" of Israel, a distinction that is not only in the present, but was operative in the past (11:1-10).

Paul's answer is an emphatic no to the suggestion that Israel had been rejected by God (11:1); he himself (11:1), and the present remnant (11:5) are proof of this, and Paul has hope for the salvation of Israelites by way of his own ministry (11:13-14), and eschatological hope that all Israel will be saved (11:25). Keeping in mind his definition of Israel that does make interpretation difficult at times, Paul goes on to argue that the mysterious character of God's salvation is due to God's purpose of showing mercy to all (Jews and Gentiles), and not due to unfaithfulness towards or rejection of Israel (11:28-32, a climax to Paul's argument that ends in doxology in 11:33-36).

It is within the latter part of Paul's argument (11:11-32), when he has turned his attention to the relationship between the salvation of Israel and that of the Gentiles, that Paul uses the ἀπαρχὴν - τὸ φύραμα metaphor (11:16a).

C. The OT Background Most Appropriate for Understanding the Metaphor

It is most likely that behind Paul's use of the metaphor is the practice referred to in Num 15:17-21, if not this text specifically. The phrase ἀπαρχὴν φυράματος

ὑμῶν in Num 15:20 and 21² is the only LXX text with the words ἀπαρχή, and φύραμα together. It was the first portion of the dough that was to be separated and presented to the Lord as an offering (15:21).³

The idea that is central in Paul's metaphor, and is taken directly from the cultic ritual referred to, is that the part is connected to the whole. Paul is stating that τὸ φύραμα has a similar status, ἁγία, as ἡ ἀπαρχή. The idea that the part represents the whole, and in that sense is efficacious for the whole is what is behind Paul's transfer of ἁγία from first fruits to the rest of the dough. Paul is not concerned with technical accuracy in his choice of words, but he is reflecting an axiom of cultic ritual. The truth is that God's acceptance of the part is His acceptance of the part as the whole. The offerer, ritually offering the harvest back to God, is now allowed to partake freely of the harvest. This is because God has been given what He requires of it, which in fact demonstrates that all the harvest is His. This was especially poignant, because the land of Israel had been given to the Israelites by God.

C. K. Barrett has observed "that the sanctification of the first-fruit loaf 'de-sanctified' the remainder and so made it available for common use".⁴ Paul has either contradicted this point completely, ignoring the cultic thought, or he is drawing on an aspect of the truth behind the ritual in the light of his argument. It is suggested here that the latter is the case. The point of the metaphor and of Paul's argument is that the acceptance of the part by God in fact indicates His acceptance and

indeed ultimate possession of the whole. The idea of integral connection is continued in the second metaphor, despite the differences that are implicit in the change of image. The integral organic relation between root and branches is similar to the integral cultic relation (in Paul's thought) of the sanctified fruit (part) to the remainder (whole).

D. Paul's Use of ἀπαρχή and ἀπαρχή in 11:16

1. Used in Reference to the Spirit

Paul's other uses of ἀπαρχή reveal that the use in 11:16 is unparalleled in its dependence on the cultic image. Paul speaks of Christians who are hoping for the redemption of the body as those who have τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος (Rom 8:23). As Cranfield suggests, "the Spirit's present work in us is the first fruits, the foretaste and pledge of the full glory which God has in store for us".⁵ Ἀπαρχή is appropriate because of its associations with the holy, and its connotation of the first portion or gift, which in this context gives assurance for the fullness of God's work by His Spirit in the future.

2. Used in Reference to Christians

In Rom 16:5, Epaenetus is greeted and described as ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἁγίας εἰς Χριστόν. This is similar to 1 Cor 16:15, where the house of Stephanus is described as ἀπαρχὴ τῆς Ἀχαΐας (see also 1 Clement 42:4). A fuller framework for viewing these uses of ἀπαρχή by Paul is that of 2 Thess 2:13, where Paul gives thanks because God chose the Thessalonians ἀπαρχὴν εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας. The well attested

reading ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (Aleph, D, Psi, 78, it, sy, sa; Ambst) gives the probable nuance of Paul's use of ἀπαρχή here and in the references above: ἀπαρχή speaks of the first converts, which in Paul's thought are seen as those in Christ, set apart by God or sanctified, so that they are the first portion, as it were, which through the ministry of the gospel, is called upon to obtain the glory of Christ. The use of ἀπαρχή in these contexts implies that these are the first of others within a particular area, and thus the first fruits of the harvest idea seems close at hand. The concept is implicitly eschatological, since Paul has the climax of God's salvation, the glory of Christ, in view. These converts, then, are the harvest of the eschatological ministry of the gospel. It is clear that ἀπαρχή became a term for Christian converts, which did not lose all of its cultic connotations.⁶

3. Used in Reference to Christ

Another use of ἀπαρχή is of Christ as ἀπαρχή (1 Cor 15:20,23), and specifically ἀπαρχὴ τῶν κεκοιμημένων (1 Cor 15:20, see also 1 Clement 24:1). Christ is the first fruit(s) in the sense of being the first and the guarantee of others who will rise from the dead. The idea of first and guarantee of others is significant as we turn our attention back to Rom 11:16.

4. The Distinctiveness of 11:16a

None of the texts above use ἀπαρχή in cultic or sacrificial contexts (unless one considers Rev 14:4 as in such a context). Rom 11:16 is distinctive in that Paul is not using a pregnant word alone, but relying on an image by using a metaphor that gives birth to the meaning which

supports his argument. The image calls for the basic cultic meaning of the word (see Did. 13:3-7, 1 Clement 29:3 [OT quotation] for sacrificial use in Christian documents, and T. Levi 9:7-8,14, T. Judah 21:5, T. Issacher 3:7, 5:4-6 with apocalyptic use of the OT). To further understand the *ἰπαρχή - φύραμα* image we need to look at the context of the phrase, and especially the *ρίζα - κλάδοι* image that is placed next to it.

E. Romans 11:16a in Context

1. Paul's Argument

In 11:11-12 Paul states the inter-related situation of Israel's trespass and the salvation of the Gentiles. With prophetic reflection on history, Paul sees the present hardness upon (a large) part of physical Israel to be the avenue by which salvation reaches the Gentiles, but there will be a fullness for physical Israel (11:12). Paul reasons that if God is able to bring riches out of trespass and failure, how much more will the fullness of Israel be.

In 11:13-14 Paul, in a striking manner, addresses Gentiles directly, and speaks to them concerning how his hope for physical Israel is even reflected in his present ministry. Paul's own ministry seems to fit practically within the historical picture presented (11:11-12). Paul can boast in his ministry (glory in the sense of magnify or make large) in order that through jealousy on account of salvation going to the Gentiles physical Israelites will be saved.

11:15 repeats the thought of 11:11-12, but moves

beyond it by answering what the acceptance of Israel will mean: *ζωὴ ἐκ νεκρῶν*. To say that this statement is disputed is to understate the issue, and we cannot claim to have any new insights for solving the dilemma of whether realized⁷ or apocalyptic eschatology is intended here.⁸ It may be true to say that there is some overlap in these views,⁹ and even if Paul is thinking apocalyptically here, it does not rule out his hope for salvation of some Jews in the present.¹⁰ It is our understanding that the salvation of Jews, in distinction from the experience of hardness, is presented by Paul as a surprising but hoped for last aspect of salvation history, something Paul experiences to a degree in his present ministry. Paul hopes for the salvation of his own people, something that the pattern of salvation-history seems to call for 11:11-12,15. This inclusion of the Jews (in greater measure) in salvation in Christ seems to be the climax of salvation history, which either ante-dates or coincides with the parousia. This is all presented within the framework that God has not rejected physical Israel (11:2,28-29), and He is able according to His plan of mercy (11:30-32) to graft them back into His saved people (11:23, *πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ* 11:26?).

2. The *ρίζη* - *κλάδοι* Metaphor

Paul uses the *ρίζη* - *κλάδοι* image because it speaks of the integral connection between aspects of a living organism that is definable as one entity, and at the same time one aspect of the organism is prior to and supportive of the other. Paul is arguing for a continuity in salvation for Israel, which is seen as certain, because

the certainty of the status of the root, speaking in terms of the metaphor, is by nature and therefore without explanation shared with the branches. Ἄγια is the shared characteristic of root and branches, a term that maintains its basic cultic sense, because it is carried over from the cultic image in 11:16a. The carrying over of the word indicates that this is the centre of Paul's concern. Paul is concerned with God's sanctifying acceptance of Israel, which means their sanctified status.

It is most probable that Paul has Abraham in mind, or the patriarchs collectively, when he uses this image (note 9:5-8, 11:28-29, and 4:1-25[11-17]). There is a definite continuity in God's plan of salvation begun in Abraham. God's promise to Abraham is still true, and the suggestion that God has rejected physical Israel in some ultimate sense is denied completely because of this promise (11:2,28-29).

Scholarly opinion on the whole has recognised Abraham as the probable referent of the root within the root-branches.¹¹ The plant image or God's planting action, including the root image as well, is often used in the OT to speak of Israel (e. g. Isa 5:1-7, 11:1,10 [messianic?], 37:31, 53:2 [messianic?]; Ezek 17:5-10, ch. 31; Ps 79:9-12 LXX, Jer 32:41, Exod 15:17, Mal 3:19), and can have either the implication of God's faithfulness or judgment. It remained as important image in later writings as well (1 Esdr 8:71-87 LXX; 2 Esdr 9:6-15 LXX, Jub. 1:16, 16:26 Abraham, 21:24 Isaac; Pss. Sol. 14:3f.; 1 Enoch 93:2,5,8,10, 10:16, 84:6; 92:8).¹² Paul is appealing to Israel's elect status, which reflects God's gift and call

to the patriarchs (11:28-29). If God has accepted, sanctified, elected the root, then the branches are also accepted, sanctified, elected. The root speaks of definiteness of the gracious work of God, and has the sense of the solid origins of the complete tree. Abraham is thus the root of God's saving activity that continues towards the Jews according to God's promise.

The force of the metaphor is the continuity of God's saving purpose, which does not allow for the idea that God could have rejected His people (11:2, 11:28-29). Even in the present situation, Paul wants to affirm that God is able (11:23 *δυνατός*, we have seen the significance of this word for Paul's thesis) to bring back the cut branches to be grafted again into the olive tree of "all Israel", indeed the righteous by faith. Thus, God's saving power, which is now proclaimed in the gospel to all nations, is still operative within physical Israel, and the present situation in physical Israel does not challenge the gospel, but indicates the glorious breadth of God's plan of mercy.

The extended metaphor indicates Paul's desire to challenge his Gentile readership. Rather than suggesting God's rejection of the Jews, the image declares the Gentiles to be mercifully brought into the people of faith by way of the Jews' failure to believe the gospel. The humility that Paul is calling for is to join with hope in God's ability to bring Jews back within the community of faith. In this respect, the Gentiles should remember that they are a wild olive branch, and the Jews (represented by the patriarchs and Abraham in particular here) are the

root and natural plant.

3. Ἀπαρχή and the Meaning of the Metaphor in 11:16a

We have already considered the basic sense of the Ἀπαρχή - φύραμα metaphor. We must now consider the most probable referent of Ἀπαρχή, and the meaning of the metaphor. First of all, we will mention three alternatives to the interpretation that we prefer.

(1) K. H. Rengstorf sees behind Paul's use of the first fruits image Rabbinic sources that speak of Adam as first fruits.¹³ Rengstorf views 11:16 as part of haggadah, and specifically "rabbinischer Adam-Haggada" (p. 131). Behind Paul's use of Ἀπαρχή is Adam as "eine reine Teighabe für die Welt" (p. 130), and this is significantly juxtaposed to the image of Abraham in 11:16b. Paul is adapting a rabbinic "Theologumenon" (p. 146), which concerns the first man, Adam. The result is that Abraham is essential for Christianity, not only because Christ is descended from Abraham, but because Adam's salvation is bound up with God's purpose for Abraham (pp. 163-164). Paul, in this section affirms the fact that all men need Christ, an argument supported by the idea that mankind's salvation is bound up to Israel's salvation and the Christ of Israel.

Despite the insightful perspective of Rengstorf, it does not seem necessary to appeal to an Adam tradition to account for Paul's use of Ἀπαρχή here. And there remains the problem of whether such a tradition existed as early as Paul's own time. Although we cannot dispense completely with this possible nuance, it does not seem the best in the light of other alternatives.

(2) It has been argued that Paul is thinking of Christ when he uses the word ἀπαρχή.¹⁴ This has been argued on the basis of Paul's use of OT material by A. T. Hanson, and from the point of view of Paul's Christology in Romans by N. T. Wright.¹⁵ The two treatments referred to here are significant, since they both seek to fit 11:16 within a definite framework for understanding Paul's Christological hermeneutic. In neither case is 1 Cor 15:20,23 given as a definite argument for their interpretation, which is good, although we are not ultimately convinced by either view. In short, we have difficulties with Hanson's argument because he has suggested that there is so much behind the two images. It is not clear to us that Rom 11:16 should be connected to 1 Cor 5:6-8, by way of φύραμα, and that Christ as ἀπαρχή should therefore be seen in a sacrificial sense (pp. 113-116). Hanson sees the implications of these images as that the salvation of the people of God goes back to Abraham, but Christ himself is present in that history of salvation (pp. 124-125). For, "whatever God does he does in Christ" (p. 117). It seems to us that there is more direct and verifiable interpretation.

N. T. Wright's perspective is guided by his interpretation of Rom 1:3-4, which indicates that the people of Israel needed to die κατὰ σάρκα as did their Messiah, so as to be raised in the Spirit. Thus, Christ is the "first Jew to rise to new life" (p. 186), which indicates a continuity in God's salvation for His people. Wright ties Rom 9-11 into the argument of the whole letter by way of this hermeneutic, but it seems improbable that

in 11:11-15 Paul sees Israel acting out the death and resurrection of Christ. The equation of Christ with ἀπαρχή (and ρίζα for that matter), may only be suggested as an allusion, if that. Surely the referent is much closer at hand, and is indicated from the immediate context.

(3) It may be that ἀπαρχή has the same referent as ρίζα, and therefore refers to the patriarchs and/or Abraham specifically.¹⁶ The assumption from this perspective is that the two images are parallel in reference, and that Paul is speaking about Israel in relation to the patriarchs, which as 11:28 declares, is "beloved on account of the patriarchs". Agreeing with this interpretation, but emphasizing the place of faith, G. Delling states, "by their membership of the race the first fruits of faith (e. g. Abraham) guarantee the maintenance by the whole (τὸ φύραμα) of its pre-eminent place in the divine plan of salvation".¹⁷ In this case the patriarchs mean for Israel as a whole what, according to Philo, the nation of Israel means to the whole world (Spec. Leg. 2. 162-163 [Loeb 7, pp. 404-407] "it has been set apart out of the whole human race as a kind of first fruits [ἀπαρχή] to the Maker and Father" (Spec. Leg. 4. 180 [Loeb 8, pp. 120-121]). More importantly, Philo goes on to say,

"And the cause of this was the precious signs of righteousness and virtue shown by the founders of the race, signs which survive like imperishable plants, bearing fruit salutary and profitable in every way, even though these descendants themselves be sinners, so long as the sin be curable and not altogether unto death" (Spec. Leg. 4. 181 [Loeb 8, pp. 120-121]).

If one keeps in mind this quotation of Philo, Paul's concern to show that although Israel has stumbled, it has

not fallen, may fit in well with the type of idea that Philo presents concerning a sin "unto death". Within this argumentation the patriarchs are the inseparable guarantee of the continued grace of God, which gives Paul continued confidence and hope for the salvation of the "rest" of Israel. Paul clearly indicates that the stumbling has not been a fall, and therefore the guarantee of promise to Abraham (Rom 4:11-17) must still be assured.

The interpretation above is straightforward, and it has the advantage of viewing the two metaphors as having the same referent, which simplifies matters. Thus, we must allow for its plausibility. Nevertheless, Paul's argument in Rom 9-11 is not that simple, and it may be that the complete equation of the two metaphors in this way is not correct. Also, this interpretation does not take into account Paul's particular use of the word elsewhere, and that may also be a factor in the way this metaphor needs to be viewed. The preceding context (esp. 11:1-15) has not been concerned with the patriarchs, but with the remnant that God has chosen by grace, which is indeed a sign that God's salvation is according to grace (11:5-7). It may be therefore that Paul has this remnant idea in mind in 11:16a, and that there is a slight transition in thought as he moves to the second metaphor, where he focuses on, as it were, Abraham and the patriarchs. Thus, we need to consider this latter possibility as the fourth and preferred interpretation.

(4) We suggest, therefore, that Paul is thinking of the present remnant of Jewish Christians as the ἰσραηλῖται (and implicitly the idea of remnant itself).¹⁸ Barrett

has argued for this view while suggesting that the two images both refer to Jewish Christians (Romans, pp. 216-217), whereas Leenhardt (Romans, pp. 285-287), Bruce (Romans, pp. 216-217), and Cranfield (Romans, vol. 2, pp. 563-566) argue for a transition in Paul's thought. As we noted the main rationale for this position is the preceding context (11:1-15), which clarifies the continued offering of salvation to the Jews by speaking of the remnant that God has maintained, something that is true in the present (11:5). This is reflected in Paul's own concern to win some Jews by way of his own ministry to the Gentiles (11:13-14). The small group of the elect according to grace among the Jews indicates that salvation is still open to the Jews, and it indicates for Paul the potential for a full (or fuller) ingathering. The a fortiori argument of 11:12, and 11:15 assumes that God brought salvation to the Gentiles through the rejection of the Jews and suggests that God will in turn bring a fullness or acceptance to the Jews. The idea of God's continued grace is fundamental to this, and is supported by both metaphors which point to the evidence of God's grace that guarantees future grace and salvation. This continuity is supported by ideas of cultic and organic unity.

We are suggesting, though, that there is a progression in Paul's thought when he moves from the cultic image to the organic image. In 11:16a Paul is thinking of the present remnant of Jews that are elect of grace, and his thought moves to the patriarchs and Abraham as the original remnant chosen by grace. In a sense 11:16a, although it leads into 11:16b, looks back to 11:1-15, and

11:16b looks ahead to 11:17-24.

The cultic metaphor implied is that of Num 15:17-21, and the intricate connection of part to whole is the crucial concept drawn on. The part (first fruits) in this case is the present Jewish-Christian remnant. The whole speaks of the rest of Israel, which has not been rejected by God, although some may be cut off because of lack of faith (11:20-23). The evident elect status of the first ones (in this case a small Jewish-Christian remnant, including Paul) is the guarantee of more being saved, because there is continuity in God's purpose of salvation, which is His sanctifying work. This leads Paul naturally to his broader perspective that he develops in 4:1-25 concerning Abraham, and which frames the discussion in Rom 9-11. Thus, in 16b, Paul proceeds one step by returning to his earlier point (9:6-13), which focused on the patriarchs, who also guarantee God's grace to Israel.

If this is the case, and ἀπαρχή refers to the present Jewish-Christian remnant, then a suggestion can be made as to why Paul may have quickly drawn upon this cultic idea. As we noted above, Paul uses the word ἀπαρχή to speak of Christian converts (Rom 16:5; 1 Cor 16:15; 2 Thess 2:13). He has just spoken of his own ministry in relation to the Jews in 11:13-14, hoping for the salvation of some. Paul may have moved into the casual cultic phrase and metaphor because of this connection between converts and first fruits. Clearly Paul's main point is the part-whole relationship, but we are just suggesting that this may be the reason why Paul may have abruptly used this cultic language before he moves on to his

more expanded argument in 11:16b-24.

F. Conclusion

The cultic language is not crucial to his overall argument, but it does support it. It does illustrate the way Paul can use such language without warning or further explanation, and even in a context where he seems to be addressing Gentiles directly. This needs to be taken into account as one looks at other uses of cultic language, and OT cultic language specifically. Such language was available to Paul, and he did draw upon it for various reasons within his apologetic for the gospel.

Footnotes

¹Paul's attempt to identify the righteous of Israel, indeed those that are really God's people, is in keeping with prophetic and apocalyptic attempts to draw demarcations between the righteous and the wicked. An interesting example of this is in Malachi 3:16-24. We mention this text, because of the following observation that seems true for Malachi, "Malachi sees both a continuity of that covenant between Yahweh and the descendants of Jacob and a narrowing of the community bound by the covenant. Yahweh has remained faithful in spite of his people's sin, even though the covenant community is not the people it had once been" (Steven L. McKenzie, Howard N. Wallace, "Covenant Themes in Malachi", CBQ, 45 (1983) 549-563, p. 559). The writers go on to say, "this narrowing of the covenant is taken a step further in 3:16-21 where . . . the covenant is applied to only the 'righteous' within Israel" (p. 559). In the next paragraph the use of the term "Israel" is noticed. Reference is made to W. J. Drumbrell's argument "that the continued use of the term 'Israel' in postexilic times is a prophetic tendency to project old traditions onto the continuing community" (p. 559). Drumbrell notes concerning Malachi's addressing the oracle to Israel that it is "the prophetic vitality of the theological ideal", and then he states "the address in fact illustrates the bold transference to the rump-state by the post-exilic prophets of the projected ideal" (W. J. Drumbrell, "Malachi and the Ezra-Nehemiah Reforms", RTR 35 (1976) 42-52 (p. 44). Paul reflects on similar traditions at times, in Rom 9-11 in the light of the crisis of Israel's rejection of the gospel.

²As accepted by Rahlf and Brooke/McClean in their texts.

³The word ἀπαρχή in the LXX is usually a translation of א'פ'ר'ח' or א'פ'ר'ח' (HR, p. 118). Very rarely is the word used outside of cultic settings (Deut 33:21; 1 Kgs 10:4; 2 Kgs 1:21; Ps 77:51, 104:36), but in these contexts it speaks of the choice, the best, or first portion of something, except for 1 Kgs 10:4 LXX where ἀπαρχή interestingly refers to two loaves of bread.

The command in Num 15:17-21 does not explicitly mention the cultus itself, rather it declares the simple procedure of the first of the dough in the form of a cake being offered to God when they first eat the bread of the land. The representative first fruits are given to God, allowing for the common consumption of the rest. The same basic principle concerning first fruits is reflected in Lev 23:9-23, which gives the details as to the types of offerings that are to be brought at cultic festivals. Lev 23:9-14 speaks of the presentation of the first fruits of the harvest on the day after the Sabbath of the Feast of Unleavened Bread (also see Num 28:16-25; and for general the practice Exod 23:15, 34:18; Deut 16:3-8; Philo Spec. Leg. 2. 176-187 [Loeb 7, 416-425]). As was true of all the festivals commanded by God, the practice in Num 15:17-21 was to be a continuing practice throughout the generations (Num 15:21). These texts reveal that it did

become a continual practice in Israel, and was connected with the central cultus. Philo's statement suggests this in principle "for he commands that from all the dough of wheat or other grain, the bakers should set apart a loaf as a first portion for the use of the priest" (Spec. Leg. 1. 132 [Loeb 7, pp. 174-175]). Both $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$, (G. B. Gray, Numbers [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903], p. 178.) and $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$ are sacrificial terms, and G. Wenham suggests that $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$ in Num 15:19,20 "is a technical term for a portion given to the priest (cf. Lv. 7:32; Nu. 18:8)" (Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary [Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981], p. 129). Wenham goes on to state that in Num 15:17-21, "the principle of first fruits is brought right into home life: when a housewife makes bread she must set aside a portion for the Lord" (p. 129). This may be linked with more general cultic practice by noting, as does P. Levertoff, that the $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$ is different from the $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$, because it involved human labour in preparation. These offerings "were individual, except that a $\pi\lambda\iota\tau\alpha$ of dough was offered as a heave offering (Num. 15:17-21)" ("First Fruits", ISBE, vol. 2, pp. 307-308, (p. 307). Although removed from the specific legislation of Num 15:17-21, it is good to keep in mind Neh 10:37; and Ezek 44:30, where such offerings are seen in their role as priestly portions. Thus we would suggest that whether one sees the Num 15:17-21 directive as linked with the "redemption of the annual crop" (J. Morgenstern, "First Fruits" IDB, vol. 2, p. 270; Morgenstern does not argue this, we are just using his expression), which took place at the festival of weeks, or just an aspect of the obligation of "every Israelite who possessed the means of agricultural productivity" (B. A. Levine, "First Fruits", EJ, vol. 6, col. 1312-1316, (col. 1312), this practice can be associated with the cultic life of Israel. The festival of weeks seems to have been significant up to the NT period (2 Macc 12:31-32; Tob 2:1; Philo, Spec. Leg. 2. 179-187 [Loeb 7, pp. 418-425], also m. bikkurim 3:2-9 may reflect practice while the Temple was standing), and the principle of first fruits continued. However the practices may have changed in post-exilic times and throughout the diaspora, the principle of offering first fruits remained (Josephus Ant. 16. 172 [Loeb 8, 276-279] Philo, Leg. 156ff., 216, 291ff., 311-320 [Loeb 10] especially in view of Spec. Leg. 2. 220-222 [Loeb 7, pp. 444-445]). And certainly an aspect of this first fruits presentation was the presentation of loaves of bread that represented the first fruits of the harvest (Lev 23:17,20; Philo, Spec. Leg. 2. 179-187 [Loeb 7, pp. 418-425].

⁴Barrett, Romans, p. 216.

⁵Cranfield, Romans, vol. 1, p. 418.

⁶For similar Christian usage, but admittedly varying nuances in context, see Jas 1:18, and Rev 14:4.

⁷Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 346, "eschatologische Prozesse"...."nicht nur ein apokalyptisches Geschehen sondern vor allem die endgültige Heilsgabe"; Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 284-285, citing Luke

19:24-32, and Ezek 37:3-14; Murray, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 83-84.

⁸Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 325, citing Jub. 23:29, and 1 Enoch 51:1; Barrett, Romans, p. 215; Bruce, Romans, p. 216 where Israel's conversion is "immediate precursor of the resurrection, to coincide with Christ's parousia"; Johannes Munck, Christ & Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11, translated by Ingeborg Nixon, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), pp. 126-127; Black, Romans, p. 144; Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 561-563; Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 2, p. 245; Kasemann, Romans, p. 307.

⁹Heinrich Schlier indicates this blurring of the edges between the realized and apocalyptic eschatology (spiritual and historical eschatology) when he speaks of the place of Israel in bringing in eschatological life, the beginning of the resurrection power of God; indeed eschatological salvation is introduced. Schlier sees God's free election of Israel as the issue here Römerbrief, pp. 331-332. Wilckens' emphasis on the continuing role of Israel in God's salvation purpose seems to be correct, and this is clear regardless of how one understands $\pi\alpha\varsigma \text{ Ἰσραὴλ}$ (Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 2, p. 245).

¹⁰Käsemann, Romans, p. 307.

¹¹Käsemann notes that this is the common view, Romans, p. 308. Although there is diversity in views concerning the origin of the root image, most agree on Abraham as the referent intended; see especially Christian Maurer, "ῥίζα", TDNT, vol. 6, pp. 985-990, "In all later Judaism there thus lives on the varied concept of Israel as the plant of God which stems from Abraham and into which the Gentiles may be grafted" (p. 988). W. D. Davies, "Romans 11:13-24. A Suggestion" in Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique; Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon, ed. by A. Benoit, M. Philonenko, C. Vogel, (Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1978) pp. 131-144, (p. 132); and K. H. Rengstorff, "Das Ölbaum-Gleichnis in Rom 11, 16ff.: Versuch einer weiterführenden Deutung", in Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube, ed. by E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978), pp. 127-164.

¹²The references from 1 Enoch express the vindication of Israel as God's righteous people.

¹³Rengstorff, "Das Ölbaum-Gleichnis in Rom 11, 16ff.", pp. 128-135.

¹⁴Barrett, although not supporting this view, allows for it when he says, "it is not impossible that behind the Jewish Christians Paul sees the figure of Christ himself, whom he actually describes as the 'first fruit' in 1 Cor. xv. 20. There is Rabbinic precedent for describing Adam as the 'first-fruit loaf', and as Adam was the head of the old humanity so Christ was the head of the new"

(Romans, p. 216).

¹⁵Anthony T. Hanson, Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology (London: SPCK, 1974), pp. 104-125, and Nicholas Thomas Wright, "The Messiah and the People of God: A Study in Pauline Theology with Particular Reference to the Argument of the Epistle to the Romans" (D. Phil: Oxford, 1980), pp. 183-188.

¹⁶Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 376; Michel, Der Brief an die Römer, p. 357; Murray, Romans, vol. 2, p. 85; Black, Romans, pp. 144-145; Schlier, Römerbrief, p. 332; Käsemann, Romans, p. 308; Wilckens, Der Brief an die Römer, vol. 2, p. 246.

¹⁷Gerhard Delling, "ἄρχω, κτλ", in TDNT, vol. 1, 478-489, (p. 485); also see Hans-Georg Link, and Colin Brown, "Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering", in NIDNTTh, vol. 3, 415-438, (p. 416).

¹⁸Barrett, Romans, p. 216; Leenhardt, Romans, p. 285; Bruce, Romans, pp. 216-217; Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 564.

CHAPTER VI

CULTIC LANGUAGE INTRODUCING THE ETHICS OF THE GOSPEL:

ROMANS 12:1-2

Romans 12:1 has been at the centre of discussion concerning Paul's use of cultic language.¹ R. J. Daly states that it is here "that the sacrificial nature of Christian life is most clearly and emphatically expressed by Paul".² At the same time the verses are very significant within Romans as well.³ With these two aspects of its significance in mind, we consider this text.

A. Summary of Interpretation

The sacrificial language is understandable as an introduction to the paraenetic section of the letter, following naturally from the climax of Paul's argument (11:33-36). The metaphor itself is low in correspondence, describing the quality of the life that the baptised community presents, and using the idea of an acceptable sacrifice to call for ethical responsibility. The distinctiveness of Paul's ethical challenge here is his bringing together of bodily existence and the phrase *τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*. Whatever the particular background of *λογικὴ λατρεία* for Paul, in 12:1 it affirms the significance of life lived in the baptised body, and expresses the true worship that man may offer God (in

contrast to Rom 1:25). The subsequent challenges move away from the cultic description, thus further demonstrating that Paul has finished with his metaphor, and now continues with the ethical emphasis.

The best explanation for the form of these verses is that it represents the equivalent of an exhortation appropriate to a baptismal setting. Paul is now calling for response from the justified-baptised believer, and this is his summary exhortation before the paraenesis. One can see the parallel between the presentation of a sacrifice and the baptismal presentation and the implications thereof, something already foreshadowed by Rom 6:3-13. These connections are not, however, exploited by Paul at this point. The common factor (between baptism and sacrifice), being ritual activities which are both associated with obedience and devotion, makes the use of sacrificial language natural and even more suggestive. It must be remembered that the focus is on the life of the baptised one, and not the baptism, just as Paul's focus is on the quality of the sacrifice and not on its presentation. This is the point of comparison that Paul wants to make.

There need not be any direct connection between the cultic language in 12:1 and the cultic description of the death of Christ. Although the significance of the death of Christ may not be far removed from Paul's thought, it is clear that Paul does not draw direct connections in 12:1-2, nor is the text overtly Christological. Despite the transformation and renewal language in 12:2, Paul's thought is not mystical at this point, but ethical within

an eschatological perspective. Furthermore, λογικὴ λατρεία reveals Paul's defence of authentic worship, which is the devoted lives of the baptised believers. It is the active response of the community to the gospel issuing in a God-pleasing quality of life that Paul wants.

Paul uses cultic language in an almost apologetical manner to describe and affirm the call of the gospel. It is his call, indeed it is the purpose and result of his ministry to bring about the offering of the Gentiles (15:16). 12:1-2 is Paul's direct exhortation to the community at Rome to be a part of a sacrifice that is the acceptable response to the gospel. The paraenesis that follows 12:1-2 directs by way of Christian ethics how this sacrifice should be offered.

It is admitted that the cultic language is rhetorical, but this does not exhaust its relevance. Such rhetoric is chosen carefully. It fits within Paul's purpose of gospel and self-presentation in the letter.

Lastly, because of Paul's emphasis, it is difficult to assess his perspective on the cultus from this use of cultic language. Paul is not making any point about the cultus itself. Although he authenticates a basically cultless religion, he is not criticising the Jerusalem cultus directly. At the same time, there is no evidence that Paul taught that special respect for the Jerusalem cult was due, except for recognising the historic privilege of the worship of Israel (9:4). The language is used to affirm the authenticity of the gospel, and the need for the response of obedience to it. Such a response is indeed λογικὴ λατρεία, but this stands in comparison to

the depraved worship of man (Rom 1:25). Paul's gospel summons people out of this situation, and leads them to authentic worship.⁴

B. The Context: Paraenesis in Romans

If W. Wuellner is correct in viewing 1:18-15:13 as a unity, giving it the label "Confirmatio", then we need to attribute to 12:1-15:13 its due significance within the argument in the letter.⁵ His perspective on the place of the paraenesis in Romans is persuasive. Wuellner does consider and use the formal rhetorical label "digression" for the section of the letter, but this in no way denies its importance.⁶ This does not minimize the fact that "Rom. 12:1-15:13, spells out the practical commitment of those who took part in the argumentation."⁷ At the same time it is an "exemplum or paradigm of Paul's basic thesis."⁸ The relevance of Rom 12:1-2 to the thesis of Paul's letter has been noted by V. P. Furnish, "Rom. 12:1-2 is but the restatement, now to be sure, in an explicitly hortatory mode and context, of the theme which had already been emphasized in 1:16-17."⁹ Furnish elaborates on this point by stating,

"The exhortation of Rom. 12:1-2 and the specific appeals which are thus introduced summarize and focus the whole preceding argument. The first verses of chap. 12 offer a fresh statement, now in the imperative mood, of what it means to receive by faith the revealing of God's righteousness (1:16-17)." (footnote 10)

The discussion below will seek to indicate that it is correct to view the paraenesis, and Rom. 12:1-2, as relevant to Paul's purpose and presentation in the letter. This can be shown without proving that each ethical directive is somehow developed with a particular theological

statement in mind. Rather, it is the relevance of the paraenesis in general that is our concern, and therefore the relevance of Rom 12:1-2 as the transition to and introduction to the paraenesis.

D. G. Bradley has noted two kinds of ethical teachings within a letter context; that which deals with specific problems, and that which is more general.¹¹ Structured paraenesis is common in the Pauline corpus (Rom 12:1-15:13; Gal 5:13-6:10; 1 Thess 4:1-12, 5:1-22; Col 3:1-4:6; and Eph 4:1-6:18), and it may include general ethical instructions, as well as directives particularly relevant to the community addressed.¹²

Our interests are not served by precisely defining the form of paraenesis within this framework, nor in general do we think that such a form can be narrowly defined. Paul's diversity, creativity, and emphases must not be overlooked.¹³ Even distinctions between general and particular in the paraenesis need to be viewed carefully, and without needless emphasis, since they both function as ethical directives within the community addressed. For instance, although differences can be suggested between Rom 12-13, and Rom 14:1-15:13, the function of the directives in each would be similar.

The main concern here is to look at the function and significance of the paraenesis as a whole within the letter to the Romans. The purpose of such paraenesis must be seen within the overall purpose of Pauline letters, and the particular purpose of the letter to Rome. W. Wuellner's work on rhetoric in Romans lends support to the idea that the paraenesis in Romans functions as Paul's

"appeal to commitment" to his gospel, and therefore his ministry.¹⁴ This is expressed in a call to obedience or a type of lifestyle that is a paradigm response to the gospel, although it is directed at least in outline to the Christian fellowship(s) in Rome.

We have noted that Paul is introducing himself in the letter as well as his gospel. A clear purpose in the letter is the establishing of his authority as apostle. It has been suggested that the very inclusion of such paraenesis assumes authority and in fact declares it.¹⁵ There is a call for recognition of Paul's authority implicit in the giving of such paraenesis, and the expectation of response. This seems to be the case especially in Romans. Paul's reference to his *χάρις* in 12:3, at the beginning of his paraenesis, is unique in the Pauline corpus. One needs also to keep in mind the apologetic for writing that follows the ethical section in 15:14-21. Here again Paul refers to the *χάρις* given to him by God, after mentioning the fact that he has written boldly (*ἀπὸ μέρους*); "somewhat boldly", or more likely "boldly in parts". If the second translation is preferred, then Paul's paraenesis, which he has just finished, may be in part what he is referring to. Introducing paraenesis with a reference to Paul's grace, following the language of worship in 12:1-2 probably indicates that the passing on of paraenesis was not done lightly. Presenting paraenesis may also indicate that Paul has the same authority and stands in the tradition of those that passed on the traditions that he is supplementing (1:8, 6:17, 15:14, 16:17-19). If we keep in mind that Paul needed to establish a

firm relationship with the readership at Rome, then both the care in presenting the paraenesis and the very act of doing so to a community that he has not ministered in can be explained.

J. L. White refers to the use of paraenesis as "A fourth medium of Paul's authority",¹⁶ which is one aspect of how Paul refers "to one or another aspect of his apostolic presence".¹⁷ White states concerning paraenesis,

"In this portion of the letter literary authors argued persuasively with reference to the broader claims of the tradition. Similarly, Paul appears to bring the full weight of the Christian apostolic tradition to bear upon the more specific claims of the letter by his use of paraenesis. This aspect of Paul's apostolic presence indicates that his authority was not primarily individualistic or esoteric in intent." (footnote 18)

White believes that by nature paraenesis is not as situational as some other displays of apostolic authority, but "is general in intent and shows the relevance of Paul's situational types of advice in connection with the preparation of Gentile congregations for the day of Christ."¹⁹ The letter ministers to the groups in Rome in much the same way as if he had been there, including the paraenesis.

As one views the close of the ethical section (15:7-13), it is difficult not to think that Paul has tied his paraenesis into the overall purpose of the letter. Paul calls the people of God to maturity and unity in Christ, the Christ who was the servant of the circumcision (15:8), and the means of hope for the nations (15:9-13). This is teaching that Paul presents on the basis of the grace given him (12:3, 15:14-16). Thus when Paul introduces this section with liturgical language, we are made aware

of the significance of this ethical exhortation (12:1-2). It has been suggested that this section is actually "the goal of the letter", for which the earlier chapters serve as preparation.²⁰ This may be too strong a claim, but it seems clear that the paraenesis is crucial within the whole purpose of the letter. It is necessary to emphasize that the paraenesis is functioning most distinctively in a letter written to a community to which Paul has not ministered.²¹

C. Exegesis of 12:1-2

Our attention above was occupied with the fact that 12:1-2 introduces paraenetic material. These verses are just as much linked with the previous material and act as a unifying bridge between both. The connection has been discussed in terms of response or obedience to grace or the gospel²², relation of ethics to theology²³, application of previous discussion²⁴, exhortation based on previous material (especially chapters 5-8),²⁵ and as exhortation taking the place of dogmatic teaching,²⁶ among others.

1. Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ

It is best to see 12:1-2 as guiding the reader and listener from the argument in 1:18-11:36 as a whole to the paraenesis. There are affinities with a number of the previous sections in the letter, and this cautions against viewing 12:1-2 as being a response to one section of the letter.²⁷ Undoubtedly, the doxology in 11:33-36, following the conclusion to the crucial argument in 9-11 (the conclusion being 11:25-32), would appropriately lead

to the use of liturgical language declaring the due response to God's merciful plan of salvation.²⁸ 11:33-36 can be viewed as a doxology that concludes the whole section (1:18-11:36). There is no need to limit the οὖν of 12:1 to the immediate argument. C. Evans suggests in agreement with Lietzmann that the οὖν is "unaccented", and using Lietzmann's words (translated) he views οὖν as "((only a formal particle of transition to fresh ideas set forth without transition))".²⁹ Evans states this because he wants to emphasize the general connection between the sections without suggesting the connection of "particular ethics" to "particular dogmatics".³⁰ At the same time the quote from Lietzmann may suggest that too careful a distinction may have been drawn between a formal-transitional use and a transitional-inferential use of οὖν in this context. Οὖν indicates a new section of material and a new mode of presentation, and it indicates an inferential exhortation based on the preceding material.³¹

Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί indicates the change of mode in communication to direct appeal, or exhortation.³² 15:30, and 16:17 should be kept in mind as one thinks of the importance of this section. In 15:30 Paul calls for supportive prayer for the ministry ahead. The use of παρακαλῶ in 16:17 introduces a final exhortation which appeals to the strength of the Roman tradition and obedience, but calls them to be alert to the problems of division and diversion. The latter, although not an uncommon apostolic concern, may indicate Paul's perception of the situation at Rome: a firm basis of teaching, but the present potential for divisions and loss of

strength.³³ This may be influential in the emphases within Paul's paraenesis.

Frequent uses of παρακαλῶ by Paul indicate its importance in what he is seeking to communicate in his letters by way of exhortation.³⁴ Carl J. Bjerkelund's careful study, Parakalo. Form Funktion und Sinn der Parakalo - Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen, provides a number of conclusions concerning Paul's usage that we should note.³⁵ 1) The form arose in the Greek world and appeared in both Greek and Jewish literature.³⁶ 2) Paul's use in Philemon sets the basis for understanding: παρακαλῶ instead of ἐπιτίσιω. 3) The παρακαλῶ - phrase used is not intrinsic to paraenesis, but is epistolary, bringing in a new section.³⁷ Thus it has a structural purpose in the letter. 4) Bjerkelund sees implied in the παρακαλῶ - phrase a recognition of the moral posture and reasoning of the community addressed, and Paul's recognition of their independence. Bjerkelund argues in relation to the παρακαλῶ - phrase in Rom 12:1-2 that it is not part of the paraenesis, but is a form of beseeching that catches up earlier themes, especially in chapters 9-11 (along with O. Michel).³⁸ At the same time 12:1 is not a deduction from preceding chapters,³⁹ but part of the letter structure that links both parts.⁴⁰ Important to Bjerkelund's thesis is the difference between 12:3 and 12:1, with 12:3 being the beginning of the paraenesis and expressing the authority.⁴¹ Also significant is Bjerkelund's perspective on Paul's ethics as directional as opposed to situational,⁴² and his interpretation of 12:1-2 as Paul's appeal to the power of judgment in the

community.⁴³

Our response to Bjerkelund's study must be limited to the uses of παρακαλῶ in Romans. The structural importance of the παρακαλῶ - phrase is clear in Romans (12:1, 15:30, and 16:17). Also each one of these uses is separate from the main section of paraenesis, which indicates the word's independence from the paraenetic form. Thus we agree with Bjerkelund on these points. But, his emphasis on Paul's use of the παρακαλῶ - phrase in Philemon needs to be questioned. The contrast between παρακαλῶ and ἐπιτάσσει indicates that Paul does not present a legal structure to Christian ethics. But parallels between Philemon and Romans need to be viewed with suspicion, since the nature of the two letters is vastly different, and the phrase occurs in different parts of the letters. Although the contrast between authoritative command and brotherly appeal is made explicit in Philemon, the appeal in Romans is more directly based upon the gospel presented. Although the phrase need not have an authoritarian tone to it, it seems that Cranfield is right when he suggests that there is a "note of authority".⁴⁴ He states, "it denotes the authoritative summons to obedience issued in the name of the gospel".⁴⁵ 12:1-2 must not be separated from the contexts that it joins. If Paul clearly presents material that presupposes authority, then to insist on the significance of the lack of appeal to authority in 12:1-2 may be splitting hairs, since 12:3 follows. Bjerkelund's emphasis on the community's power of judgment as significant in understanding the basis of Paul's appeal is not really crucial in this matter, nor

is Paul's emphasis one of comfort or appeal to Christian mutuality. The use of παρακαλῶ does not take away from the strength of the appeal. Although 12:1-2 is a structural link in the letter, it is definitely appropriate as an introduction to a section of paraenesis. Furthermore, the directional, rather than situational, nature of Paul's paraenesis says little about the authority implicit in the giving of either, and the dichotomy is unnecessarily drawn for the purposes of this argument.

Thus, Bjerkelund's study, for all the worth of its general conclusions, needs to be carefully re-evaluated within the context and purpose of Romans. Within this setting the phrase is a strong appeal, on the basis of the gospel already presented, a gospel which binds Paul and his readers together.

Διὰ τῶν οἰκτιρῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ is part of the rhetorical appeal. H. Schlier views "das Erbarmen Gottes" as the primary subject and the apostle as secondary in the appeal to the community.⁴⁶ Schlier's emphasis on the mercy of God appealing through Paul, in parallel with Christ working through Paul, does lay stress on words that may be too quickly put aside as rhetorical embellishment.⁴⁷ But, more important is the rarity of such a phrase in the Pauline corpus. The theocentric nature of the διὰ - phrase most likely reflects the theocentric argument of the whole letter, and especially the concern just concluded. The plural abstract noun οἰκτιρῶν,⁴⁸ within the διὰ - phrase, points back to Paul's argument, although it is undoubtedly as rhetorically significant as it is theologically. The whole argument stands behind

this change to the hortatory mood. There is no need to isolate one section of the letter as the most significant⁴⁹, since the climax of the argument occurred in the preceding verses (11:25-32). (Uses of ἔλεος, 9:23, 11:31; ἐλεέω, 9:15,16,18, 11:30,31,32; and οἰκτιρῶ, 9:15 point to the place of the immediate climax in Paul's mind. There is no need to separate this section from the rest of the letter though.)

2. Παροστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν
εὐάρεστον τῇ Θεῷ,

Paul's exhortation is given in two parts with the second part consisting of contrasting directives. The first part displays the significant use of cultic language: παροστήσαι τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν θυσίαν ζῶσαν ἁγίαν εὐάρεστον τῇ Θεῷ, τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.

Παρίστημι with θυσία is a common way of saying "present a sacrifice". This is true in "extra-biblical Greek", whereas the closest the LXX readings get to this meaning is priestly or levitical service or presentation (e. g. Deut 17:12, 18:5,7; Jud 4:14, 11:13).⁵⁰ Paul's use of the words παρίστημι, and παριστάνω reflects diversity (Rom 6:13,13,16,19, 12:1, 14:10, 16:2; 1 Cor 8:8; 2 Cor 4:14, 11:2; Eph 5:27; Col 1:22,28; also 2 Tim 2:15, 2 Tim 4:17). An important set of occurrences are presented in 6:13-19, although sacrificial language is not explicit. (One may see this implied in chapter 6, because of 7:4, and 8:10, but it is not clear.) In 12:1, though, the presentation is sacrificial with τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν entering the consecrated realm of that which is given completely to God. Παρίστημι is the action Paul calls for, an action that may have both priestly and sacrificial connotations,

since the sacrifice involves self-presentation. It is this nature of the sacrifice that allows for the two-fold connotation, a sacrifice consisting of the appropriate bodily existence of those baptised into Christ Jesus.

$\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ refers to the whole selves, the persons, the individuals' concrete lives. These are the victims, so to speak, in this presentation of a sacrifice. Cranfield states, "The Christian is to offer to God himself entire - himself in the whole of his concrete life."⁵¹ R. J. Daly comments concerning the concreteness of Paul's image using $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$, noting that it is "more material in emphasis than Greek religious thought."⁵² R. Jewett suggests in a summary fashion that "presenting the bodies as a sacrifice means to place them entirely in God's service and under his rule."⁵³ Jewett, furthermore, sees Hebrew sacrificial thought as lying behind the image, with the sacrifice being placed completely at "God's disposal."⁵⁴ (Jewett considers the emphasis on the living body to be a counter to "enthusiastic-gnostic theology prevalent in Corinth", and "pneumatic libertinism in Rome".⁵⁵) Paul's image does seem to bring together ethical and cultic thought in a particularly concrete way, having a Hebrew flavour, but not dependent upon a specific OT image. Thus, whatever the specific source of Paul's imagery, the use of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ seems to place it firmly outside of a strictly philosophical or mystical approach to sacrifice which Paul could have drawn on. The image is too concrete for dependence on such sources.

Käsemann has suggested great significance to the use of $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ here. $\Sigma\omega\mu\alpha$ represents "our being in relation to

the world"⁵⁶, which leads Käsemann to see a close relationship between 12:1 and 12:2. Käsemann views the cultic "transposed into eschatology" here, a baptismal exhortation "in which levitical demands are simultaneously adopted and adapted".⁵⁷ He sees Paul's application as emphasizing the rule of God over the lives of the bodies involved. Despite Kasemann's insightful theological perspective on *σῶμα*, it does seem sufficient to stress its appropriateness to a cultic setting, and to see it as referring to the persons that Paul is addressing, in their bodily existence.

A key factor in understanding Paul's use of *σῶμα* here is his use of the plural, whereas *Θυσία* is singular. The plural seems to emphasize the literal and individual referent of the word *σῶμα*. Each one of the *ἀδελφοί* is exhorted therefore to present himself, in his concrete bodily existence. Other factors behind the use of *σῶμα* here will have to be evaluated further after we have considered more of the text.

Paul's use of the word *Θυσία* is limited (Rom 12:1, 1 Cor 10:18; Phil 2:17, 4:18; Eph 5:2). This is the only time it is used within a direct exhortation.⁵⁸ The use of *Θυσία* in Phil 4:18 describes the gift that Paul received from the Philippians in a way that undoubtedly bespeaks his thankfulness, and also the goodness of such a gift. Such a gift was pleasing to God as were fragrant and acceptable sacrifices.

Phil 2:17 is a difficult text because of the grammatical construction *ἐπὶ τῇ Θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν*, but it seems to parallel Rom 15:16 as a cultic

description of Paul's ministry. The main question is the relationship of the hendiadys τῆ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ to the genitive τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν . Fine grammatical distinctions may be impossible in view of the ambiguity of the phrase, but it seems that the θυσίᾳ must be related to the πίστις of the Philippians.⁵⁹ Thus, even if Paul's sacrificial service is in mind, as in Rom 15:16, the sacrifice itself is the result of such service, which means that the sacrifice is the faith of the Philippians. If this is the case, then we are viewing a comparison similar to that in Rom 12:1. In Rom 12:1, though, the image is introducing the paraenesis to follow with the tenor of the implied metaphor involving bodily Christian existence. The use of θυσίᾳ in Phil 2:17 indicates the response to or result of Paul's ministry. The emphasis and vocabulary are different, but there is conceptual similarity. If Rom 12:1 represents the response the gospel demands, and for which Paul appeals, then the parallel is significant.⁶⁰

The most significant parallel outside of Paul's own use of θυσίᾳ is that in 1 Peter 2:5.⁶¹ Here, the elect (1:1) are living stones (2:4), identified with the living stone which was rejected by men but elect and precious with God. They are being built into a spiritual dwelling οἶκος πνευματικὸς to be a holy priesthood offering spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ:

ἡς ἑρᾶτευμα ἕγιον ἀνευέγκαι πνευματικῶς
 θυσίᾳ εὐπροδέκτος [τῷ] θεῷ διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
 (2:5). The spiritual sacrifices are not specified, but are an extension of the image of a holy priesthood, which in fulfilling their responsibilities offer such

sacrifices. As such, the sacrificial image flows from the priestly description, and would seem to speak of lives and/or actions consistent with divine election in Christ.⁶² Its presence in a section on purity and maturity (1:13-2:10), and the subsequent exhortations beginning with ἄλλα πητοῦ, παρακαλῶ (2:11), suggest this ethical emphasis.⁶³

It is interesting to note the undeveloped nature of Paul's use of cultic language in Rom 12:1 in comparison to 1 Peter 2:5. There is no explicit description of the presenters as priests, and the idea of a dwelling place or Temple is lacking.⁶⁴ There is no mention of the mediating role of Christ, and the emphasis is on the appeal itself based on the mercy of God. Thus the image is not tied into a Christological frame in any way, but is framed by the appeal and the complimentary directives to follow (12:2).

The use of *Θυσία* in this context takes on an ethical significance, as the three descriptive phrases, the surrounding appeal, and the paraenesis to follow indicate. It is what is done in the body that makes the presentation of the bodies a corporate sacrifice. The thought is similar to that in Hebrews 10:5-14 in the sense that the body offered in accordance with the will of God is the sacrifice. In parallel to the obedience of Christ (in Heb 10:5-14), here it is the obedience of the Christian in the body that is called for. This corporate bodily life of obedience is the tenor of Paul's metaphorical language, and is thus the sacrifice that Paul is encouraging.⁶⁵ This presentation of the body for a life of obedience is

preliminary and complimentary to the commands in 12:2, which result in the proving and discerning (in a complete sense) of what the will of God is.⁶⁶ Thus, *Θυσία*, in the context of the image presented, has ethical significance.⁶⁷

The juxtapositioning of *Θυσία* to *ζῶσα* creates a certain degree of tension in the meaning, revealing that Paul is applying cultic terms metaphorically, and creating a new type of cultic image at the same time. *Ἅγιος* and *ἐνάρπτος τῷ Θεῷ* are interesting because these words are appropriate in both ethical and cultic contexts. Thus, although these descriptive words should be translated together modifying *Θυσία*,⁶⁸ *ζῶσα* stands out because it is the most surprising dictional aspect of the cultic language, and will prove to reveal a particular Pauline emphasis. The fact that the sacrifice is a living one, suggests that Paul is not pursuing a martyrological theme. It is living in response to the gospel, not dying, that he is concerned with. One has to consider the theological implications, therefore, of the living character of this sacrificial "victim".

ζῶσα and *ζωνή* are used significantly in Romans, beginning with 1:17.⁶⁹ Cranfield suggests that the sacrifice "is to be 'living' in a deep theological sense", since in fact when sacrifices were offered they were living, and the contrast of dead and living sacrifices is hardly "worth mentioning".⁷⁰ If this is the case, then we are dealing with what may be a carefully created liturgical introduction that has used significant words in the letter. If this is a Pauline creation that takes into

account the content of the letter, it is not clear how or in what way a word like ζῶσα has been infused with theological significance. The trilogy of descriptive terms suggests that they are not to be considered at length individually, but together give a further picture of what the nature of this sacrifice is. At the least, the use of ζῶσα with θυσία, describing the presentation of τὰ σῶματα ὑμῶν clarifies the fact that this sacrifice involves bodily living, or existence. It is living to the Lord (14:8), indeed serving Christ according to the directives of the Kingdom that is pleasing to God (14:18). This would seem to be the emphasis in the use of the word ζῶσα at this point, although we must consider the broader context.

Within Romans there is great significance to "life" in a theological sense. The death-life construct is crucial in Paul's understanding of justification and salvation, and acts as the paradigm (at times with the help of the image of Christian baptism) for Christian experience and obedience.⁷¹ Life is possible because of the death and resurrection life of Christ, and is identified with the Spirit who is already at work in the Christian, giving life proleptically before his glorious involvement in the final redemption of the body (Rom 8:2-23).

Thus, a number of factors need to be kept in mind when evaluating what ζῶσα may mean in this context. We have already noted that ζῶσα is one of a trilogy of descriptive words that are used. This should warn against deriving from it a lot of theological significance that is

not clear from the immediate context. It is important also that the word ζῶσα is in agreement with θυσία; and not τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν. The fact that death is the end of a sacrifice does suggest that there is significance to the continued existence, the on-going life of this sacrifice, which is the life of the "victims" themselves. As Christians, ἀδελφοί, any self-presentation to God will be part of that life which is commensurate with and the result of justification by faith (Rom 1:17). The Christian life is also dependent on the life that has been granted through faith and baptism in Christ, and the presence of the Holy Spirit.⁷² These ideas are presupposed, though, and may not be the stress of the word in context. Here the stress is on the distinctiveness of a unified sacrifice (singular) made up of the lives of the community members addressed. One is easily drawn to the use of ζῶσα and πνευματικός in 1 Peter 2:5, where the living nature of the stones of God's real dwelling and the spiritual nature of acceptable sacrifices are emphasized. These qualities are dependent on the life of the rejected stone, Christ himself, and His mediation that allows the spiritual sacrifices to be rendered to God acceptably (1 Peter 2:4-5).⁷³ The use of ζῶσα, and πνευματικός in 1 Peter 2:4-5 does not directly criticise ritual practice, but such a criticism is implied. The same may be said for the use of ζῶσα in Heb 10:20, and even in 7:25, 9:14,17. The permanent, final, and sufficiently efficacious is declared in contrast to the limited, temporary, and therefore insufficient. When one remembers the use λογικὴ λατρεία in Rom 12:1, the same type of implicit

comparison may be being made. This is more probable when Paul's reference to the corrupt worship of man is kept in mind (1:25). This reference may suggest that Paul's critique is not at the level of cultic practice itself, but more fundamental, the nature of real worship. This more basic concern to describe real worship may be reflected in Paul's description of his own service *λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου* (1:9). Furthermore, in a context where traditional vocabulary is used (2:29), Paul speaks of *πνεῦμα* in such a way as to implicitly authenticate the experience of the real Jew. Thus when one considers the role of "life" within Paul's argument in Romans, the possibility that *ζωή* acts to further stress the authentic nature of this sacrifice is plausible, especially when such passages as 1 Peter 2:1-10, and Hebrews chapters 7, 9, and 10 are kept in mind. The sacrifice is living, real, and authentic, as opposed to those that are dead, and meaningless and inauthentic in comparison. This is not the false worship of Rom 1:25, but the *λογικὴ λατρεία* of a community baptised into the death and resurrection of Christ. This language need not say anything directly against the cult itself; it is a matter of implicit comparison. Paul's reference in Rom 9:4 would seem to rule out total disrespect for the cultus in the life of Israel. But it must be said that Paul is not only adapting cultic language, he is using language that implies criticism of the limitation of the cult (see excursus). The response to God, as declared by Paul's gospel, is a complete one that involves true worship. This is what Paul is going to talk about in ethical terms, as mentioned above; living to

the Lord (14:8), serving Christ (14:18), and glorifying God together in unity (15:7-12).

The use of ἅγιος,⁷⁴ and εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ further indicates Paul's emphasis on the nature of this sacrifice presented. One has to consider whether the cultic significance of ἅγιος is here being emphasized, or if the ethical is being stressed. A continued metaphorical use of language would allow for the maintenance of this type of tension. In view of the following λογικὴ λατρεία, it seems that Paul is still using metaphorical language, even if it is a recognised spiritualised use of cultic language. The ethical meaning seems to be an appropriate extrapolation on the cultic in this setting. The sacrifice is to be totally given to God, totally devoted for and to his use. For Paul, the state of being ἅγιος,⁷⁵ or the actions associated with it, involves the call of God (1:7), the presence and work of the Holy Spirit (15:16), and the active personal response of the Christian expressed in bodily slavery to righteousness (6:19,22). It is this latter aspect of holiness that Paul probably has in mind here. It is the presentation of bodies whose members have been committed to doing actions commensurate with righteousness that justifies its description as holy (6:19). Lives that are serving God and bearing fruit are those that lead to final sanctification (6:22). It is kingdom living in the Holy Spirit (14:17), the service of Christ (14:18) that is pleasing to God, and can be described with the cultic and ethical word ἅγιος.⁷⁶ Käsemann states that the sacrifice is "called holy, not in an ethical sense....., but as open to God's present time

and manifesting this".⁷⁵ This he says after having suggested that these predicates of the sacrifice are "originally cultic" but "are now transposed into eschatology".⁷⁶ But, it is unlikely that Paul transfers a concept of cult time or moment into an eschatological sanctifying of life lived in the body, without there being an ethical dimension implied. This idea seems to lie behind Cranfield's response to Käsemann, when he insists, pace Käsemann, that "an ethical significance is included".⁷⁷ Indeed to separate eschatology from ethics at this point is unfair to the eschatological structures that are clearly a part of Paul's ethical teaching (13:11-14, 15:8-12). The "polemic" nature of the text that Käsemann sees determining this non-ethical and eschatological emphasis is what we have referred to above in relation to the use of ζῶσα.⁷⁸ The word ἄγιος does act to authenticate the sacrifice as we observed above in relation to ζῶσα, but likewise ἄγιος has its relevance in relation to Christian living.

This would seem to be supported further by the use of εὐάρεστον τῷ θεῷ to follow. Although this is appropriate within a cultic setting, and develops theologically from the acceptance of sacrifices,⁷⁹ the phrase is common to ethical sections and uses of cultic language that affirm particular actions (Phil 4:18).⁸⁰ The fact that Paul moves away from cultic vocabulary (on the whole) in 12:2 but uses λογικὴ λατρεία immediately after does suggest that the phrase is used because of its appropriateness in both a cultic and non-cultic context. Again, the authentic nature of this sacrifice is re-inforced by

this phrase affirming God's pleasure with it. It also directs the readers, *ἀδελφοί*, to think in terms of their responsibility to God. The corporate sacrifice of the bodily existence of the community is to be offered in an acceptable way to God.

A cultic motif in the introduction to a section of ethics is not surprising in general. Cultic language was appropriate within an ethical context in Greco-Roman texts of the period, not to mention the OT, and the literature of intertestamental and early rabbinic Judaism (see footnote 81 and excursus at the end of the chapter). This was due to the critique of sacrifice itself, and the growth of the varying ethical traditions. At the same time, Paul's particular image of presenting bodies as a living sacrifice is unprecedented. The image is distinctive in the Pauline corpus as well. He does use cultic language in contexts where such usage could be labelled as ethical (1 Cor 3:16f., 5:7-9, 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16; Phil 4:18; Eph 5:2).⁸² But the distinctive aspect of 12:1 is the presentation of bodies being described sacrificially. The fact that this is Paul's direct exhortation, and receives further emphasis because of the descriptive phrase *τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*, makes this image that much more distinctive.

3. *τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν*

The phrase *λογικὴ λατρεία* is a summary statement or term that captures the significance and implication of the sacrifice described. This phrase is more than liturgical summary. It is appositional "to the idea of the sentence"⁸³, affirming the exhortation given. The phrase

reminds one of language used in contexts where the non-literal and metaphorical uses of sacrificial language are found (e. g. T. Levi 3:5,6; Corp. Herm. 1:31, 13:18, 19; Disc. 8-9 6:57 [see excursus]). Paul's language could designate noble, spiritual, or real worship emphasizing the mind and the supra-physical, implicitly questioning the value of traditional worship or sacrifice that lacks philosophical illumination.⁸⁴ This is not Paul's particular emphasis, though, despite the fact that Paul's use of such a phrase to clarify and affirm the authentic spiritual nature of the response to his exhortation may indicate that he is aware of critiques of sacrifice. At the same time, describing the presentation of bodily existence as in some sense constituting reasonable worship or service by means of the metaphorical use of sacrificial language is unique in the relevant literature.⁸⁵ Thus, Paul's usage is distinctive and his own nuance in the use of the phrase *λογικὴ λατρεία* must be pursued.

Paul does not use *λογικός* elsewhere. A word with some overlap in meaning, *πνευματικός*, does occur often in the Pauline corpus,⁸⁶ including three uses in Romans (1:11, 7:14, 15:27). *Πνευματικός* is used twice in Romans when a contrast is made between flesh and spirit (7:14, 15:27). It may be that Paul did not want to use *πνευματικός*, because it may have suggested the appropriation of an eschatological body (1 Cor 15:44,46), or some type of pneumatic understanding of worship in the body that may have been far removed from Paul's emphasis here.⁸⁷ But Paul is not using flesh/spirit language in this context. He is using an unusual combination of

cultic words that leads into a stylized text (12:2) that has a number of rare words.⁸⁸ Thus, more likely than that Paul is actually avoiding the use of πνευματικός is the view that λογικός may be more consistent with Paul's thought at this point and is used consciously for that reason. Paul continues on in 12:2 to call for the transformation of the readers through the renewing of the mind. With this type of emphasis, complementary to the thought in 12:1, it is understandable that λογικός would be used. There is no reference to πνεῦμα in 12:2. The νοῦς is the focal point of the renewing process. One is reminded of 1:28, and God's giving over of mankind to a worthless or corrupt mind. In either context, Paul's language is ethically oriented with the νοῦς as the determiner of actions. (In neither context does the role of the Spirit receive mention).

Another text that may be of help in discerning the meaning of λογικός is 1 Peter 2:2. In a context filled with cultic language, spiritual in the phrase "spiritual unadulterated milk" transfers the image of babies drinking milk directly to the Christian sphere that it seeks to describe. Thus, we are speaking of a spiritual feeding, and a spiritual milk which is the pure teaching of the word (1:25). Implicit here is not only "spiritual" in the sense of non-literal, but authentic and real for the realm of salvation. It is interesting that λογικός is used in relation to teaching and growth (1:25-2:2), whereas πνευματικός is used to "spiritualize" house and sacrifices in 2:5. It may be that the reference to λόγος (1:23) and the exhortation that implies learning may have

directed in the use of λογικός here, because it implies the growth of the Christian mind and character through teaching.

The above use of λογικός may give us insight into the use of λογικός in Rom 12:1.⁸⁹ Λογικός conveys the reasonable, the rational, the spiritual, effectively the authentic, that in this case is the call of the apostle.⁹⁰ It surely connotes the non-literal, in the sense of other than or more than ritual worship, but this is not the emphasis. The emphasis is on the genuine character, the reasonable (in the sense of appropriate) response to the gospel. The ethical, and particularly the emphasis on the mind, which is to follow, probably gives the direction of Paul's thought; the authentic willful and conscious presentation of the body in a life pleasing to God is the reasonable worship of a person whose mind is renewed.

The significance of λογικός must be seen in its relation to λατρεία, and their role in the exhortation. The noun λατρεία only appears one other time in the Pauline corpus, and that is in Rom 9:4. Any contrast drawn between 9:4 and 12:1 must note the positive nature of Paul's reference to the worship of Israel in 9:4. Also, ἡ λατρεία is one of a list of privileges that are mentioned there. It is unlikely, therefore, that Paul has this specific text in mind as he speaks of λογικὴ λατρεία. More significant is Paul's use of the verb λατρεύω (Rom 1:9,25; Phil 3:3; 2 Tim 1:3).⁹¹ Paul speaks of his ministry in the gospel using λατρεύω and qualifying it with ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου.⁹² This is a unique description of ministry. It has an apologetical

sense to it, although it is not as polemical as the identifying phrase *οἱ πνεύματι θεοῦ λατρευόντες* in Phil 3:3. In both texts the meanings of "service" and "worship" overlap, since the word is appropriate to the cultic setting or to general service. The authenticating note, and indeed the apologetical sense is present in 12:1, although the reference to *πνεῦμα* is lacking. More directly relevant for comparison is Rom 1:25. Mankind has exchanged the truth for a lie, and has revered and worshipped the creature rather than the creator. Rom 12:1 declares by the mercy of God, the alternative to such worship. This worship is not caught in a lie, but is the authentic and appropriate response of mankind in the body. It is the response to the truth of the gospel. It is the rational response - in the sense of reasonable in view of the gospel presented in 1:16-11:36 - to God. The relationship between 1:18-32 and 12:1-2 is further suggested as one notes the movement of ideas in both sections. In 1:18-32 one can outline a movement from wrath (1:18), to bodily corruption (1:24), to false worship (1:25), and to a worthless mind (1:28).⁹³ Although more concise and interrelated, 12:1-2 can be outlined in a similar fashion (mercy of God - bodily presentation - rational worship - transformation by the renewing of the mind). Thus there is a reversal of the situation under the wrath of God which is based upon the argument of Paul that comes to a fitting climax as the paraenesis is introduced. Here the significance of the gospel is spelled out in no uncertain terms as the "brethren" are called upon to worship God appropriately, which is now their responsibility and

privilege. Thus, Cranfield seems to be right when he states that for Paul "true worship is rational....in the sense of being consistent with a proper understanding of the truth of God revealed in Jesus Christ".⁹⁴

Τὰ σώματα ὑμῶν is used directly in connection with the presentation of bodies as a sacrifice (12:1), and not the renewing of the mind (12:2). Thus Paul affirms strongly the importance of life in the body. This is precisely what we would expect at the beginning of a section of paraenesis for the community. It may be that Jewett is right in sensing a particular stance against an "enthusiastic-gnostic theology" or against "pneumatic libertinism", because of Paul's use of σῶμα here⁹⁵ (as we noted above). Whether this is the case or not, Paul has adapted cultic language and language similar to that of cult critique (see excursus), and instead of focusing on the mind or supra-physical, he has affirmed the realm of the body as the place for true worship. This is particularly consistent with his answer to antinomian accusations against the gospel in chapter 6. Authentic worship involves the presentation of one's self to God as if alive from the dead; refusing to allow sin to rule in one's mortal body. The death of Christ's body and its role in dealing with sin and death may also be in the background (7:4, 8:10).

Paul's particular emphasis on the body is reflected again, but with a different use of σῶμα in 12:4-5. The σῶμα is thus central to Paul's individual and community ethic. It is the realm within which consecration and obedience is to take place. (As with Christ, in the

particular obedience offered in the giving of his body [Heb 10:10, in view of the provision of the body as noted in 10:5-9], so it is for the Christian, although Paul does not draw this comparison). Clearly, furthermore, individual consecration is connected to corporate dedication and life. This distinctive element of Paul's thought is dominant as he uses the cultic language.

The Christian significance of such language is suggested by E. Käsemann, when he states that the whole text is a "baptismal exhortation", and one "in which levitical demands are simultaneously adopted and adapted".⁹⁶ Käsemann's suggestion presumes a Christian adaptation of whatever the original source happened to be. The language does have similarities with Hellenistic Judaism and the Hellenistic synagogue,⁹⁷ and it suggests to Barrett "stoic language, mediated through the Hellenistic synagogue."⁹⁸ It does not seem necessary to us to postulate that Paul is actually quoting a liturgical piece here, but that he is creatively using cultic language. It does seem that Paul has composed 12:1-2 in view of the rest of the letter. The text (12:1-2) would indeed be appropriate as a baptismal exhortation. There are close affinities with chapter 6, which begins with the didactic use of baptismal language. The use of *σώμα* in 6:6,12 and the presentation of *ἐαυτοῦς* alive from the dead and bodily members as instruments of righteousness to God definitely parallels the concept in 12:1. The actual considering of the self as dead to sin, but alive to God in Christ Jesus (6:11) is indeed similar to and a prerequisite of Paul's call in 12:1. Also, the introduction to a formal

presentation of paraenesis would lend itself to a baptismal exhortation, since the paraenesis was associated with baptism and the life of the baptised. The language of non-conformity to this world (age), and the call to transformation by means of the renewing of the mind is the type of eschatological perspective on ethics that one expects from a baptismal context (12:2). Whether such language suggests the act of baptism itself, or just the implications of baptism for the Christian life is not crucial in determining the use of it by Paul. What is crucial for our concern is the meaning and significance of the sacrificial picture in this context with the possible connections with baptism in the background. This we view after a brief discussion of the relationship of 12:1 to 12:2.

4. Rom 12:2

The *καί* in 12:2 suggests the continuation of Paul's exhortation. It is the exhortatory frame that holds 12:1 and 12:2 together. The transition from a cultic image does not disrupt the exhortation. It may be that the appositional *τὴν λογικὴν λειτουργίαν ὑμῶν* leads into the second part of the exhortation naturally, with the movement from the presentation of the body to the renewal of the mind. 12:1-2, therefore, presents a comprehensive challenge, addressing the *ἰσέλθοι* at the level of their bodies and their minds. The trilogy of descriptive words following *Θουσία* parallels the trilogy of descriptive substantives following *τὸ θεῖγμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*. This parallel construction helps to bind the exhortation together structurally.⁹⁹

The transition to non-cultic language indicates that

the cultic metaphor implied was illustrative of Paul's point, and did not need to be continued. The context here is hortatory and it holds the cultic and the eschatological-ethical and transformational language together.¹⁰⁰

It is the call for response to the gospel involving body and mind that brings together the diverse concepts. The movement from body to mind not only reminds one of Rom 1:24-28, but the movement from body to mind in chapters 6 through 8. The "high" view of the *νοῦς* in 7:22-25 is in interesting contrast to the *σῶμα* (7:24) from which Paul wishes to be freed. Thus, it is not surprising that Paul's thought in 12:1-2 develops from bodily presentation which speaks of yieldedness without allegiance to the flesh to the renewal of the mind. Thus, the bodies of the community are to be presented to God, dedicated to living lives pleasing to God, although the actual redemption and revivifying (one could say renewal) of the body are still in the future (8:23,11). At the present the baptised one is to live with the understanding that he is dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus (6:11). His mind is set on the desires of the Spirit (8:5), the Spirit associated with future life (8:11). In essence this means that the gospel ethic is to be that of the future age, living as if alive from the dead, living as heirs with Christ in this time of suffering (8:17). Such a perspective would seem to be behind Paul's call for a renewing of the mind.¹⁰¹

This is part of a continuous transformation that should take place, rejecting the present age, and living in light of the future age of bodily redemption (compare 2 Cor 4:16-18 in the context of 2 Cor 4:1-6:2). Both body and

mind are appropriate to a baptismal "charge", or call for response to the gospel.

Having noted similarities between Rom 12:1-2, and chapters 6-8, it needs to be stated that explicit references to Christ and Spirit in 12:1-2 are lacking. 12:2, like 12:1 is theocentric and ethical in tone, and it seems to be closely related to the thought of Rom 1:28-32, although the discussion of the mind in chapters 7 and 8 needs to be kept in mind. The ἁδελφοί are not those who οὐκ ἔδοκίμασαν τὸν θεὸν ἔχειν ἐν ἁπικρυσίαι and are consequently given over by God εἰς ἁδοκίμων νοῦν (1:28). The ἁδελφοί are not those that live a lifestyle deserving of death and are totally morally perverse. Rather, they are those who are being transformed by the renewing of the mind resulting in the ability to discern and approve¹⁰² the will of God; a will that is morally complete and perfect. Here the means of the renewal are not stated. They are presupposed from the gospel presented that has taken the reader from 1:16 to the present point. Also, the renewal is further illustrated and presented in the paraenesis to follow.

Although secondary, we note here the appropriate placing of the presentation of sacrifice next to the recognition of the divine will. Sacrifice and divination were closely related in the Greco-Roman world. Thus, Paul's exhortation covers these two fundamental aspects of religion: presentation to God, and discernment and acceptance of the will of God.¹⁰³ Λογικὴ λατρεία may join these two aspects of worship together, although it is primarily a response to the content of 12:1. In any case,

12:1-2 represents the fulfillment of true religion. In response to the call of the apostle and on the basis of the mercy of God, the worshipper has a sacrifice to offer and a way of discerning the divine will. If the first is rational and authentic worship, then the two together represent the core of religious experience.

Thus, 12:2 completes the exhortation and complements the thought in 12:1.¹⁰⁴ It is not synonymously parallel to 12:1, but adds to it. The rare words and the liturgical structure suggest that Paul is composing and possibly borrowing idioms that are appropriate to a liturgical situation (baptismal).

D. Conclusion: Cultic Language, Paraenesis, and Baptism

It is apparent that the exhortation presents challenges that involve the body and mind. The logic behind the anthropology involved is tied closely to the factors that determine the structuring of the whole exhortation. The possible role of baptism, as we have noted before, seems to be necessary to guide us in the "logic" of the exhortation. The role of baptism and the accompanying teaching or paraenesis seems to be the background for the call for bodily presentation and the charge for non-conformity and transformation. The sacrificial language, which calls for the total yieldedness of the believer resulting in a life of obedience is more understandable against this background. The connection between sacrifice and obedience is intensified by the baptismal framework. For, presenting bodies as a corporate living sacrifice means death to sin, being alive to God, and devoted to

living a life pleasing to Him (6:2-14). This is practised and demonstrated within the community by means of baptismal initiation. This would seem to be the logic behind Paul's earlier discussion (6:1-23). The sacrifice of the community is baptismal existence, or existence based on faith and baptism. This involves separation from the present world, and the willingness to be transformed by the renewing¹⁰⁵ of the mind. The association of the Spirit with baptism suggests the implicit means for such a transformation, something not mentioned by the words of the text itself. This must be held together with the gospel itself, and especially the paraenesis to follow. Indeed, obedience to the didache is very hard to separate from walking by the Spirit (6:17-23, 8:4-13). The call for transformation by mind renewal is thus appropriate to a baptismal setting, because of the assumed relationship of Spirit and paraenesis to such an occasion. Thus, the way in which baptism helps in the understanding of 12:1-2 suggests that it was indeed in Paul's mind or implicit as Paul composed this liturgical exhortation.

We would suggest that this exhortation is not just based upon the gospel he has just finished presenting, but that Paul's own role as proclaimer of the gospel is significant in the structuring of the exhortation. This is something we will consider further in the following chapter. The obedience to which Paul calls the Gentiles is the living out of their baptismal commitment, which is also the offering of an acceptable sacrifice. The connections between baptism and sacrifice need to be seen on four possible levels: 1) the common element of ritual

in baptism and sacrifice which makes for an easy application of cultic language to non-cultic ritual activity (which may be implicit in the language used), 2) the idea of obedience reflected not only in doing the ritual act, but in ideas of yieldedness and death to the flesh which Paul draws out of baptism and can apply to sacrifice, 3) the possible implicit association with Christ, since baptism involved dying and rising with Christ (6:3-4), 4) the role of the apostle who calls forth the sacrificial existence, a role that is later described in cultic terms (15:16). Thus, there are implicit associations of ideas that make transfer of sacrificial ideas to baptismal ideas within this type of hortatory context straightforward. Paul is not equating baptism with sacrifice in an explicit way, nor is he concerned with a clear sacrificial image. It is the ideas implicit in the metaphorical use of cultic language that are the focus of his attention. If any of the *four* elements mentioned above was to be seen as most explicit in the text, it would probably have to be the *fourth*, since Paul's own role as exhorter is so pronounced at this point in the letter.

We note, as a penultimate conclusion, that we have been satisfied to speak in terms of cultic language, and not OT cultic language. This is because Paul's language need not be reminiscent of the Jewish cultus. The language is general, and is mingled with ideas that make a specific or conscious use of OT sacrificial language hard to prove. Having said this, it is not impossible that Paul's cultic thought is shaped by the OT cultus

anyway, since that would be the most influential cultic activity in his experience. This is suggested also in view of the strong emphasis on the OT in the letter, and the particular OT cultic language mentioned above. It is admitted, though, that a general understanding of sacrifice and non-literal uses of cultic language would enable one to understand Paul's use of cultic language here. Also, the general nature of the exhortation has lent itself to the general ethical use of cultic language. If we are correct in seeing the most direct implicit contrast drawn as being with the type of worship expressed in Rom 1:24-28 (25 esp.), then this may also be used as a framework for clarifying the nature of the cultic language. Paul is not so much challenging a particular cultus, the Jewish cultus or otherwise: he is using cultic language in the midst of a definition of authentic worship. The nature of the authentic worship as complete response to the gospel with a strong priority on ideas of obedience and purity implicitly challenges worship that is less than this. Paul's call is a positive one in its use of cultic language, which simultaneously rejects any response to the gospel that would be anything less (in view of Rom 1:25).

Paul begins his call for individual and community response with the sacrificial image. The general nature of the cultic language need not take away from its significance. For, although Paul expresses similar thought elsewhere, nowhere else does he state such a deliberate introductory exhortation to his paraenesis. And nowhere else does Paul summarise the response due to the gospel with this sacrificial description of bodily consecration.

Excursus: λογική λατρεία and
the Possible Background of Paul's Cultic Language
in Rom 12:1

After selectively but carefully presenting relevant comparative material to Paul's use of λογική λατρεία (including material from the OT, Greek philosophy [esp. Stoic and Epictetus in particular], Hellenistic Judaism [esp. Philo], LXX, Qumran, and a brief mention of the Rabbis),¹⁰⁶ Cranfield states:

"... it is no simple matter to decide what is the correct conclusion to be drawn with regard to Paul's meaning in the light both of the comparative material and of the context in Romans, and scholars in fact differ widely". (footnote 107)

It is no surprise, therefore, that Cranfield emphasizes Paul's own adaptation of λογικός in terms of "a proper understanding of the truth of God revealed in Jesus Christ".¹⁰⁸ This in fact is the direction we have gone in our discussion above, and we believe that it is justifiable to maintain this type of emphasis. At the same time, Paul's choice of the phrase τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν is suggestive to say the least, especially in view of the cultic language preceding it. Käsemann, reflecting on comparative material relevant to this text, suggests that "Paul thus stands in a Christian tradition which is marked by fixed terms and motifs, which is mediated by Hellenistic Judaism, and which is adopted in baptismal exhortation".¹⁰⁹ Exactly how Paul fits within "a Christian tradition", represented most significantly by 1 Peter 2:2,5,9 (a later text), is hard to say. Such texts as T. Levi 3:5,6, Sib. Or. 8:408, Odes. Sol. 20, and even the often cited Corpus Hermeticum 1:31, and 13:17-21

must, furthermore, be seen as suggesting various developments of spiritualised cultic ideas, but do not present a Christian tradition within which Paul can be firmly placed (not to mention the problem of a firm pre-Pauline dating for the relevant material in Sib. Or., Odes. Sol., Corpus Hermeticum, and even T. Levi). It may be unfair to question the generality of Käsemann's statement further, but it does seem that the mediating role of Hellenistic Judaism may need to be clarified more, if one is going to understand how this is significant in Paul's particular use of a phrase, not to mention what exactly we are talking about when we refer to "fixed terms and motifs".¹¹⁰ Thus, we need to present some type of reconstruction, which may show how it is that Paul has brought together cultic language, and the phrase τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.

It may be helpful to begin by stating what we believe to be the best way of viewing this text in terms of its different elements. We suggest that Paul is not using a specific coined phrase as such, in his use of λογικὴ λατρεία, but that his choice of λογικός is deliberate, especially in light of the thrust of his exhortation in 12:1.¹¹¹ Paul is using a word that was of importance in Greek philosophical circles in connection with νοῦς ;¹¹² a late example of which is the statement of Epictetus that affirms man's rational nature (λογικός), which is expressed in his praise of God (Diss. 1.16.20-21 [Loeb 1, pp. 112-113] see also 2.9.2-5 [Loeb 2, pp. 266-269]). Seneca reveals the high place given to reason in stoic thought when he states: "Ratio autem nihil aliud est quam

in corpus humanum pars divini spiritus mersa." (Epist. 66:12 [Loeb 2, pp. 8-11]). This also reveals the close connections between reason and divine spirit, which is central to stoic philosophical "religion". Earlier than Seneca, and revealing the influence of stoic thought, although it is mingled with more mystical ideas, are Philo's references to reason and rationality. In the midst of Philo's symbolical interpretation of aspects of the Cultus, he notes that "what is precious in the sight of God is not the number of victims immolated but the true purity of a rational spirit in him who makes the sacrifice" (ἄλλὰ τὸ καθαρότατον τοῦ θυόντος πνεῦμα λογικόν - Spec. Leg. 1. 277 [Loeb 7, pp. 260-261], see also Cher. 39 [Loeb 2, pp. 38-39], Mig. Abr. 184-186 [Loeb pp. 238-241], Abr. 32 [Loeb 4, pp. 150-151]). These references reveal a close relationship between the affirmation of the rational element in and indeed the rational character of man and the nature of worship. This rational aspect, as Epictetus points out, distinguishes man from the beasts, and is thus a quality that should be reflected in living (Diss. 2.9.1-3 [Loeb pp. 266-269] the whole of 9 is significant in this regard).

It is this element of human rationality, which is appropriate to and authentically representative of man, that seems to be caught up in Paul's use of the word λογικός. The meaning is clearly more specific as used by Paul in light of the gospel, and God as creator. At the same time, this root element of "rationality" in the sense of appropriate or authentic to man as a creature remains.

- If we are correct in viewing Rom 1:25 as receiving the

thrust of the implicit criticism of the language, then this basic element remains appropriate. Instead of worship that is not worthy of God, worshipping creatures rather than the creator, Rom 12:1 describes the authentic worship that the gospel demands. The corollary of the false worship was the handing over of man to an *ἰδούκιμος νοῦς* (1:28), whereas in 12:2 we see the further directive to be renewed mentally resulting in the *δοκιμάζειν* (12:2) of God's will. There may be mystical overtones to these words, but Paul's emphasis is ethical, and thus he seems to be in line with basic philosophical and specifically stoic use. It is not so much an inner versus outer worship, nor a spiritual versus physical worship in the most literal sense,¹¹³ but an authentic versus a false worship.¹¹⁴ It is a worship that is for "brothers", in response to the apostle's call on the basis of the mercy of God, and it involves total response, including the yielding of the body to righteousness, and the eschatological renewal of the mind.

Paul would have been aware of the emphasis placed on reason in philosophical circles, and he may have known of the strength of stoic philosophy at Rome (such as Musonius Rufus and Seneca). Such stoic, and indeed general philosophical thought was known and adapted by Philo, and one can see influences or at least similarities in documents such as Ben Sira, and especially 4 Maccabees. Thus, Käsemann's stressing of role of Hellenistic Judaism needs to be mentioned, also. Later sources do suggest the role of *λογικός* in contexts of worship language in the Greek synagogues, and there is no reason to suggest that

such was not used in the day of Paul, although the existence of the cultus in Jerusalem meant that such language was not replacement language. Thus, the mediating role of Hellenistic Judaism may be the simple adaptation of a word that has philosophical significance, and its use within a Jewish context. The basic meaning of the word, though, would be the same.

What is most significant is that Paul uses τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν following the explicit use of cultic language. Seidensticker has suggested that this text, with its use of known Hellenistic phrases, presents the most powerful criticism of Hellenistic piety that Paul ever states.¹¹⁵ We would agree that there is an implicit criticism of Hellenistic piety, but we would want to stress the positive nature of Paul's sacrificial language. Paul is not so much countering abstract philosophical piety which may have used λογικὴ Ὀυσία language as much as he is using positively language that expresses his exhortation. This need not be in direct conscious opposition to a Hellenistic view of sacrifice. Undoubtedly Paul's exhortation is in opposition or at least in contrast to numerous texts that one could cite, but Paul need not have any in mind. As we have said, the depraved worship of man in the face of God's wrath is what should be contrasted with Rom 12:1-2. It is probably the baptismal background that has lent itself to the sacrificial language, and Paul has affirmed it with the use of λογικὴ λατρεία.

Paul is not: 1) challenging the cultus in the tradition of the OT prophets, or wisdom literature

(Isa 1:10-17, Jer 6:20, 7:21-23, Hos 6:6, Ps 49:7-15); 2) challenging the cultus ritual in favour of bloodless and spiritual worship of the heart, or reason, wisdom and doing good (Apollonius, Ep 26, quoted in Ferguson, "Spiritual Sacrifice", p. 1154, possibly implied in T. Levi. 3:6); 3) presenting the real requirements for acceptable literal sacrifice (Ben Sira 35:1-11; Philo Spec. Leg. 1. 277 [Loeb 7, pp. 260-261]); 4) speaking of an equivalent to literal sacrifice in that it pleases God (Phil 4:18, Eph 5:2); 5) challenging directly a philosophical critique of sacrifice. Rather, the sacrificial language was available, and the formal nature of this introduction to paraenesis has resulted in a baptismal-type exhortation. Paul has not re-defined sacrifice as much as he has used sacrificial language metaphorically to speak of the complete consecration involved in baptismal response and Christian living. This λογικός worship is authentic, what man is called to do because of creation and redemption.

Paul has probably used language that within the syncretistic piety of Hellenism could mean various things, but his usage is not so much polemical as it is apologetic. It affirms the gospel at the expense of any opponent, without necessarily labelling that opponent.

Footnotes

¹Of most significance are the following: Wenschkewitz's, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 125-127, 130-131; Seidensticker's Lebendiges Opfer; H. Schlier's "Vom Wesen der Apostolischen Ermahnung"; E. Kasemann's "Worship And Everyday Life" in New Testament Questions of Today, (London, SCM Press, 1969), pp. 188-195; Raymond Corriveau's Liturgy of Life, pp. 155-185; R. J. Daly's Christian Sacrifice, pp. 243-246. Other articles of significance, but not primarily concerned with sacrifice, are Horace E. Stoessel's, "Notes on Romans 12:1-2 The Renewal of the Mind and Internalizing the Truth" in Interp 17 (April, 1963), 161-175; Christopher Evans' "Rom 12. 1-2 The True Worship" in Dimensions De La Vie Chretienne (Rm 12-13), edited by Lorenzo De Lorenzi, (Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul h.l.m., 1979), 7-49 (Monographique de [[Benedictina]] Section Biblico-Oecumenique 4; John Koenig's "Vision, Self-offering, and Transformation for Ministry (Rom 12:1-8)" in Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit: Commemorating the Fiftieth Year of the Liturgical Press, edited by D. Durken, (Collegeville, Minnesota, The Order of St. Benedict, Inc., 1979); Josef Blank's Paulus. Von Jesus zum Christentum: Aspekte der paulinischen Lehre und Praxis, (Munchen, Kosel, 1982), pp. 169-191.

²Daly, Christian Sacrifice, p. 243.

³Daly notes this also, stating "there is every reason to consider these to be the most important verses of the letter", Christian Sacrifice, p. 243.

⁴There is little question that Paul would have denied the need for the centrality of the cult for the Gentiles if this became an issue. But, Paul is not making it an issue himself. Further comment on Paul's perspective on the cult must wait for discussion of Rom 15:16. For, it would seem that if Paul is to reveal a perspective on the cult in Romans it would need to be in relation to the gospel ministry itself, which he represents.

⁵Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans", p. 168.

⁶Ibid., p. 171. The term "digression" is used in a formal rhetorical sense, and should not be thought of as indicating a section that is not significant to Paul's overall purposes in the letter.

⁷Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans", p. 170.

⁸Ibid., p. 171.

⁹Victor Paul Furnish, Theology and Ethics in Paul, (Nashville-New York, Abingdon, 1968), p. 103

¹⁰Ibid., p. 106.

¹¹D. G. Bradley, "The Topos as a Form in the Pauline

Paraenesis", JBL 72 (1953), 238-246, esp. pp. 239-240. More recent and with some correction is the work of T. Y. Mullins, "Topos as a New Testament Form", JBL 99 (1980), 541-547. The Topos form seems especially common in the more structured and general paraenesis.

Concerning other matters: the relationship between kerygma and didache is not a simple matter, and it touches upon the broader question of the relationship between theology and ethics in Paul. It would seem that James I. H. McDonald's recent study has shown the danger of drawing too clear distinctions between the two (Kerygma and Didache: the articulation and structure of the earliest Christian message, (Cambridge, CUP, 1980). C. H. Dodd made clearer distinctions than McDonald in Gospel and Law: the Relationship of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity, (Cambridge, CUP, 1951). Also see Dodd's More New Testament Studies (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968), "The 'Primitive Catechism' and the Sayings of Jesus", pp. 11-29, and "Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ", pp. 134-148. We agree with Dodd's main conclusions concerning the importance of the teachings of Jesus as forming a basis for early paraenesis that functioned within the community as a guide for Christian practice.

¹²For the outlines of paraenesis, Doty's Letters in Primitive Christianity, pp. 43, 59-60. A more recent study that considers the nature of such paraenesis is McDonald's Kerygma and Didache, pp. 69-100 and notes.

¹³As Ronald Russell has suggested concerning Philip-
pians, "Pauline Letter Structure in Philippians", JETS,
25 (Sept. 1982), 295-306.

¹⁴Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in
Romans", pp. 170-171.

¹⁵John L. White notes this making reference to Nils
Dahl's unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting
of the Society of Biblical Literature in 1973, "Paul's Let-
ter to the Galatians: Epistolary Genre, Content, Struc-
ture", p. 75, in "Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter
Tradition", pp. 439-440.

¹⁶White, "Saint Paul and the Apostolic Letter
Tradition", p. 441.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 439. ¹⁸Ibid., p. 441.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 441. This is an interesting observation
in relation to Karris' argument concerning the general
nature of Paul's paraenesis in 14:1-15:13 ("Romans 14:1-
15:13 and the Occasion of Romans"). Karris is arguing
that such paraenesis does not indicate that a specific
situation is in mind when Paul writes Romans. If White is
right concerning the nature of paraenesis, and it seems
that he is, then Karris' argument loses its strength,
since the nature of such paraenesis is to be somewhat
general in form regardless of the situation addressed.
Granted that the converse of Karris' thesis could not be
proven by use of the paraenesis either, this still is a

significant point. Thus Paul S. Minear's thesis is viewed as overplayed, even if it is assumed that Paul did in some sense address the situation at Rome (The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans, [London: SCM Press, 1971]).

²⁰Daniel Patte, Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel: A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), p. 246. Patte suggests that "since he did not found that Church, he proceeds with great caution taking time to present at length his view of the gospel before formulating exhortations addressing the concrete situation of the church in Rome", p. 246. Patte appeals to Käsemann (Romans, pp. 364-387), and Willi Marxsen (Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to its Problems, translated by G. Buswell [Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970], pp. 92-109) for support.

²¹The relationship of 12:1-2 to what precedes it is a more complicated matter, and will be addressed in the exegesis below.

²²Barrett, Romans, p. 230; similarly Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 595, and Bruce, Romans, p. 226.

²³C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, (London, Hodder and Stoughton, 1932), p. 188.

²⁴Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 351.

²⁵Schlier, Römerbrief, p. 351.

²⁶Leenhardt, Romans, p. 300.

²⁷Paul's appeal on the basis of the mercy of God reminds one of the significance of mercy in the preceding section (9:15,16,18,23, 11:30,31,32). The language of presentation has already been used in 6:13,16,19. Chapters 5-8, and especially 6-8 have other affinities with the extensive use of $\zeta\eta\eta$ and $\zeta\alpha\omega$ (5:10,17,18, 21, 6:2,4,10, 11,13,22,23, 7:1,2,3,9,10, 8:2,6,10,12). $\zeta\omega\mu\alpha$ is also significant in this section (6:6,12, 7:4,24, 8:10,11,13, 23); and $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in 7:23,25. Thus these chapters have a number of connections that will receive further mention below. Then the conceptual and linguistic connections with 1:18-2:16 must not be forgotten, especially with the emphasis on morality in this section. The degrading of the bodies 1:24, perverted worship 1:25, and the lack of realization of God's kindness leading to repentance 2:4 all have their direct opposites in 12:1; responding to the mercy of God, presenting bodies as a sacrifice which is true worship. Then the depraved mind leading to depraved lives in 1:28-31 is the opposite of the renewed mind of 12:2 (this will be noted below). Certain connections can be emphasized to the exclusion of others, and this is not appropriate for 12:1-2 as a whole. Particular connections will be referred to when appropriate below, but these indicate that 12:1-2 seems to be a fitting bridge between the two major sections of the body of the letter

(1:18-11:36 and 12:3-15:13).

²⁸Chapters 9-11 really continue the type of concern expressed and responded to in 3:1-8. Thus one should not see this section as an afterthought, unless it is specifically an afterthought due to the realization that a big question had been left unanswered. The crucial nature of this section is therefore affirmed. R. Scrogg's article, regardless of a verdict concerning the main thesis, points to connections between 1:16-4:25 and 9-11, which again suggest that the content of 9-11 is crucial to Paul's thought in the letter ("Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11").

²⁹Evans, "Romans 12. 1-2 The True Worship", p. 12. Quote from D. Hans Lietzmann is from An die Römer, 5th ed. (Tübingen, J. C. Mohr[Paul Siebeck]), 1971, p. 107.

³⁰Evans, "Romans 12. 1-2 The True Worship", p. 12.

³¹For use of $\hat{\sigma}\upsilon\nu$, see BAG, p. 597.

³²That Paul actually takes up the pen at this point in the letter, as G. J. Bahr has suggested, is difficult to prove conclusively, and will not be assumed in our discussion ("The Superscriptions in the Pauline Letters" in JBL 87 (1968), p. 38). Bahr's analysis is helpful and supports the idea that Paul addressed the Roman community specifically in the content of chapters 12 through 16 (pp. 38-40). This may be the case regardless of who actually penned these words. After all, Paul must be held responsible for the content of the letter, regardless of the actual writing process.

³³1 Cor 16:13-17, Gal 6:12-15, Phil 4:14-18, 1 Thess 5:12-15, 2 Thess 3:6-13, Phlm 20-22 may be similar sections revealing the situation or main observation concerning the community that Paul has in mind.

³⁴1 Cor 1:10, 4:16, 16:15; 2 Cor 2:8, 6:1 (in view of 5:20), 9:5, 10:1; 1 Thess 2:12 (note this use in relation to description of ministry when present), 4:1, 10, 5:15; 2 Thess 3:12; Phil 4:2; Col 2:2 (another description of apostolic concern and ministry); Phlm 9, 10; Eph 4:1; also 1 Tim 2:1; other NT uses of interest include Jude 3; 1 Peter 2:11; Hebrews 3:13, 10:25, 13:19, 22. The verb occurs over fifty times in the Pauline corpus (54?).

³⁵Carl J. Bjerkelund, Parakalo. Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalo - Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen, (Oslo, Universitetsforlaget, 1967). This is a work that is particularly significant to Kasemann's comments on 12:1-2, see pp. 326-327 of Romans.

³⁶Bjerkelund, Parakalo, p. 188. ³⁷Ibid., p. 189.

³⁸Ibid., pp. 160-163. ³⁹Ibid., p. 168.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 173. ⁴¹Ibid., p. 169.

⁴²Bjerkelund, Parakalo, p. 171-172 ⁴³Ibid., p. 172.

⁴⁴Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 597.

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 597.

⁴⁶Schlier, "Vom Wesen der Apostolischen Ermahnung", p. 78.

⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 79-80.

⁴⁸Nigel Turner in GNTG, vol 3, p. 28; also Cranfield in Romans, vol 2, p. 596, "Hebrew plural of rah^amîm" represented "by the plural of ὀικτιρμός".

⁴⁹Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 595-596.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 598 for extensive references, the most important of which are Josephus' in Ant. 4. 6. 4 (113) [Loeb 4, pp. 530-531] and J. W. 2. 6. 2. (89) [Loeb 2, pp. 354-355]. (More references are given in Georg Bertram and Bo Reicke's article, "παρίστημι, παριστάνω" in TDNT, vol. 5, pp. 837-841. Also, BAG, p. 633; and LSMJ, pp. 1340-1341.)

⁵¹Ibid., p. 599. Robert Tannehill states that in this context σῶμα need only be viewed as the self that "exists for or to something or someone" (Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology, [Berlin: Topelmann, 1967], p. 72). Also, see Rudolf Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament, vol. 1., translated by K. Grobel, (London: SCM Press, 1965, pp. 192-203, Robert Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of their use in Conflict Settings, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971), pp. 201-304, Robert Gundry, Soma in Biblical Theology, with emphasis on Pauline Anthropology, (Cambridge, CUP, 1976), pp. 34-36.

⁵²Daly, "Christian Sacrificial Activity", p. 102.

⁵³Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, p. 301.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 301. ⁵⁵Ibid., p. 302.

⁵⁶Käsemann, Romans, p. 327. ⁵⁷Ibid., p. 327.

⁵⁸The reference to the sacrifice of Christ in Eph 5:2 follows a command to "walk in love", but it is separated from the command by καθὼς καὶ, which clarifies the exemplary role that Christ's love and giving of himself has in these verses. Thus the use of θυσία does not occur in the exhortation itself.

⁵⁹The use of λειτουργὸν with τῆς χριστίας μου in Phil 2:25 would seem to point in this direction; the genitive being objective. This text is discussed more thoroughly in relation to Rom 15:16 below.

⁶⁰1 Cor 10:18 contains a literal use of θυσία referring to the practice of Israel according to the flesh.

This use of *θυσία*, which is very different from the use of *θυσία* in Rom 12:1, is important for other reasons than parallel meaning. The use of *θυσίας... τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου* in this setting reveals awareness on Paul's part of the basic understanding of participation in sacrificial practice and meals. At the same time, because Paul parallels the rationale of involvement in such sacrifices of *Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα* with the Christian observance of the Lord's supper, the sacrificial "nature" of the Lord's supper and the nature of the church as Israel *κατὰ πνεῦμα* may be suggested. It must be added immediately though that such comparisons serve a didactic means in directing in the behaviour of the Corinthian community. Paul is not making a direct statement concerning the nature of the church or of the sacrificial nature of the Lord's supper. These comparisons serve the more immediate end of giving perspective on the involvement in meals connected with idol worship. Paul's concern is to give a basis for practical guidance. His thought in 10:23-11:1 reveals the core of his ethic on such matters, and needs to be kept in mind when viewing the earlier argument in chapter 10, regardless of any change in the practice referred to directly. Thus one must be cautious in referring to the Lord's supper, on the basis of these verses, as a sacrifice, or the church as the spiritual Israel.

⁶¹Hebrews 13:15-16 describes the praise and deeds of Christians sacrificially. This can be viewed with 4:14-16, and 10:19-25 in mind. In these texts the connection with the mediating role of Christ is clear, whereas in 13:15-16 the sacrificial picture is left undeveloped.

⁶²D. Hill notes that the writer of 1 Peter draws "upon liturgical fragments and ideas in order to reinforce his affirmation of Christian faith and his exhortation to fortitude and fidelity" ("To Offer Spiritual Sacrifices...." (1 Peter 2:5): Liturgical Formulations and Christian Paraenesis in 1 Peter", *JSNT*, 16, (1982), 45-62, p. 61. The language is used in a passage like 1 Peter 2:5, as in Rom 12:1, to exhort the listeners/readers to live Christian lives befitting a holy Priesthood, as stated elsewhere *ἀξιως περιπατῆσαι τῆς κλήσεως ἧς ἐκλήθητε* (Eph. 4:1). A thorough study of *βασιλείου ἱεράτευμα* is supplied by J. H. Elliott in The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of 1 Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase *βασιλείου ἱεράτευμα*, (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966).

⁶³Exhortation is the intent of the letter (1 Peter 5:12).

⁶⁴Temple language is not used explicitly in Romans. McKelvey is correct in not treating any passages in Romans under his theme (The New Temple). Receiving careful attention are 2 Cor 6:16-7:1; 1 Cor 3:16-17; 1 Cor 6:19-20; Eph 2:20-22, pp. 92-124 (and 1 Tim 3:15; Gal 2:9; 2 Thess 2:3-4, 1 Cor 10:4, pp. 133-138). Daly's suggestion of a temple theme in Rom 15:20 is questionable (Christian Sacrifice, p. 249). A building motif does not necessitate a temple motif being in mind. Even if this is the case, our interest is in explicit uses of such

language, which in fact is noticeably lacking in the Romans correspondence.

⁶⁵Barrett, Romans, p. 231.

⁶⁶Other parallels with Hebrews may be drawn, but they must wait upon the completion of the exegesis. Paul's possible knowledge or use of Psalm 39:6-9 as in the LXX, BSA readings or some equivalent, is an interesting possibility, but dependence on this text does not seem necessary for an understanding of Paul's image.

⁶⁷In general, Paul's use of *θυσιᾶ* leaves much room for nuances in the meaning of the word, since only one usage is a literal one in the strictest sense (1 Cor 10:18). The other references show the diversity possible (Phil 2:17, 4:18; Eph 5:2). He never uses *ὀλοκτύμμα*, so one would expect *θυσιᾶ*, or *προσφορά* here. Paul never uses the verb *προσφέρειν*, and he only uses *θύω* twice (1 Cor 5:7, 10:20). (The majority of the LXX readings of *θυσιᾶ* are renderings of the words *ΠϚ!* or *ΠΠϚ!*. Such a translation seems to be consistent with the usual meaning of *θυσιᾶ*). The word is general, covering the act and the victim involved in sacrifice (Johannes Behm, " *θύω*, κτλ ", p. 181).

⁶⁸Thus we agree with Cranfield that in translating the phrase to "living, holy, and pleasing to God", each part equally describes the sacrifice (Romans, vol. 2, p. 600).

⁶⁹*ζῶν* - 1:17, 6:2,10,11,13, 7:1,2,3,9, 8:12,13, 9:26, 10:5, 12:1, 14:7,8,8,9,11; *ζυγῆ* - 2:7, 5:10,17,18,21, 6:4, 22,23, 7:10, 8:2,6,10,38, 11:15.

⁷⁰Romans, vol. 2, p. 600. He refers primarily to 6:4, but also 1:17, 6:11,13, 8:13b.

⁷¹Implicit in this discussion seems to be faith, which is the basis of union with Christ (6:8). Baptism is obviously closely associated with repentance and faith, as 6:11-14 indicates. Paul is not developing a new aspect of soteriology here in view of 1:16-5:21. It is just as appropriate to speak of faith-union with Christ as baptismal-union. For, although baptism is used to indicate realistic participation in and experience of the accomplishment of Christ through death and resurrection, the Christian must reckon himself to now have this new life in Christ so as to live to God and not to sin. In other words, the ethical truths implicit in the death and resurrection of Christ are not automatically experienced in the baptised one. There is a reckoning that must take place, which involves the recognition of what real faith-union with Christ means, a new life to be lived to God. This is part of the obedience of faith that Paul is calling for (1:5; 15:18; 16:26?), and indeed has expressed clearly in 12:1-2.

⁷²Leenhardt, Romans, p. 302.

⁷³The parallel between these passages is made clearer by virtue of the paraenesis that follows both cultic texts. We are not suggesting much agreement between the paraenetic material, but the structural similarity between them.

⁷⁴On ἁγιος : Otto Procksch, Karl Georg Kuhn, "ἁγιος, κτλ", TDNT, pp. 88-115; Horst Seebass, "Holy, Consecrate, Sanctify, Saints, Devout". in NIDNTTh, vol. 2, pp. 223-238; BAG, pp. 8-10; LSMJ, p. 9.

⁷⁵Käsemann, Romans, p. 327. ⁷⁶Ibid., p. 327.

⁷⁷Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2., p. 601.

⁷⁸Käsemann, Romans, p. 327. We prefer to speak of "apologetic" rather than "polemic" here.

⁷⁹For development of this idea, see Daly's Christian Sacrifice, pp. 70-86; Note especially in Paul the use of ὀσμὴ εὐωδίας with θυσία δεκτή, and followed by εὐάρετος τῷ θεῷ. Here we see the combining of these three phrases that expand on each other, but all suggest the same thing, God's acceptance. The use of εὐπρόσδεκτος should be considered also, since the meaning is very similar to εὐάρετος. Here we see the use of the word crossing from the cultic to the ethical in texts using cultic language (Rom 15:16, 1 Peter 2:5), and being used in the general sense of acceptable or pleasing (Rom 15:31, 2 Cor 6:2, 8:12).

⁸⁰Significant uses of εὐάρετος indicating its basic ethical meaning (Rom 12:2, 14:18; 2 Cor 5:9; Eph 5:10; Col 3:20; Tit 2:9). Also note outside of Paul, Heb 13:21 (where God's working in the life is being referred to), and Wis 4:10, 9:10.

⁸¹A number of significant studies are listed here that give much of the evidence from primary sources: Schmitz, Die Opferanschauung, outside the NT, pp. 9-195 which includes the OT material; Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", background to NT pp. 6-87; brief discussion in light of the hermetic material, C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935), pp. 194-198; R. K. Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism, (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953); Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, background to NT pp. 1-120; Johannes Behm, "Θύω, κτλ", TDNT, vol. 3, pp. 180-190, esp. for background to NT, pp. 186-189; R. J. McKelvey, The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament, (London, OUP, 1969, on "The Spiritual Temple in Jewish and Greek Literature", pp. 42-57; Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, background in the light of Rom 12:1, pp. 159-164; C. Brown, H.-G. Link, F. Thiele, "Sacrifice", NIDNTTh, vol. 3, pp. 415-438 including NT material; Daly, Christian Sacrifice, for OT-NT, pp. 9-307, also note within the rest of the material a lot of material on Philo and Barnabas, pp. 389-440; J. P. Brown, "The Sacrificial Cult and its Critique in Greek and Hebrew I", JSS, 24 (1979), 159-173 and "The Sacrificial Cult and its Critique

in Greek and Hebrew II", JSS, 25, (1980), pp. 1-21 for linguistic comparisons; J. W. Thompson, "Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice", JBL 4 (1979), pp. 567-578; Frances M. Young, The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers From the New Testament to John Chrysostom, pp. 11-73; and Everett Ferguson's "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment", pp. 1151-1189, for OT and NT background, pp. 1152-1162.

⁸²1 Cor 5:7, and Eph 5:2 have soteriological implications as well, but they are not stressed within their contexts. We have purposefully not included Paul's references to himself or ministry with the use of cultic language, although the relevance of such texts will be expressed below.

⁸³Sanday and Headlam, Romans, p. 353.

⁸⁴See note 58 for numerous studies that discuss the relevant material. Special emphasis on the philosophical material is presented at the beginning of Seidensticker's Lebendiges Opfer, pp. 17-43. Also important in this respect is O. Casel's older short study, "Die λογικὴ Θυσία der Antiken Mystik in christlichliturgischer Umdeutung", JL, 4 (1924), 37-47. Helpful also is the work of C. H. Dodd, especially concerning Corpus Hermeticum, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 194-198; also, The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel, (Cambridge, CUP, 1953), pp. 420-423; and a more general discussion, but in relation to the fourth gospel, "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship", in Studies in the Fourth Gospel, edited by F. L. Cross, (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1957), pp. 9-22; Richard Reitzenstein, Hellenistic Mystery - Religions: their Basic Ideas and Significance, translated by J. E. Stealy from the third edition, (Pittsburgh: Pickwick press, 1978), pp. 415-421;

⁸⁵Seidensticker affirms the uniqueness of Paul's use of sacrificial language against the background of relevant literature. He attributes this to a Christologizing process that is different from contemporary spiritualization - Lebendiges Opfer, pp. 327-329. We will need to consider the reason for the distinctiveness of Paul's use of sacrificial language after the exegesis. It must be stated, though, that Rom 12:1-2 reveals little evidence of a definite Christological thrust. This thrust may be suggested by the use of σῶμα, or the use of sacrificial language itself. But Paul's use elsewhere does not demand such an interpretation, unless one is using the term "christologize" in the broadest sense. This we will need to consider in view of the whole letter at the conclusion of this study. The most concise and representative presentation of the primary evidence is given by E. Ferguson in "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and its Environment"; Qumran material receives only brief mention in this article with only one text presented, but with so much written on the Qumran evidence this may not be an oversight. In addition to what has been listed in notes 58, and 84, there is an overview of primary

materials dealing with the cult in early Judaism in G. W. E. Nickelsburgh, and M. E. Stone's Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), pp. 51-88.

⁸⁶1 Cor 2:13,15, 3:1, 9:11, 10:3,4, 12:1, 14:1,37, 15:44, 46; Gal 6:1; Eph 1:3, 5:19, 6:12; Col 1:9, 3:16.

⁸⁷This is the case, even if the words are close or identical in meaning. The fact is that Paul uses πνευματικός elsewhere, but he does not use λογικός. This we note in view of G. Kittel's noting of the closeness of meaning between the words, especially within the context of spiritualizing language ("λογικός", TDNT, vol. 4, pp. 142-143). The past problems at Corinth probably helped Paul develop his particular vocabulary having to do with the present and future body. On the problems at Corinth in general, see A. C. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology at Corinth", NTS, 24 (1978), 510-526.

⁸⁸Συνοχηματίζω appears only here in the Pauline corpus; μεταμορφόω occurs only in 2 Cor. 3:18; ἀνακκίνυσις appears only in Titus 3:5.

⁸⁹As Ernest Best (1 Peter [London: Oliphants, 1971], p. 98), and E. G. Selwyn (The First Epistle of St. Peter [London: Macmillan & Co, Ltd., 1946], pp. 154-155) have suggested, specifically seeing Rom 12:1 as a similar and previous usage to that in 1 Peter.

⁹⁰BAG, p. 477.

⁹¹We are dependent upon H. Strathmann's "λατρεύω, λατρεία", TDNT, 4, pp. 58-65; also Klaus Hess' "λατρεύω", in NIDNTTh, vol. 3, pp. 549-551.

⁹²R. Jewett refers to "popular Hellenistic Christian usage" as determining the πνευματί μου reading (such as 1 Cor 5:4, 14:14, 16:18), but he sees the spirit referring to the "divine spirit which was apportioned to the apostle" (Paul's Anthropological Terms, p. 198, note Eduard Schweizer on πνευματικός in "πνευμα, κτλ", TDNT, vol. 6, (332-455), pp. 434-437, article written with H. Kleinknecht, F. Baumgartel, W. Bieder, E. Sjoberg.

⁹³There is much more in these verses. We are just seeking to note the order in which a number of ideas are presented.

⁹⁴Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 604-605. Cranfield's denial that Paul's concept of rationality involves "the natural rationality of man"(p. 604) is surely right if it is separated from the idea of divine createdness and intention. But if this distinction is not made, then the denial of this by Cranfield may be unnecessary.

⁹⁵Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, p. 302.

⁹⁶Cranfield, Romans, p. 327.

⁹⁷Michel speaks of λογική λατρεία as "Es gehört freilich in den Sprachgebrauch der hellenistischen Synagoge", noting a number of references from Const. apost. (such as VII 34,6; 35,10; 38,5; VIII 37,6.). Furthermore, Michel states that "λογική λατρεία und λογική Θυσία gehören offenbar in die liturgische Sprache des hellenistischen Judentums, die auch philosophische Motive verarbeitet hat" (Römerbrief, p. 370.) This he states after references to Hellenistic materials, Qumran, and the usual reference to Test. Levi 3:6, and the hermetic corpus I 31, and XIII 18. His thought is also influenced by D. Hans Lietzmann, and R. Reitzenstein's interaction with 1 Peter 2:5 (Reitzenstein's perspective on Rom 12:1 and 1 Peter 2:5 is heavily dependent on discussion of "Hermetic thought" [p. 416], Hellenistic Mystery - Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance, translated by J. E. Stealy, (Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978, esp. pp. 415-421.)

⁹⁸Barrett, Romans, p. 32. Barrett has in mind the evidence of Philo particularly, Spec. Leg. 1. 209 [Loeb 7, pp. 218-219]. Numerous passages from Philo could be cited, especially from Spec. Leg. 1. 66-298 [Loeb 7, pp. 136-237]. R. J. Daly's presentation of and interaction with this material is helpful, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 389-422.

⁹⁹The "addition" of ὑμῶν in Aleph, D, Psi, and others may indicate a further desire to parallel 12:2 with 12:1; with the use of ὑμῶν with τὰ σώματα and λογικὴν λατρείαν.

¹⁰⁰Thus, Käsemann was right in noting the eschatological meaning to the cultic language Romans, p. 327. We would still argue that the ethical is still intrinsic to the eschatological, and indeed baptism ritualizes this connection.

¹⁰¹On νοῦς, R. Jewett, Paul's Anthropological Terms, pp. 384-389, 450-451. "The νοῦς in this context appears to be a constellation of thoughts and assumptions. These are made new by the gospel, and out of the new situation and understanding flows the new existence, which is, so to speak, reshaped or formed from the inside" (p. 385).

¹⁰²BAG, p. 201 "accept as approved, approve". The word suggests a recognition and positive assessment.

¹⁰³This is suggested through interaction with R. K. Yerkes, Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism, (London: A. & C. Black, 1953), pp. 198-202, and pp. 92-114 on "The Greek Thusia".

¹⁰⁴On 12:2 see H. E. Stoessel, "Notes on Romans 12:1-2: The Renewal of the Mind and Internalizing the Truth", 161-175; Schlier, "Vom Wesen der Apostolischen Ermahnung", esp. pp. 86-89; Käsemann, "Worship and Everyday Life: A Note on Romans 12", 188-195; Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, pp. 181-183; J. Koenig, "Vision, Self-Offering, and Transformation for Ministry", 307-323, esp. pp. 313-315.

¹⁰⁵This word is found only in Christian writings, BAG, p. 55.

¹⁰⁶Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 601-604; see note 58 for longer treatments.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., p. 604. ¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 605.

¹⁰⁹Käsemann, Romans, p. 329.

¹¹⁰Ibid., p. 329. We recognise that within a commentary some generalizations will be made that will not be helpful for more detailed analysis.

¹¹¹Despite the helpful insights of Reitzenstien, we do not think that the Hermetic corpus is the necessary key to understanding Paul's emphasis in Rom 12:1-2; see Hellenistic Mystery - Religions, pp. 415-421. Paul may have been aware of a λογικὴ θυσία concept, through awareness of Hellenistic philosophy, common religious talk, or even adopted language in the synagogue.

¹¹²Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, pp. 1-43, but esp. pp. 17-43. For a much shorter treatment, Gerhard Kittel, "λογικός" in TDNT, vol 4, pp. 142-143. On rational worship in Greco-Roman texts: see Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, pp. 159-161; Thompson, "Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice", esp. pp. 574-578; Ferguson, "Spiritual Sacrifice", pp. 1153-1156; as well as Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", pp. 49-67 on stoic philosophy primarily, and on Philo, pp. 67-87.

¹¹³It is surely worship in and by the human spirit (Rom 1:9), but Paul is not describing a spiritual rather than a physical response of man.

¹¹⁴Paul does not seem defensive in relation to Gentile philosophy in Romans.

¹¹⁵Seidensticker, Lebendiges Opfer, p. 262.

CHAPTER VII

CULTIC LANGUAGE IN THE DESCRIPTION OF THE APOSTOLIC MINISTRY OF THE GOSPEL: ROMANS 15:16

A. Summary of Interpretation

The description of Paul's own ministry in 15:16 functions as a rationale for Paul's bold correspondence. In short, 15:15b-16 gives the reason for boldness in writing, a reason that includes a metaphorical description of Paul's authoritative ministry to the Gentiles. Paul, in this way, is "boasting" in the ministry that God has given him (15:17). He directs attention to the working of Christ through him which has resulted in the obedience of the Gentiles, and he notes that the accompanying validations (signs and wonders) have been in the power of the Spirit (15:18-19a). This is a ministry that has been fulfilled in a particular area according to a particular principle of ministry (15:19b-21). The cultic description of ministry is prominent in this section (15:14-21) which introduces the peroration or conclusion of the letter.

In 15:16, Paul presents himself as an authorized sacred minister of Christ Jesus, who is involved in the sacrificial activity of the gospel of God. The purpose and confident result of the sacred servant's ministry (priestly ministry - generally speaking) is that the

Gentiles may be acceptable to God, on the basis of the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit who validates the effectiveness of the ministry. The idea of the acceptability of the offering of the Gentiles emphasized by the cultic language seems to correspond with the Gentiles' complete obedience to the gospel (15:18), indeed their self-offering (note 12:1-2), which is brought about by the priestly apostle and the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit.

This description of ministry is unique in the Pauline Corpus (although Phil 2:17 can be compared). It may be a fuller description of what Paul suggested in his language in 1:9 (ὃς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ τοῦ υἱοῦ κύριου), which may indicate that the priestly role of apostleship has been in Paul's mind in other places in the letter (note also 12:1). Undoubtedly, in this letter of introduction there is a formality that understandably results in the use of religious and specifically cultic language. One needs to consider further, though, this choice of the cultic minister as Paul's vehicle for self-description. The choice does not seem so surprising in light of the other cultic language in the letter, but it merits a more specific explanation. At a time of transition in his ministry, reflection on his ministry, and self-presentation in the letter to the Romans, Paul clearly emphasizes his apostolic calling to the Gentiles (1:5, 13-15, 11:13-14, 15:16-21). He is thinking in broad missiological categories, which includes eschatological categories. Paul clearly hopes to be part of that process of the Gentiles being grafted into the people of God.

Notions of harvest (1:13, 15:28) seem to be close at hand, and it is reasonable to suggest that Paul could picture his ministry within ideas of an eschatological offering, specifically of the Gentiles. The forthcoming trip to Jerusalem may have heightened such an eschatological perspective, and the audience at Rome with its Jewish-Christian origin and element may have been familiar with ideas of priesthood towards the Gentiles (at least Israel's role in this regard). It needs to be stressed, though, that Paul is not exploiting any of these eschatological notions. His emphasis is not on an actual final presentation, and indeed he has already spoken of a sacrificial presentation that takes place in response to the gospel in the present (12:1-2). In 15:16, the emphasis is on his role in making the offering acceptable, bringing about obedience to Christ on the part of the Gentiles. The language is used to express the nature of Paul's gospel ministry, there is no need to see the language as specifically based on one OT text (like Isa 66:20), or a concrete apocalyptic hope (the collection project bringing about the conversion of Israel through jealousy). The cultic language should not be pressed beyond its descriptive role. It is clearly a vehicle for self-description, stressing the fact of God's gracing of Paul for the gospel ministry to the Gentiles.

The cultic language is general, although it is difficult to suggest that Paul would be thinking specifically in pagan terms. Paul's language here is similar to Jewish ethical and specifically prophetic texts, that use cultic language metaphorically.

B. The Immediate Context

After the major ethical section is brought to a close (15:13), Paul begins his concluding remarks by complimenting the Roman Christians for their level of maturity (15:14). Paul, thinking back over the content of the letter, seeks to assure his readers that he has not been too audacious in writing to instruct the Roman church(es), church(es) not founded by him nor under his ministry. This intention is made clear in 15:15 as Paul appeals to his God-given *χάρις*, which is the basis upon which he has written boldly in parts of the letter by way of reminder.¹ It seems most probable that Paul has the major ethical section of the letter in mind, or his ethical directives, and that the *ὡς ἐπανάμνησεν ὑμῖς* is in part an indication that Paul seeks to associate and agree with tradition which has already been passed on to the Roman church.²

The picture of ministry in 15:16 comes in a section in which Paul is affirming his God-given calling as a necessary support for his apostolic teaching. Paul's letters are not lacking in such boasts.³ In 15:14-21, having tied his teaching into what the Christians at Rome have already received, Paul now affirms his teaching privilege by speaking formally of his apostolic ministry.⁴

The phrase *διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ* speaks of the gift or grace which had been given to Paul by God. This gift or grace is precisely his ministry, or is at least manifested in his ministry. It is the ministry's God-given status that allows Paul to write boldly and to associate with doctrine already taught.

This close relationship of grace to ministry is seen in Romans 1:5 where *χάρις* and *ἀποστολή* are probably best understood as hendiadys.⁶ This apostolic grace, or grace resulting in apostleship was to lead to the obedience of faith among all the Gentiles (1:5). In Gal 1:15-16 the divine origin of Paul's ministry is presented, also, with the use of *καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*. It is specifically the Gentiles again that are to be the recipients of his apostolic message. Later in Galatians Paul appeals to the Jerusalem recognition of the divine origin of his ministry (*χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι* 2:9). This is a ministry that is to the Gentiles (2:8) and not to the circumcision (2:9). In 1 Cor 3:10 Paul speaks of his ministry in metaphorical language, a ministry *κατὰ τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν δοθεῖσάν*. Here Paul sees himself as a master builder (BAG p. 112) laying a foundation (possibly for the Temple of God 1 Cor 3:17). This was Paul's ministry by divine bestowal.⁷

As we noted in the previous chapter, an important use of *χάρις* occurs in Rom 12:3. Paul prefaces his paraenesis with the words, "*λέγω γὰρ διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς δοθείσης μοι*". Paul is drawing attention to the authority on which basis he presents his paraenesis (note the absence of *χάρις* in 2 Cor 10:1, 1 Thess 4:1, Gal 5:16, 2 Cor 6:1, Phm 8, Phil 1:27, Col 3:12, 2 Thess 2:1, Eph 4:1). We have already mentioned that Paul appeals to his God-given *χάρις* in 15:15b, at least partially, because of the apologetical concern most likely felt because he has sought to give instructions to a church that he has not visited. The introduction to paraenesis, especially with

the use of *χάρις* in Rom 12:3, suggests that this is a concern of Paul, and so he stresses the authenticity of his divine calling.⁸ The description of ministry in 15:16 comes at a time when the same concern is evident.

H. Schlier's study of Rom 15:14-21 emphasizes the role of *χάρις* within Paul's thought.⁹ Schlier sees the apostolic "Liturgie" as being *χάρις* (p. 253). Ultimately, this *χάρις* is Christ himself, who is manifested in and through the gift and ministry of apostleship (Rom 5:15, p. 253). Speaking concretely, this grace of God is given in the preaching of the gospel (pp. 253-254). Such a gospel ministry can be termed a true "Liturgie", indeed a "Liturgie" that is "Gnade", because Christ himself, in the power of the Spirit, is at work in the apostolic gospel ministry (p. 254). Schlier brings together Christ, apostle, and gospel by means of a comprehensive concept of grace. This is the framework for his concept of Christian sacrificial activity, which involves Christ's suffering, apostolic ministry, and response to the gospel (pp. 254-256). What is important to stress here is that it is the idea of grace that allows Paul to be an actual liturgist of Christ, enabling the Gentiles to be an acceptable offering in response to this gospel liturgy (pp. 250-251). Paul calls forth the obedience of faith among the Gentiles "und darin das Opfer vollziehen" (p. 259). It is God's gift, divine *χάρις*, that enables this eschatological cult.

We would suggest that *διὰ τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ* in 15:15b primarily refers to the divine bestowal of a ministry, and so the phrase can be viewed in

light of 1:5 and 12:3. The emphasis is on "God-giveness", and therefore authority. The provocative view of Schlier needs to be evaluated at different points (see above pp. 95-102), but here we will consider only the use of *χάρις* in 15:15b. It is probably not correct to see the cultic picture in 15:16 as deriving from *χάρις*, as if it has specific cultic connotations for Paul.¹⁰ The word *χάρις*, in fact, need not have cultic connotations for Paul,¹¹ although a cultic description of ministry is certainly not inappropriate in view of *χάρις*. It is clear, therefore, that Paul does speak of his apostolic grace in cultic terms, and that the cultic description of ministry does explain the nature of this apostolic grace. In the broadest sense, God's particular gracing of Paul enables him to speak of a cultic ministry, although the cultic picture of ministry is not dependent upon Paul's use of *χάρις*.

Having spoken of the maturity of the Roman church, Paul begins his closing statements with an apology for having written in the manner he has. This calls for a statement of Paul's authority before he goes on to discuss his plans.¹² His authority is based upon authentic divine calling and responsibility for ministry, which is made explicit in the *διὰ* - phrase. This phrase connects the fact of writing boldly (in parts) to the description of ministry that follows. It is on the basis of Paul's apostolic grace that he has written the church at Rome.

C. Cultic Language in 15:16

1. *Εἰς τὸ εἶναι με λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*

God's call and bestowal has resulted (εἰς τὸ εἶναι) in a ministry that makes Paul a minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles. Λειτουργός has the general meaning of minister or servant, which can be appropriate to a domestic, civil, political, or cultic sphere of life.¹³ LXX usage definitely emphasizes the cultic associations of λειτουργέω and λειτουργία, but the noun λειτουργός does not have as strong a cultic sense, or usage.¹⁴ Λειτουργός is used only a few times in the LXX (14), three of which have a definite cultic personnel in mind (Isa 61:6; Neh 10:40; Sir 7:30). G. Schrenk suggests that λειτουργός was not used for לְיָדָי, because of its political and general cultic associations,¹⁵ whereas λειτουργός is used as a translation for different forms of לְיָדָי and לְיָדָי (once).¹⁶ The LXX translation of ... לְיָדָי in Isa 61:6 is λειτουργοί..., and Neh 10:40 has οἱ λειτουργοί for לְיָדָי. In these cases, as in others, the participle is used substantively in Hebrew, and can be translated as "ministers".¹⁷ In Isa 61:6 LXX λειτουργοί seems to be used in parallel with ἱερείς, without any distinction being made. In Neh 10:40 LXX οἱ ἱερείς is placed next to οἱ λειτουργοί, either suggesting two separate groups or λειτουργοί as appositional. The Hebrew reads לְיָדָי לְיָדָי and is rendered by the RSV as "the priests that minister". It is apparent, therefore, that λειτουργός can be used where a cultic sense is implied, but the word is not, strictly speaking, a word that has definite cultic connotations. The NT usage follows the pattern of LXX usage in having limited occurrences: twice in Hebrews (1:7, 8:2), and three times by Paul (Rom 13:6, 15:16, Phil

2:25). In Heb 1:7 *λειτουργός* is in the middle of an LXX quotation (Ps 103:4), and the referent seems to be angels. The referent in Heb 8:2 is *ἀρχιερεὺς*, Jesus himself exalted to the right hand of the throne of God, a *λειτουργός* "in the sanctuary and the true tent" (RSV). The writer goes on to discuss the sacrificial ministry of *πᾶς . . . ἀρχιερεὺς*, which has been surpassed by Christ's *λειτουργία* (Heb 8:6). It is evident that *λειτουργός* in 8:2 is used of Christ when his ministry is being compared and contrasted with the cultic model of the Jewish High Priesthood. As such, the word has a definite cultic meaning in context.

Paul uses *λειτουργός* with reference to political leaders (Rom 13:6), with reference to Epaphroditus who had been an apostle and minister of Paul's need (Phil 2:25), and of himself (Rom 15:16). Also, Paul uses *λειτουργεῖν* (Rom 15:27) and *λειτουργία* (2 Cor 9:12) in relation to the Jerusalem collection.¹⁸ *λειτουργία* is used in relation to the completion of the Philippians' service to Paul through Epaphroditus (Phil 2:30), and in the difficult phrase *Θουσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ* in Phil 2:17, which we have interpreted as a cultic description of Paul's own service.¹⁹ We can see from such references that the *λειτουργ*-words in Paul have to do with services of political, apostolic, personal, financial, and cultic natures. In Rom 15:16, when Paul speaks of himself as *λειτουργὸς Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*, this does not necessarily suggest priestly ministry, as we have seen from other references. But, the following description identifies this *λειτουργός* as a cultic minister.²⁰ (Thus, Phil 2:17 is an interesting

parallel). "... λειτουργὸν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ " is a unique phrase in the NT, and it joins ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,²¹ δούλος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ,²² and δέσμιος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ²³ as self-descriptions of ministry that are expressed with Christ in the genitive.²⁴ Paul is a servant - minister, on behalf of, for, in the service of, under the authority of Christ Jesus. All of these could be included in the ambiguity of the genitive, but this must be looked at more carefully.

Cranfield suggests that λειτουργός, especially with the genitive Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, indicates a specifically Levitical priest who acts in subservience to Christ, who is the priest responsible for the actual sacrifice offered.²⁵ Cranfield argues this on the basis of: (1) the association of Levitical service with λειτουργεῖν and λειτουργία in the LXX, (2) the likelihood of τοῦ Θεοῦ being used instead of Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ if a priestly minister was being referred to, and (3) the emphasis on the "auxiliary" role to "Christ's priestly service" that is seen in the ἕνεκα clause.²⁶ By interpreting λειτουργός as a Levitical priest, Cranfield has presented an indeed possible way of understanding the metaphorical language of 15:16; it is seen in relation to the priestly role of Christ.

We disagree with Cranfield's interpretation on the following grounds. (1) The LXX material seems unconvincing as a basis for arguing for a specific Levitical role being behind the use of λειτουργός. Although Cranfield's discussion concerning LXX usage of λειτουργεῖν and λειτουργία is well supported, λειτουργός itself does not

seem to be associated clearly with Levitical service. The LXX uses of λειτουργός which probably refer to cultic servants do not reveal this distinctive use,²⁷ and there are examples of λειτουργίῳ and λειτουργία used in the LXX for priestly service.²⁸ (2) The genitive Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ may not have as sensitive a meaning in relation to the metaphorical description as Cranfield suggests. It is more probably a genitive in the pattern of ministerial "titles" mentioned above, which indicates subordination to and representation of Christ. There need not be a Priest - Levite relationship implied, at least in the sense of the OT cultus. (3) We would suggest that, regardless of the possible priestly role or status that Paul saw in the present position of Christ, he definitely is not explicitly presenting a priestly picture of Christ in 15:16, or in the following description of ministry. Paul's references to Christ working through him (15:18), the gospel as being of τοῦ Χριστοῦ, and the defining of missionary strategy in light of the naming of Χριστός would not seem to express a priestly picture of Christ. Also, the clarification of Paul's boast towards God as being ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ does not in any definite way suggest a priestly image for Christ (15:17). If the idea of Christ's priesthood was foremost or prominent in Paul's mind in 15:16, it would seem that he would have talked in priestly terms concerning Christ, when clarifying his boast. We agree with Patrick Boylan when he states that "the context gives no real support to the view that Paul, according to this verse, is merely an 'assistant' of the High Priest, Jesus, who prepares the sacrifice which

Christ, then, offers to God".³⁰ Rather, the emphasis seems to be on Paul's ministry itself under Christ. Christ, as B. Weiss suggests, seems to maintain his status "as Lord and Regent of the Church".³¹ The position of Christ does not seem to be presented in priestly categories,³² but broader ones.³³ (4) It seems that other uses of *λειτουργός* by Paul argue for a general understanding of cultic ministry. One, therefore, has to fill the cultic significance of the word from the immediate context. The *λειτουργός* of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles seems to gain his cultic status through two parallel constructions: *λειτουργὸν ... ἱεραρχοῦντα* and *ἡ προσφορά ... ἡγιασμένη*. The picture is simply of a minister doing sacred service (cultic service) in order that an offering might be acceptable, sanctified in the Holy Spirit. It does not seem necessary to postulate a more complicated picture than this. One does not need to speak of this priestly service in terms of a Levitical service subordinate to Christ's priestly work. (5) An important question, therefore, in evaluating Cranfield's suggestion is, how far does one fill out a picture that is suggested by the metaphorical language? Barrett, Leenhardt, and D. W. B. Robinson are among those that suggest that the language should not be taken too allegorically.³⁴ Robinson states that the "image is probably drawn from cultic religion in general, rather than the Levitical system in particular".³⁵ Furthermore, Robinson sees the metaphorical language as merely illustrating the dependence of the Gentiles on Paul "in making a right response to the gospel".³⁶ Although we would question (with Konrad Weiss) the

likelihood that Paul consciously drew a parallel with general cults rather than the Jewish cultus, we do believe that the details of specific priestly orders and practices are far in the background of the metaphorical language, if present at all.³⁷ Paul could be speaking of a priestly servant of Christ, without necessarily wanting to develop the picture of the cultic servant's ministry beyond the level of his metaphor. In entering the world of the metaphorical, we agree with G. B. Caird that we do a disservice to the language if we fail to note the "intended point of comparison on which we are being asked to concentrate to the exclusion of all irrelevant facts".³⁸ Although we must consider further the nature of the metaphorical language, at this point we suggest that the priestly role of Christ is not being emphasized, and thus is not determinative in understanding the metaphorical description. Rather, the emphasis is on the "priesthood" of Paul on behalf of Christ Jesus. The type of priesthood is defined by the appointment, the Gentiles as those for whom the priesthood is appointed, and the nature of the service which has to do with the gospel of God. The emphasis of the metaphorical language is not on the activity of Christ Jesus, but the activity or service of the *λειτουργός*, Paul himself. Further discussion of the possible origins of such a description of ministry must be held off until we have looked at the rest of the text.

2. *Εἰς τὰ ἔθνη* 39

Our discussion of *Χάρις* has already directed our attention to Paul's specific calling. It is no surprise

to see *ἰς τὰ ἔθνη* in 15:16, after Paul's remarks in 1:5, 1:13, and 11:13.⁴⁰ The importance of this is that the cultic picture of Paul's ministry is tied into his distinctive understanding of that ministry. This *λειτουργός* is concerned with the Gentiles, his mission being specifically to the nations.⁴¹

That Paul speaks of *τὰ ἔθνη* here needs to be seen in the light of the prominence of *τὰ ἔθνη* in Romans.⁴² While Paul insists on the priority of the Jews in God's privileges and plan (1:16, 2:9-10, 3:1, 9:1-5, 11:1-3, 15:8-9), he insists just as firmly that the Gentiles are at present recipients of God's mercy in Christ (15:9), and that ultimately there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile before God (2:11, 3:22, 11:32). Paul uses the OT to argue for the place of the Gentiles in God's mercy, especially in 15:9-12.⁴³ This mercy has been demonstrated in Christ, the one who became a servant to the circumcision, in order to confirm the promises given to the patriarchs, and in order that the Gentiles might glorify God for His mercy (15:8-9).⁴⁴ It is this Christ, the root of Jesse ... who rises to rule the Gentiles, in whom the Gentiles hope (15:12, Isa 11:10 LXX). The Gentiles' hope for mercy is grounded in the Messiah of Israel, the one who came to serve the circumcision (15:8).⁴⁵ Therein seems to lie the theological basis for the two strands of thought in Paul: the priority of Israel, and the equality of the Gentiles.

That Paul continues his self-definition in the light of the Gentile mission is seen from *ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν* (15:16), *Χριστὸς δὲ ἐμοῦ εἰς ὑπακοὴν ἐθνῶν* (15:18), and

the geographically based strategy of mission presented in 15:19-21. 15:15b-19a establishes the validity of this apostolic mission to the Gentiles, speaking of the calling and divine activity. In 15:19b-21, Paul grounds his ministry in Jerusalem beginnings,⁴⁶ stating that a definite stage has been completed, and that it has been completed according to Paul's priority or principle of ministry, which is based on Isa 52:15 LXX. Paul's ministry is not an unstructured isolated itinerant ministry,⁴⁷ rather it has reached a point of completion according to plan. This plan has clearly involved the Gentiles as the sphere of ministry.

This peroration (15:14-16:[27]) functions to conclude the letter, and to give the basis on which Paul seeks a future visit.⁴⁸ Gal 2:9 may be significant in giving an indication of why the Gentiles are presented so clearly as Paul's responsibility. As we have noted above (p. 126-129), if the church at Rome had particularly strong links with the Jewish mission, then Paul's calling to the Gentiles could be seen as complementary to the mission to the circumcision, and indeed needed to be seen as such. Paul makes it clear that he has authority from God for this specific mission (in relation to the Jewish mission), and this is the basis upon which he has written and plans to visit Rome.⁴⁹

3. Ἱερούργουντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ

Ἱερούργειν appears nowhere else in the Pauline corpus, and is unique in the NT. Claude Wiener's study has revealed limited and late usage of the verb in classical Greek texts, which implies association with sacred rites;

but those who practise such rites are not necessarily priests.⁵⁰ Jewish sources, including Philo and Josephus, speak of sacred functions and sacrifices, but the term is not connected with priests specifically.⁵¹ Corriveau refers to Josephus' and Philo's use of ἱερουργίᾱ in relation to the offering of "first fruits", "spiritual holocausts", and "sacrifices of investiture".⁵² With such texts in the background Wiener believes the general concept of offering sacrifice to be the meaning of ἱερουργουῦντα in Rom 15:16.⁵³ Corriveau suggests that "Temple priests or the faithful offering sacrifice" could be the appropriate background.⁵⁴ Thus, the personnel involved in making the sacrifice are not definite, although the fact that ἱερουργεῖν speaks of offering sacrifice and doing sacred service is clearly supported. With this word, the description of Paul's ministry definitely enters the realm of the cultic. Schrenk sees ἱερουργεῖν as meaning "to perform holy or sacrificial ministry", and in the context Paul is describing his ministry clearly "as service of a cultus".⁵⁵ Cranfield suggests that in light of the context the best rendering is "serve with a holy service", although he recognises the sacrificial background.⁵⁶

One reading of 4 Macc 7:8 provides an interesting parallel to Paul's language here.⁵⁷ In a section reflecting on the faithfulness of Eleazar, others are called to such faithfulness to the Law and to being willing to suffer even to death. The sentence, "τοιοῦτους δεῖ εἶναι τοὺς ἱερουργουῦντας τὸν νόμον ἰδίῳ δέματι καὶ γενναίῳ ἐβῆτε τοῖς μέχρι θανάτου πλάθει ὑπερκαπιζούσης", can be translated "such must be the ones who do the holy service

of the Law, shielding (it) with their own blood and noble sweat with sufferings even to death". The Law itself is that which is maintained by faithful service and obedience even in the middle of suffering.⁵⁸ Sacrificial service was done in accordance with the Law and to fulfill the Law. As opposed to 4 Macc 7:8, Paul is involved in a priestly service, a sacrificial ministry, a holy service of the gospel of God.⁵⁹ As such Paul's sacred ministry is sacred because of the gospel and its cultic nature is defined by the gospel.⁶⁰ The actual activity of the sacred and sacrificial service is not mentioned immediately, and is left for further explication in the clause. But it would seem that Paul is thinking of the gospel ministry, the preaching of the gospel (15:20), as a cultic-type activity. Included in this gospel ministry would be the letter that he has just written, an apology for which is the impetus of this description of ministry.

Τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ is undoubtedly the same in content as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ (15:19). Paul's use of τοῦ Θεοῦ with εὐαγγέλιον, which is limited,⁶¹ is here probably due to his recognition of God as the origin of his χάρις in 15:15b. In the same way, God is also the origin or source of his gospel.⁶² The emphasis here is on τὸ εὐαγγέλιον as it defines the nature of the ministry,⁶³ although the qualifier does indicate the theocentric perspective that frames this metaphorical description.

Paul begins the letter with a formal statement concerning his apostolic call εἰς εὐαγγέλιον Θεοῦ (1:1). In 1:9 this is further expressed when Paul appeals to God as a witness (ὃς λατρεύω ἐν τῷ πνεύματι μου ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ

τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). Paul presents himself as a worshipper or minister in relation to, or in the service of the gospel of God's Son.⁶⁴ This comes very close to the cultic picture, although the phrase ἐν τῷ πνεύματί μου literally spiritualizes the content of the λατρεία in this context.⁶⁵ Some of the aspects of Paul's service are seen in the following statements as he speaks of his prayers for the church at Rome (1:9-10), and his desire to visit them and minister among them (1:10-13). This ministry is described in a ἵνα clause as obtaining some fruit (καρπός) even among the Romans just as among the rest of the Gentiles (1:13). Paul expresses a sense of obligation in his Gentile mission, an obligation which includes preaching the gospel to those who are in Rome (1:14-15). It is this gospel that Paul preaches (1:15), that he believes to be the power of salvation (1:16), and that becomes the content of the letter. These aspects of Paul's presentation of his ministry are mentioned here because parallel ideas appear in 15:14-33. After Paul compliments the Roman church on its spiritual condition (1:8, 15:14), he speaks of his ministry in sacred or cultic terms (1:9, 15:16). Paul's prayers concerning his trip to Rome (1:10) are matched by a request for the prayers of Rome on his behalf, even that he might get to Rome (15:30-32). Paul expresses his hope for results in ministry in the ἵνα clauses (1:13, 15:16, and even 15:31,32). Καρπός, although used differently, does indicate the result of ministry in both 1:13 and 15:28. Paul's expression of obligation towards the Gentiles (1:14-15) is paralleled by the obligation that the Gentiles should sense towards their Jewish

predecessors (15:26-27). The powerful gospel of 1:16 is preached ἐν δυνάμει σημειῶν καὶ τεράτων, ἐν δυνάμει πνευμάτων ... (15:19), and therefore is proved powerful in Paul's ministry. The primary result of the ministry is the obedience of the Gentiles (15:18), something that Paul has mentioned at the outset of the letter (1:5).

Such a series of parallels suggests that the description of Paul's ministry as sacred service must be seen within this framework of apostolic mission to the Gentiles. In other words, as quickly as we enter the cultic world with words like ἱερουργεῖν, we recognise that the cultic language serves to explain gospel ministry. There is a cultic nature to the ministry of the gospel. The cultic nature is not so much connected with parallels of function, but in terms of the results of the ministry. It is within the ἵνα clause, therefore, that one can more explicitly see the cultic nature of the priestly service of the gospel. We want also to stress that the parallels between 1:9 and 15:16, within their respective sections of the letter, suggest that the cultic picture of ministry may have been in the back of Paul's mind in the thanksgiving section of the letter.

4. The ἵνα Clause

The ἵνα clause begins the real explanation of the cultic role of the ἱεργός, "in order that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable". The result and possibly the purpose of the sacrificial service is expressed in the word εὐπρόδεκτος. The ministry of the ἱεργός is to make possible or ensure that the προσφορά is εὐπρόδεκτος. Whether or not there could

even be a προσφορά of the Gentiles without Paul's ministry is not stated. The emphasis is on the result of the cultic servant's service, and that is the acceptability of an offering.

Εὐπρόσδεκτος is not an LXX word.⁶⁶ It is found in the NT in both cultic (Rom 15:16; 1 Pet 2:5), and non-cultic settings (Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 6:2, 8:12), although the two should not be distinguished too quickly in the cases above.⁶⁷ In Rom 15:16 the sacrificial picture would suggest that God himself is the one who is to be pleased. This is supported by the use of ἐνάρετος in Rom 12:1, 14:17, and Phil 4:18. The absence of τῷ θεῷ here is probably due to the addition of ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, and should be understood since God is the one that accepts sacrifices and offerings.⁶⁸ Εὐπρόσδεκτος and similar words were "known in hellenism",⁶⁹ and were related to general piety and ethics.⁷⁰ In Rom 15:16 the cultic associations are allowed, and therefore one thinks of the acceptability of an offering.⁷¹ The emphasis is on acceptability and not presentation, which may also reveal: (1) the lack of concern to stress one presentation at one local cult (note 12:1), (2) the nature of the προσφορά as involving the lives of the Gentiles as an offering of an eschatological mission in the general sense, and (3) the concern to stress the means of acceptability as being the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit, although the work of the λειτουργός is still needed.

Before we deal with ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν, we need to view the explanatory phrase ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ. This phrase explains the first part of the ἵνα clause, and

speaks of the basis of the effectiveness of the priestly ministry. The *λειτουργός* will accomplish his task of rendering the offering acceptable by reason of the fact that his ministry is accompanied by, and based upon the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit. *ἁγιάζω* is clearly a LXX word.⁷² It is commonly cultic in meaning, and in general the word refers to a "god-effected state", and can mean "consecrate", "sanctify", etc.⁷³ Although the concept of sanctification may be common in Paul's writings, the word *ἁγιάζω* is used only one other time by Paul with the accompanying phrase *ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ* (1 Cor 6:11). This passage emphasizes the cleansing, justifying, and sanctifying of the Corinthians in the midst of the evils mentioned in 1 Cor 6:9-10. It is interesting to note the ethical challenge that the presence of the Spirit causes in 1 Cor 6:12-20, in which Temple imagery is used. The community set apart by God's choice and presence must live as such,⁷⁴ as was the case with Israel.⁷⁵ The ideas of acceptance with God, and the sphere or activity of the Holy Spirit are found together in Rom 14:17-18. The kingdom of God involves righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit. The one who is in this kingdom, the one who serves Christ with this type of living, is pleasing to God (*εὐάρεστος τῷ Θεῷ*) and acceptable to men. It would seem that in Rom 15:16, although the cultic concepts are clearly evoked, the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit results in ethical purity in the lives of the Gentiles. These ideas are very closely intertwined, and reveal the close connection of cultic and ethical ideas of purity.

Paul affirms the close connection between his

preaching of the gospel, and the work of the Holy Spirit (15:17-20). The power of the Spirit was operative (15:19) in the external evidence that accompanied the gospel ministry. A common element in these two references to the work of the Spirit is the accompanying idea of validation or authentication. The sacrificial service of the *λειτουργός* is effective, indeed can be seen as cultic, because of the work of the Holy Spirit.⁷⁶ The Holy Spirit is the guarantee of the acceptability of the offering, and thus the guarantee of the cultic role of this *λειτουργός*. In the reality of Paul's preaching ministry, the accompanying work of the Holy Spirit assured the authority of the apostle. Thus, the acceptability of the offering of the Gentiles is made certain because of this divine activity intrinsic to the gospel cult.⁷⁷ Consequently, Paul's use of the phrase *ἡγιασμένη ἐν πνεύματι ἰσχύι* appropriately concludes a section of cultic language that has never lost touch with the ministry of Paul, which such cultic language seeks to explain and defend.⁷⁸

5. Ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν

Clearly the most interesting and discussed aspect of the metaphorical language is the phrase *ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν*. *Προσφορά*, as it is used in the LXX, has as its main equivalent in the MT *תְּרוּמָה*.⁷⁹ The word is used sparingly in the LXX, with the majority of its appearances in Ben Sira.⁸⁰ *Προσφορά* has a more general sense than even *Θυσία* does, and has various meanings in Greek literature including "dowry", "receipt of a gift", "contribution" (MM, p. 552), as well as "income", "benefit", "offering", or "increase" (LSMJ, pp. 1530-1531). Weiss

suggests that the NT use of the word is more specialized and means "sacrifice as gift or act",⁸¹ although the NT appearances are limited to nine.⁸² Baur suggests "the act of bringing, or that which is brought" as a general description of NT usage (BAG, p. 727).

There are a number of uses of προσφορά outside of Romans that we should consider. Προσφορά is used in Acts 21:26 with reference to the offering that Paul presented in the Jerusalem Temple for each of the men under a vow. In Acts 24:17 Paul responds to the accusations of Tertullus, the High Priest and the elders, and tells Felix about his bringing of alms εἰς τὸ ἔθνος μου and προσφοράς. Here again, "offerings" or "gifts" (pl.) would seem to be adequate translations, especially since we cannot tell precisely what Paul has in mind.

Occurrences of προσφορά in Hebrews present an interesting study due to their presence within a relatively small section of text, and the use of προσφορά in relation to the sacrifice of Christ.⁸³ In a passage that reveals knowledge of numerous terms for sacrifice προσφορά is chosen to speak of the offering by which sanctification takes place once for all (διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).⁸⁴ In 10:14 the perfecting work of the προσφορά is spoken of in relation to the sanctified community. And in 10:18 we are told that, in the light of the prophetic word concerning forgiveness (Jer 31:33-34) and on the basis of Christ's προσφορά, there is οὐτέτι προσφορά περὶ ἁμαρτίας. Here, προσφορά is probably used to relate Christ's offering to the sin offering, although προσφορά has a broader meaning.⁸⁵ It is possible

to read too much into the author's use of *προσφορά*, since he has apparently picked up a word in the OT passage quoted in 10:5. It is appropriate, though, to note the author's stressing of Christ's fulfilling of God's will as the broad explanation of this *προσφορά*. Therefore, the sacrifice is not to be seen within the mechanics of the Law (10:8), but as an active obedient self-offering of Christ's own body. Christ's "perfect obedience to the will of God"⁸⁶ has abolished the old sacrificial order, and therefore Christ's actual sacrifice is part of the new order (10:9). *Προσφορά* itself does not carry these connotations, but the author has chosen to develop the idea of Christ's sacrificial obedience in relation to the OT text quoted, and the word *προσφορά* itself. The nature of the argument reveals the close association of offering with obedience.

In Ephesians 5:2 Christ's love and giving of himself *ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* is described as a *προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας*. In an ethical context where the readers are called to imitate God and to walk in love, Christ is presented as an example because of his love and giving of himself "for us".⁸⁷ It would seem that the epistle is using the cultic terms to emphasize the quality and the acceptability to God of Christ's love and giving of himself for others.⁸⁸ Because the cultic language is descriptive and expansive, one cannot offer any real insight into any distinction between *προσφορά* and *θυσία*. It is important to note the addition after *θυσία* of *τῷ θεῷ εἰς ὁσμὴν εὐωδίας*.⁸⁹ This would seem to be a parallel to the phrase *εὐάρεστον τῷ κυρίῳ* (5:10), although it

stresses the cultic picture more vividly. The cultic description does not separate Christ's love and giving of himself "for us" from the life of love that the readers are called to: it simply emphasizes the acceptability of such a life and death to God, an acceptability that the Ephesians are to seek after (5:10) in the light of what they have been taught (4:20-21). The general ethical force of the cultic language, ethics that derive from relationship and example, is clear.⁹⁰

Returning to Rom 15:16, it is best to start with the translation of "offering" for προσφορά, because of the general cultic picture. The nature and content of the offering are dependent upon the use of the genitive τῶν ἰθυῶν. It should be noted that there is an intrinsic ambiguity in the cultic picture involving who is actually offering "the offering", because of the brevity of words. This situation has resulted in a number of possible interpretations of the cultic picture, which we will look at below. The obvious emphasis is on the acceptability of the offering, a point reinforced by the qualifying phrase which follows, and this must be remembered for interpretation. As we will note further below, the nature of Paul's ministry suggests that Gentile acceptability is the central concept,⁹¹ and that in a very specific sense the Gentiles are the offering that the Holy Spirit sanctifies through the priestly and sacrificial service of Paul.⁹²

6. Τῶν ἰθυῶν

There are two primary ways of understanding the genitive τῶν ἰθυῶν that result in various interpretations

of the cultic imagery. (1) The genitive can be appositional, epexegetical, or of content so that in some primary sense the Gentiles themselves are the actual offering that is being offered.⁹³ Barrett, for example, suggests that "Paul acts as a priest in presenting to God an offering which consists of ('of the Gentiles' is appositional) the Gentile Christians who have been converted in his mission".⁹⁴ Käsemann points to the epexegetical genitive and the apocalyptic nature of Paul's concept of bringing the heathen world as an offering to God.⁹⁵ Cranfield, classifying the genitive as appositional, speaks of "the sacrifice consisting of the Gentiles", which are offered to God by Christ.⁹⁶ Schlier sees "die Völker" as the offering that Paul brings to God through the gospel.⁹⁷ This view is held by a majority of commentators with different degrees of emphasis on the apocalyptic nature of the concept and different perspectives on the vividness of the cultic picture. Leenhardt says:

"The apostle is a liturgical minister because he exercises a priestly function (ἱεροουργεῖν) through the preaching of the gospel, thus offering to God a sacrifice that is well pleasing; namely, the converted Gentiles who are sanctified by the Holy Spirit".
(footnote 98)

Then Leenhardt goes on to explain:

"the priesthood is assumed by the apostle not because he sacrifices at a new altar to offer a new sacrifice, but because he proclaims the gospel and becomes the instrument by which the Holy Spirit associates believers with the sacrifice of the cross".
(footnote 99)

Therefore, Leenhardt explains the significance of the Gentiles as 'the offering presented' in the light of Pauline ministerial and theological categories, and not

cultic ones (in the formal sense). This is a view similar to the one we will present, although there is a further aspect of the cultic picture that we will emphasize.

A number of commentators who take this view of the genitive see as the background for the concept of the Gentiles as Paul's offering, the offering from all the Gentiles in Isa 66:20 (or at least they refer to this text).¹⁰⁰ This is a possibility that we must consider separately below. Here we simply mention that once one has decided on the appositional, epexegetical, or genitive of content use of τῶν ἔθνῶν, the way is opened for different origins of the cultic image, and various emphases.

(2) The second basic understanding of the genitive is to view it as possessive or subjective so that in some sense the offering is that which the Gentiles offer.¹⁰¹ In this case, the λειτουργός renders the offering acceptable, an offering that is brought by the Gentiles. The Gentiles in their self-offering (12:1), obedience (15:18), and even praise (15:9) are to be seen as presenting sacrifice to God, which the λειτουργός has brought about and rendered acceptable through the work of the Holy Spirit. A. M. Denis sees the subjective genitive as more natural, paralleling ὑπακοὴν ἔθνῶν in 15:18.¹⁰² Viewing the sacrificial picture in the light of 15:19, Corriveau states,

"As Paul's own cultic activity is by the power of the Holy Spirit (15,19), as it renders the sacrifice, made by the Gentiles in the response of faith, acceptable, sanctified by the Holy Spirit". (footnote 103)

Here the emphasis is on the active role of the Gentiles, which the λειτουργός enables. The obedience, faith, and

response of the Gentiles is the content of the offering that they themselves present.

(3) An alternative is to see the προσφορά́ of the Gentiles as specifically related to the collection from the Gentiles which Paul is bringing to Jerusalem. The suggestion here is not simply that προσφορά́ equals collection, but that the προσφορά́ τῶν ἔθνῶν and the collection are to be seen in the light of τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἔθνῶν (11:25) and ὑπακοὴν ἔθνῶν (15:18).¹⁰⁴

Therefore, the προσφορά́ is referring to the fullness of Gentile obedience, which is to be expressed in the presentation of the Gentile collection for the Jews in Jerusalem.¹⁰⁵ Keith Nickle, following this interpretation,

draws attention to the variant reading in 15:31

(δωροφορίά).¹⁰⁶ This reading would add to the sacrificial picture of the Jerusalem collection, the actual substance of which along with the delegates is included in the concepts of πλήρωμα (11:25) and προσφορά́ (15:16).

This view has not been presented with much exegetical detail in relation to 15:16, except in a recent article by Roger Aus.¹⁰⁷ Aus, although he sees the offering of the Gentiles in relation to the gathering of Gentile converts to Jerusalem (including the collection), sees the genitive as epexegetical and referring to the Gentiles which Paul presents as an offering.¹⁰⁸ The importance of the collection enterprise to Paul's missiology cannot be discussed here,¹⁰⁹ but its importance to an understanding of Rom 15:16 will be discussed below. It is apparent, however, that this perspective is not decisive for the use of the genitive, although few argue for the subjective or

possessive genitive on the basis of the relationship of Rom 15:16 to the collection project. Thus, the determinative factor is how one views the collection itself, and whether it could have affected Paul's priestly and sacrificial language in Rom 15:16 (this we will consider briefly below).

7. Conclusions Concerning ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν

Our interpretation is based on the understanding of the genitive as appositional or a genitive of content, but we suggest that inclusive within this idea of Paul's offering of the Gentiles are ideas of Gentile obedience to Christ, and of self-offering. Thus, we introduce our understanding of ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνῶν with some comments from C. H. Dodd. Speaking in light of Rom 12:1 as "the cult of the Christian religion", Dodd says of Paul's ministry, "in so far as his preaching of the Gospel and his pastoral care for the Gentile churches promote this cult, he is exercising a priestly office".¹¹⁰ Dodd goes on to speak of Paul's sacrifice, which is the "consecrated bodies, or personalities, of his converts".¹¹¹ Dodd, therefore, seems to take the genitive (τῶν ἔθνῶν) in an appositional sense, but he makes it clear that he is not denying the idea of "the priesthood of all believers" even in this context (15:16). Thus, Dodd says of each believer's sacrifice:

"But the minister who brings men to Christ, and instructs and trains them in Christian living, is making that sacrifice possible, or helping to make it more real and complete". (footnote 112)

Dodd's explanation of the text allows for an interpretation of the cultic activity as involving more than the

priestly activity of the *λειτουργός*. The priestly minister makes the sacrifice possible and acceptable. Implicit, though, in the idea of *ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν* is the obedient response of the Gentiles to the gospel, and in this way their own offering is suggested (as in Rom 12:1).¹¹³

Paul is not stretching his metaphorical language. The implied image is general, and the thrust of it is that the Gentiles are acceptable to God through his gospel ministry. The phrase *ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἔθνῶν* speaks of the Gentiles collectively, in their response to the gospel, as being made acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. It is interesting that the actual presentation of the offering is not referred to; it is implicit. Since the *λειτουργός* is the one described by the cultic language, it is most probable that he is doing the act of offering that is implied. One must allow for the possibility, though, that the Gentiles, within this metaphorical cultus, are not simply a passive sacrifice.¹¹⁴ Although Paul's concept is eschatological,¹¹⁵ as we will suggest below, and Käsemann is generally correct in seeing "the Gentile world itself" as the offering,¹¹⁶ this offering involves the obedience of the Gentiles (15:18); their self-offering under the priestly ministry of the apostle (12:1-2).

The question may arise as to why we have not taken the genitive as subjective or possessive if we are seeking to retain the self-offering idea implicit in Paul's language. In short, we are seeking to retain what seems to be the cultic picture of Paul's own

eschatological priestly missionary service to the Gentiles. The Gentiles themselves are the content of the acceptable offering that is the result of Paul's sacred ministry. It is the Gentiles, who through the ministry of the apostle, are sanctified through the Holy Spirit and are thus brought into the sacred sphere. To be an acceptable offering means to be consecrated to God, to be sanctified for presentation, and use or service. Thus, Paul is thinking collectively of this ministry that results in the offering (the Gentiles) being acceptable to God. When one seeks to understand the implicit meaning that the metaphorical language may convey, it is the acceptable status, rather than presentation that must be emphasized. It is at the secondary level, in the light of the actual involvements of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles, where one can legitimately see more than a passive role to ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἔθνων. The obedient response of the Gentiles to Christ by means of the apostle's ministry in the power of the Holy Spirit (15:18-19a) is what Paul has in mind in the whole of 15:16. Ideas of Gentile faith, obedience, and self-offering are implicit in the eschatological offering of the Gentiles that Paul administers. This is the nature of Paul's cult, if one were to stretch the metaphorical language. It does not involve the bringing of passive victims, but the Gentiles in their obedience to Christ. In this way, we retain the appositional genitive or genitive of content, and keep the ministry of the λειτουργός central. But, necessarily, the broader implications of the offering of the Gentiles involves Gentile response, which indeed Paul seeks through his ministry.

Our understanding of the offering of the Gentiles will be explained further as we consider possible reasons for Paul's use of cultic language in Rom 15:16.

D. Possible Reasons for Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans 15:16

1. The Cultic Minister as a Natural Self-Description

Paul describes himself in many and various ways in his letters.¹¹⁷ It may be suggested that the cultic self-description in Rom 15:16 is not surprising because it is close at hand in other places, and is a natural type of Paul's ministry.¹¹⁸ In fact, though, Paul does not speak of himself as *λειτουργός* elsewhere. The difficult text, Phil 2:17, may imply a priestly role for Paul, along with his own self-offering as an accompanying libation, but this is not stated as clearly as it is in Rom 15:16. Even so, Phil 2:17 does present an interesting parallel to Rom 15:16. An eschatological perspective is present (Phil 2:16), and Paul is reflecting on at least his apostolic sufferings, if not his death in the service of the Lord. If the genitive *τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν* after the hendiadys *ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ*¹¹⁹ is similar to the genitive *τῆς χρείας μου* after the description of Epaphroditus as *ἰπόστολον καὶ λειτουργόν*, then Paul seems to be speaking of the sacrifice and service of his apostleship resulting in the Philippians' faith. (This is a debated point, though, since many see Paul's libation being added to the sacrifice and service resulting from the Philippians' faith,¹²⁰ in which case the priestly role of Paul is lacking.) We suggest that Paul is thinking in terms of his own sacrificial ministry, and that this is reflected

in his exhortation to ethical purity in Phil 2:14-15 (note especially the use of ἄμωμη).

Despite the differences between these texts, Phil 2:17 (in the light of Phil 4:18 also) gives us reason to be cautious in viewing Rom 15:16 as a completely unique example of self-understanding on Paul's part. The cultic world could provide language and images for description of the Christian ministry.¹²¹ At the same time, there is the need to pursue other possible reasons for why Paul may have chosen this cultic description of ministry. For 15:16 is an apologetic self-portrayal, which is related to the rationale behind the content of the letter.

2. The Collection Project and Rom 15:16

The visit to Jerusalem and the giving of the collection, which is described with διακονέω, κοινωνέω, and λειτουργέω in 15:25-27, is definitely a crucial event in Paul's ministry.¹²² Paul shows concern that this "fruit" might be taken to Jerusalem, and accepted with the help of apostolic "sealing" (15:28). Because of this Paul asks for prayer on the part of the Romans, thus revealing his uncertainty concerning the success of the project (15:30-32). The linguistic parallels between 15:16 and 15:31 are significant.¹²³ Since they are at the beginning and end of a section of the peroration (15:14-33), it may be that there is a connection between these similar uses of language. We do not think that Paul is speaking of the collection when he uses the phrase ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν (15:16), but it may be that there are reasons for the similar use of language.¹²⁴

There are two factors worthy of note in viewing Rom

15:16 in the light of the collection project. The first is one we have already suggested more generally, and that is the association of cultic language with "good" acts of piety (Phil 4:18), which is common in Jewish and Christian literature.¹²⁵ The associations of cultic categories with righteous behaviour takes place often in the prophetic tradition, even at times when the cultus is challenged because of its abuse.¹²⁶ In much of the Wisdom literature, there is a respect for the cultus, and the simultaneous use of cultic categories to describe good conduct.¹²⁷ Of special interest is the use of προσφορά in Sir 34:18, 35:1, and 35:5. In this section of Ben Sira there is a warning against depriving a poor man of his bread (34:21), and 35:2 equates almsgiving with a θυσίαζων δινείσεως. Also, the helping of the πτωχός is juxtaposed with teaching about offering sacrifices ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ εὐλογία σου in 7:29-32.¹²⁸ In the Wisdom literature right behaviour pleases the Lord and is the prerequisite for acceptable sacrifices. This includes almsgiving, which is central to the ethics of the wise man.

The documents at Qumran show the application of cultic language to the reception of and obedience towards the rules of the community.¹²⁹ The cultic language used with reference to specific acts of righteousness or sufferings is an intensification of what we have already seen in other literature. This is due to the community's saving function for Israel, and its rejection of the present impure Temple cultus. Within the Qumran writings, sometimes spiritualized sacrifices do not merit description in cultic terms simply because of the common use of cultic

language, but because these acts, functions, and participation in the community were seen as ultimately redeeming for the community and for all of Israel. Although the council (1QS 8:1-10), and the whole community (1QS 9:3-6) are seen as having atoning functions, specific qualities and actions of individual members and the group are described in cultic terms as well (1QS 8:3-4, 9:5, 3:3-12) [Daly, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 162-169].

Two NT texts are also worthy of mention here. In 1 Peter 2:5, the community is to be built as living stones into a holy house to offer *πνευματικὰς θυσίας εὐπροσδέκτους* to God through Christ. It is hard to reduce this intermingling of cultic images to propositions, but it is evident that the Christian community is being described as having a priestly function in offering sacrifices, which strictly speaking are not cultic.¹³⁰ This model of the community is primarily ethical in purpose as it leads directly into a description of the community's purpose within the mercy of God (1 Pet 2:9-10). The cultic picture need not be separated from the strong emphasis on instruction in the letter, including basic ethics and teaching concerning purity and suffering.

Hebrews 13:15-16 speaks of community sacrifices (*καρπός*) that involve praise, the *καρπός* of the lips confessing "his" name, doing good, and not neglecting to share one's goods (*κοινωνία*). A number of instructions are given after this call to sacrificial activity which do not receive explicit cultic description (13:17-19). Although these instructions do not seem to be outside the realm of sacrifices pleasing to God (13:16), it is

interesting to note the specific activities that do receive cultic description. Praise, doing good, and sharing one's possessions seem to summarize the cultic-type activity of those who have no lasting city, but await the city to come (13:14). By living thus, the pilgrim people of God, who are sanctified through the blood of Christ (13:12), please God. It is of special interest to us that *κοινωνία*, undoubtedly referring here to the giving of money, is mentioned in this context.

Rabbinic teaching reveals a continued and detailed interest in giving to the poor.¹³¹ This sometimes finds cultic associations or descriptions, and indeed is seen as central to the righteousness that is pleasing to God. This is specifically relevant to our concern in respect of the Gentiles. R. Johanan ben Zachai's statement concerning the fact that "charity makes atonement for the heathen"¹³² stands within the strand of rabbinic thought which "allows for the salvation of 'righteous Gentiles'".¹³³ The true proselyte was the one committed to Torah-obedience, and in this manner he proved himself to be a proselyte. Part of that obedience was, undoubtedly, the giving of alms.

The evidence above may seem to have gone far from Romans, but it may help our understanding of Rom 15:16 by suggesting first of all, the common association of obedience and righteousness with cultic language, and secondly, the specific association of almsgiving with cultic language. The second would seem to be a representative case of the first. That the collection was an act of obedience that could be representative of Gentile

response to the gospel, and therefore receive cultic description, is a real possibility.

The second factor that is worthy of note is the simple fact of the imminence of the collection delivery, and the likelihood that it would have been on Paul's mind. One needs to ask what sort of associations there may have been in Paul's mind concerning the collection enterprise (we will deal with the possible role of Isa 66:20 in the next section). Keith Nickle has drawn attention to "the harvest motif" in 1 Cor 16:2, and 2 Cor 9:6 ff., which are both concerned with the collection.¹³⁴ Paul's reference to the collection in Rom 15:28 contains agricultural language that would be suitable when referring to the delivery of grain (*σφραγισάμενος ὑμῶν τὸν καρπὸν τοῦτον*),¹³⁵ which would be appropriate if there was a close association between harvest and collection in Paul's mind.¹³⁶ This connection would have been a natural one in terms of imagery, and it is even more understandable if Paul hoped to be in Jerusalem by Pentecost, if not originally by Passover. It may be that Paul viewed, for theological or chronological reasons, the collection project within the framework of the harvest season, and especially the Feast of Weeks (keeping in mind Acts 20:16, and the probable dating of the writing of Romans just before the Passover to Pentecost "season", A. D. 57, noted above p. 120).¹³⁷ The Feast of Weeks, leading up to Shavuot (Pentecost), was primarily a first fruits and harvest festival time.¹³⁸ This is the time when the *Θυσία νέα* was offered, and God's sovereignty over the harvest was recognised afresh.¹³⁹ If the collection delivery was to take place in the context

of the ingathering of the first-fruits cultic associations could be made with ease. We have already noted that Paul seemed to use ἀπρχή (first-fruits) to speak of converts (Rom 11:16, 16:5; 1 Cor 16:15; 2 Thess 2:13) and the idea of Gentile converts bringing their collection around the harvest celebration would make cultic connections easy.

It seems to us that the collection enterprise may have helped to bring the cultic description of ministry to mind, but that Paul has more in mind than the collection in 15:16, if he has it at all. The collection enterprise is part of Paul's ministry of bringing about the obedience of the Gentiles (1:5, Christ's role in 15:18), an aspect of Christian service that Paul hopes to seal himself (15:28). This need not be seen as an apocalyptic event in the climactic sense (as we will note below), but as an event fulfilling an obligation that Paul encouraged the Gentiles to complete. Such an event would have provided further reason for Paul to reflect on the nature of his ministry. The collection as a part of the response that Paul sought to bring about from the Gentiles, may have quite easily fitted within this priestly picture of ministry that Paul presents.

We state here, though, that the collection in and of itself is not the reason behind the cultic image in 15:16. That there is association in Paul's mind, and that Paul could think of the collection in cultic terms is most probable. It seems, though, that this picture of ministry and Paul's view of the collection may both be explained at least in part by a common factor that needs to be seen as primary to both. Thus, we proceed to a third possible

reason for the cultic language in Rom 15:16 which seeks to view the cultic language and the collection within a broader or at least a unified framework.

3. The Possible Relevance of Isaiah 66:20 and/or the Pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Jerusalem

A number of scholars appeal to Isaiah 66:20 as relevant to an understanding of Rom 15:16 (see note 100). Although numerous other texts might be referred to,¹⁴⁰ Isa 66:20 is the only text we are aware of that has been seriously considered as an actual source, and not just a parallel use of certain cultic words. We know of only one study that has presented with any detail a rationale for seeing Isa 66:20 as influential upon Paul's description of ministry in Rom 15:16.¹⁴¹ It is necessary, therefore, to consider this study in some detail. To say that Paul saw his ministry and the collection project in some broad eschatological sense, although probably true, is not a specific enough statement to reveal the relevance of "eschatological ideas" to Paul's ministry and Rom 15:16. Thus, we assess a more specific thesis.

Within Roger Aus' broader concern, he sees Rom 15:16 as a "Christian interpretation" of Isa 66:20 aided by contemporary Jewish understanding. Paul adapts the concept of the Jews coming back from "diaspora as an offering to the Lord in Jerusalem" to the Gentile Christians as an offering brought to Jerusalem "to the Lord Jesus".¹⁴² Aus's purpose is to show that Isa 66 is the backbone of Paul's "collection enterprise".¹⁴³ He sees Paul as reading the Isaiah text in relation to Christian missionaries, who bring representatives from all the Gentile nations to Jerusalem as an "offering" or

"gift" to the Messiah.¹⁴⁴ Aus's thorough argument contains many supporting points. He argues that Paul saw Tarshish, Spain, as the end of the world, in the light of OT prophecy and Rabbinic sources.¹⁴⁵ He uses Isa 60, 66, and Pss 72 and 68 as exegeted by the Rabbis, along with inter-testamental literature, to support his view of Paul.¹⁴⁶ He uses Jer 3:14 to argue that Paul had a concept of "representative universalism" based on the OT.¹⁴⁷ On the basis of this construction of Paul's missiology, Aus proposes that the πληρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν would be fulfilled after Paul's visit to Spain, when he would complete this eschatological offering of the Gentiles.¹⁴⁸ Aus concludes his argument by seeking to answer two possible objections. The first objection has to do with the possible interference on Paul's part in what was seen in some Rabbinic circles as the Messiah's right "to gather the exiles of Israel".¹⁴⁹ Aus assumes that either Paul was not aware of this tradition, or that his mission to the Gentiles allowed the Messiah then to gather the Jewish exiles, which would then mean that "all Israel would be saved" (Rom 11:26).¹⁵⁰ The greater objection, according to Aus, and one that we are more interested in, is that Paul does not quote or explicitly allude to Isaiah 66 although there is clear evidence for its importance in Rabbinic sources.¹⁵¹ Aus gives three reasons for the lack of overt reference to this passage in Rom 15:16 ff. First of all, Paul would not have wanted to "accentuate the eschatological motif", because this would have been poor practice in that he would appear to be using the Gentiles for his own aim.¹⁵² Second, Paul would

not have wanted to hurt relationships with Jerusalem by overemphasizing the success of his ministry and by his attempt at "forcing the End".¹⁵³ Lastly, Paul would not want to appear to be breaking the Gal 2:9 agreement, in that his real hope is the salvation of the Jews through the Gentiles coming to Jerusalem.¹⁵⁴

Despite the extensive evidence used in Aus' work, and his attempt at dealing with objections, we are left with this question: does Paul demonstrate the use and particular understanding of Isa 66:20 (and accompanying texts) which Aus suggests? Are such OT texts and Jewish literary parallels determinative in forming Paul's eschatology and strategy for mission? The numerous references, especially in Rabbinic sources, are suggestive indeed of a trend that developed in Rabbinic exegesis. But is it an aspect of Paul's exegesis? Aus recognises that explicit evidence in Paul's letters for these determining factors in his mission is lacking. We could even say that we are dealing with a "missiological secret".¹⁵⁵ In responding to Aus' thesis, we will restrict our comments primarily to the thesis' implications for Rom 15:16, although he deals with other significant texts.

First of all, we think that the προσφορά in Rom 15:16 is probably being presented to Θεός, and not to the Messiah.¹⁵⁶ Although the dative, representing to whom the sacrifice is offered is lacking, the picture does not seem to suggest that the offering is to be presented to Christ. In actual fact, according to 15:18, Christ is already at work in Paul's ministry, and it would seem odd if Paul were to view the presentation of the offering (in

context) to be at the feet of the Messiah. At the same time, as we have suggested, the presentation of the offering is not what is emphasized in the description of ministry in Rom 15:16, anyway. Undoubtedly, this presentation is assumed, but one should not make this the emphasis of the text because of an assumed eschatological perspective (even if there is truth to the eschatological perspective in a general sense).

Second, there is no hint of a pilgrimage motif in the cultic language, and it is understandable without it. As one looks at the text of Isa 66:20, there are few points of contact with Rom 15:16. Except for the use of נְתַתֵּן , which is referring to $\text{נְתַתֵּן לְךָ זֶבַח}$, and $\text{זֶבַח אֲנִי מִנְחָתָם}$ there are no real linguistic or conceptual parallels.¹⁵⁷ Although נְתַתֵּן is the MT equivalent for the LXX use of *προσφορά*, there is no Greek text of Isa 66:20 that we know of that has *προσφορά*. Because of Paul's apparent use of the LXX in 15:9-12, and 21, it would seem that if he had Isa 66:20 in mind, he would have used *δῶρον* instead of *προσφορά*. That *προσφορά* fits the sacrificial image better than *δῶρον* could be argued as a reason for Paul's departure here from LXX usage. However, it would seem just as likely to us that the cultic picture of ministry is the controlling factor in Rom 15:16 without any need to refer to the נְתַתֵּן , לְךָ זֶבַח , *δῶρον* of Isa 66:20. Also one must note that the LXX translation *ἔξουσιν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὑμῶν ἐκ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν δῶρον κυρίῳ* seems far removed from *ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν*. It is interesting to note that in Isaiah the gift of the Gentiles is compared to the $\text{נְתַתֵּן לְךָ זֶבַח}$ which the

sons of Israel bring to the house of the Lord. The LXX has rendered $\pi\pi\iota\beta\iota$ here by τὰς θυσίας, which does not support the idea of Pauline dependence. In short, Paul's dependence upon Isa 66:20 in Rom 15:16 must be seen as only a faint allusion on linguistic and grammatical grounds. If Paul is referring to Isa 66:20 in Rom 15:16, he is not making it explicit for his Roman readership.

If Paul in some sense derived his offering of the Gentiles idea from Isa 66:20, one would need to see a pattern of exegesis elsewhere in Paul's letters that would support this connection. It is therefore necessary to look for Paul's use of the pilgrimage motif elsewhere, especially when cultic language is used. In fact, Paul does not use passages anywhere that specifically refer to the Gentile pilgrimage to Zion. This is even the case in the collection passages, unless the harvest motif is seen as an explicit pilgrimage motif. We do not doubt the importance of the collection enterprise, especially at this point in Paul's ministry. Nevertheless, it seems unjustified on the basis of Paul's missiology to assume that he was planning a continuation of the collection enterprise in the West, at least as a prerequisite for the parousia. Except for Paul's call for prayer which is understandable (15:30-32), and the possible implications for the support of his own mission it does not appear that Paul is connecting the collection with his future ministry in any programmatic way. One could argue that Paul's reference to gaining fruit (κάρπος) among the Gentiles (Rom 1:13) is used with reference to a continued collection project (15:28), but this would seem to make

κέρπος almost a technical term, which is unnecessary. The grain and harvest imagery would seem appropriate in reference both to the ministry in general (1:13) and to the collection project (15:28). Yet this shared word (κέρπος) is not sufficient evidence to support a deliberate identification between ministry and collection. In short, we believe that we are left in the dark as to much of Paul's missionary strategy in Spain beyond what is explicitly said in 15:24. It could be that Paul hoped to maintain the agreement stated in Gal 2:10, but it is a different matter to suggest that this determines his mission strategy in a major way.

Due to the lack of evidence, we would suggest that it is not correct to view ἡ προσφορὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν as prescriptive for Paul's future missionary strategy in the sense that Aus proposes. We do not think that there is a connection between Rom 15:16 and 11:25-26 which would point in the direction that Aus has suggested. Paul does not seem to use a pilgrimage concept or even language that ties these two texts together. Furthermore, the pilgrimage theme is noticeably absent from 15:14-33, where we would most expect it.

We, therefore, view the absence of specific reference to Isa 66:20 and the absence of reference to specific pilgrimage motifs to be important in challenging Aus' thesis. Consequently, we need to consider Aus' answers to this objection. (1) That Paul remains silent out of pastoral motives could never be proved or disproved. There is however evidence against this view. Paul has not remained silent concerning his hope for Israel (10:1,

11:13-15, 25-26), but he does not explicitly discuss the collection project in relation to this hope. One can assume that Paul hoped that the Jews would respond to the gospel through his ministry, and that they would respond specifically in the light of Paul's ministry to the Gentiles (11:13-15). This hope, though, does not seem to be the centre of Paul's missionary motive or strategy, rather Paul is motivated by his sense of divine calling to the Gentiles (1:5, 15:15-21). A specific apocalyptic understanding of the collection lacks evidence,¹⁵⁸ and it is unlikely that Paul would have remained silent about such a perspective if it helped him to unravel the mystery of Israel.

(2) As far as maintaining a good relationship with Jerusalem is concerned, the collection project does not need to be seen as a source of conflict. Paul may be indicating his faithfulness to the Jewish-Christian church and Jerusalem through mentioning the collection and the rationale for it (15:25-27). This would be significant to the church in Rome (having connections with Jerusalem), since Paul affirms his connection with Jerusalem (15:19, 26,31). That the Jerusalem church (or the church at Rome) was sensitive about their "relative ineffectiveness" in mission to the Jews is not clear, and therefore we cannot suggest that Paul was especially sensitive to this.¹⁵⁹

(3) It is not necessary to view the Gal 2:9 agreement in such a rigid way as Aus does, implying that the Jerusalem leaders would be threatened by Paul's real concern that Israel would be saved. We doubt that this type of motivation, even if present in relation to the

collection project, would have offended the Jerusalem leadership, or placed the acceptance of the gift in jeopardy. In this regard it is important to remember that the Gal 2:9 agreement was connected to the Gal 2:10 agreement, which would seem to be the foundation of the collection project, regardless of eschatological motivations. That the collection was significant to Paul on the basis of Gal 2:10, and because of its strengthening of Jew-Gentile relationships, is clear. That Paul saw the need for the Gentiles to recognise the appropriateness of such a gift is clear (15:25-27). That the gift was an eschatological act in as far as it was a part of Paul's mission, a mission conducted in the light of the Lordship and parousia of Christ, is also clear. That the collection project was an important concrete expression of the obedience of the Gentiles, and may have thus influenced Paul's use of cultic language in Rom 15:16 is also possible. But, one needs to be very careful in applying apocalyptic language and concepts from other parts of Paul's teachings or from other sources to the collection project itself.¹⁶⁰ In short, the collection is quite understandable in the light of the ethical fabric of Jewish and early Christian religion (as we saw in 2 above), not to mention the Gal 2:9-10 agreement.

In conclusion, we do not believe that there is enough evidence within Paul's letters and particularly within Rom 15:14-33 to suggest that the cultic language in 15:16 is based on a deliberate Christian interpretation of Isa 66:20. This text does not seem to be behind Paul's metaphorical language in Rom 15:16, nor is it the key to

unlock Paul's understanding of the collection. It does not seem to be the source for the cultic picture of ministry and the collection.

4. Paul's Self-description in Rom 15:16 Understood Within the Closing Section of the Letter and in the Light of the Apologetic for Mission (Implicit and Explicit in his Letter).

If the peroration is carefully written in view of the content of the letter,¹⁶¹ which seems probable, then it is worth suggesting elements of the letter that may point towards this significant self-description. We have already pointed to the use of *λατρεύω* (1:9), which is also unique as a descriptive term of Paul's ministry. Paul is clearly stressing the authenticity of his ministry by using this word (which can be used in cultic settings). The general statement of ministry (1:9) is given expansion in the following parts of the thanksgiving and letter-body opening (1:8-15, exordium and narratio). Paul's sacred service includes his plans for Rome, where he also hopes to be involved in gospel ministry. We also have seen Paul's exhortation in 12:1-2, which intrinsically makes Paul the one who calls forth bodily sacrifice. Paul, in an implicit sense, can be seen as the priestly exhorter, calling forth the sacrifice of the community. This leads into Paul's paraenesis, which he presents on the basis of the grace that God has given him (12:3). This paraenesis presupposes Paul's apostolic authority, an authority that he exercises in relation to a church that has not been under his foundational ministry.¹⁶²

Rom 15:16 describes Paul's ministry in a way that implicitly defends his right to have written to Rome with

the boldness he showed. The picture of ministry within 15:14-21, we would suggest, probably reflects this apology or defence. Thus, Paul states his God-given priestly role of bringing about the acceptability of the Gentiles. This seems to make clear the type of priestly service that was suggested in 1:9, and 12:1-2. Coming at the end of a section of ethical teaching, and in light of the further description of ministry in 15:18 (in terms of obedience to Christ), it is understandable that Paul would have used cultic language. If there was any question as to the basis of Paul's gospel or paraenesis, this metaphorical description emphasizes the God-given role of Paul to enable the acceptability of the Gentiles. There are definitely ethical connotations here, and it may be that this in part aided the further use of cultic language.

It is safe to say, though, that one can and indeed should see this description of ministry in a broader perspective than that of the apostolic right to present ethical instruction. This letter, a defence of Paul's gospel, is simultaneously a defence of Paul's apostleship and mission to the Gentiles. Paul has stated that what is true for the Jew is true for the Gentile (Greek- 1:16, 2:9,10, 3:9, 10:12). He has argued for divine impartiality and the fact that God is one (2:11, 3:22,29-30, 10:12), which supports his gospel of justification by faith for everyone who believes. While asserting the faithfulness of God to Israel, Paul makes clear the acceptance of the Gentiles within the people of God. God has called the Gentiles (9:24), even if historically this has happened in light of the transgression of Israel (11:11).

Paul himself is involved in this call of God to the Gentiles, and this is the basis upon which he writes (1:1,5, 15, 11:13-14, 15:14-21). Furthermore, the close of the letter body-middle (probatio's exhortation) has called for the mutual acceptance of members of the community in the light of the uniting of Jews and Gentiles within the purposes of God in Christ (15:7-9). This leads into a section of OT quotations where the praise and hope of the Gentiles joins that of the Jews, and clearly is made possible by Christ himself, the root of Jesse (15:12). Thus, the basis of mutual acceptance of Jews and Gentiles is their unity in God's purpose of salvation in Christ. This desire for mutual acceptance is probably expressed in Paul's concern for the acceptance of the collection and his own service on the part of the church in Jerusalem, and the recognition of the Gentiles' own obligation on their part (15:25-32). Another expression of that mutual acceptance would be the acceptance of Paul in Rome and the mutual encouragement of each others' faith (1:11-12). This was indeed a concern of Paul that is implicit and explicit in the very fact of writing, and one that may be reflected in the background of Paul's gospel apology and self-description.

It is after the climax in 15:7-13 (with the use of the OT), and before the explanation of the collection that Paul describes his ministry and makes clear his plans to pass through Rome to Spain. 15:14-21 is at one time personal and universal. We would suggest that Paul is speaking as a Jewish Christian who sensed the call of God into the apostolic service of Christ Jesus. He is

involved in priestly ministry to the nations, therefore, on behalf of the root of Jesse, the Christ in whom the nations hope, the Lord they praise. Moreover, Paul's clear statement of his Jewish nationality (11:1-2), his emphasis on the privileges of Israel (3:1-2, 9:4-5), his insistence on Gentile obligation to their spiritual "elders" (15:27, 11:16-24), his description of Abraham as the father of all who have faith (4:1-25, note 9:6), his recognition of the importance of Jerusalem and the Jerusalem church (15:19,26,31), and his discussion of problems related to Israel itself (9:1-11:32), should be kept in mind as one thinks of Paul's concept of a priesthood to the nations on behalf of Christ Jesus. Furthermore, Paul's uses of the OT (especially Isaiah), in relation to mission, the inclusion of the Gentiles, and Israel's rejection of the gospel and/or God's faithfulness and Israel's salvation are an indication that Paul is carefully explaining and defending how the gospel for Israel is the gospel for the nations.¹⁶³ And this is something that Paul does, when writing to a church that probably has connections with Jerusalem, Jewish roots, and has been under other ministry, probably that of the Jewish mission.

One wonders if Paul would not have developed this picture of priestly ministry creatively in the light of the situation and emphases of the letter mentioned above, without necessarily adopting or using a particular text. We have already suggested that the priestly role may have been in Paul's mind earlier in the letter, and here it is used to sum up the nature of his apostolic calling. Thus, it is probably not dependent on a specific text, but was

precipitated by the same factors that have affected the structuring and basic apologetic thrust of the letter.

We emphasize here two such factors, although they may in fact be related. The first is that Paul is presenting his gospel and apostleship in a way that would be particularly relevant to a church with strong Jewish roots and connections with Jerusalem. The priestly picture would be particularly meaningful and have a clear sense of divine authority implicit within it. This may have been aided by ideas of Israel or the servant's role to the nations (as in Isa 42:1-9, 43:8-13, 49:1-7, 52:6-53:12),¹⁶⁴ or associated ideas of the hope of God's grace extending to Israel and thereby to the nations, the nations' recognition of the glory of Israel, or Israel's benefitting from the wealth or service of the nations (60:1-14, 61:1-11, 62:1-12, 66:10-21).

One text where this does come to expression in an interesting fashion is in Isa 61:1-9. After the announcement of the ministry of the one anointed by the Spirit (61:1-3), the rebuilding of Israel is spoken of with reference to the nations' service and wealth. Within this context, the prophetic word for the people of God is: *ὕμεις δὲ ἱερεῖς κυρίου κληθήσεσθε, λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ* (61:6a LXX). There is no ministry spoken of, the appellation seems to be honorific and possibly used to recall the role of Israel as stated in Exod 19:6. This type of recognition on the part of the nations is parallel to Paul's desire for the nations to recognise their obligation to Israel spiritually, which they should act upon in terms of material gifts (represented in the collection - 15:25-32).

In one sense this honorific title, with its implied respect, is what Paul hopes for and expects on the part of the Roman church as he goes there. As he plans on imparting *μεταδῶ χάρισμα ὑμῖν πνευματικόν* (1:11), Paul hopes for support in his ministry in Rome and to be sent on to Spain. After all, the priests did deserve the benefits of their priestly sacrificial duties, and this was to be true for gospel ministry as well (1 Cor 9:13-14). Since Paul was to pass through Rome, it is not unreasonable to suppose that he hoped for the concrete help of a Roman church that recognised his apostolic privilege, indeed his priestly responsibility and right. It seems doubtful to us that Paul actually had Isa 61:6 in mind as he wrote, but it is possible that the priestly picture of ministry implied authority and recognition of a ministry to the Gentiles specifically. Thus, this type of background, including the priestly role of Israel should be kept in mind. The leadership of the church at Rome may have been particularly sensitive to these types of connections, and thus the cultic image of ministry would be significant.

The second factor that should be considered is related to the first, and is one that we have already noted. It is the fact of the soon approaching trip to Jerusalem, which provided also the situation for Paul's reflection on his ministry. Going to the city of the Temple, and the place where the gospel began, makes for an easy use of cultic language in relation to gospel ministry. This is especially the case, as we have noted, because of connections between obedience and cultic

language, and the collection as an example of that obedience. We have already noted the similarities between 15:16 and 15:31, and it may be that the cultic language was that much more in Paul's mind because of the trip ahead. The trip to Jerusalem could have also caused Paul to reflect on his ministry along the lines suggested as factor number one above.

E. Conclusion: Cultic Language and Paul's Ministry

We have suggested above that the best way to understand the cultic language in Rom 15:16 is to view it in the light of its role in the letter. This text is not isolated from the rest of the letter but presents Paul's ministry as an authoritative priestly service, which indeed gives him the right both to write to Rome, to visit them, and to expect their acceptance. Paul seems to have had the priestly picture of ministry in mind as he wrote the letter, and the use of other cultic language in the letter makes it fitting. It is reasonable to assume that Paul's attempt to present himself to the Roman church, his reflection on his ministry, and the soon approaching trip to Jerusalem all had a part in the cultic language used. The language is descriptive and says nothing about the present cultus itself. We suggest that the OT, and ultimately the Jewish cultus, should be viewed as behind this use of metaphorical language, although the language is general.

If there is any one thing that needs to be emphasized more than others in this whole discussion it is that the cultic picture of ministry grows out of and is appropriate to Paul's understanding of the ministry itself. Its

cult-like nature is due to the role Paul plays on behalf of Christ Jesus, which in fact is a mediating role. There are two aspects to this mediation that should be noted, one that we have stressed above, and one that we note here before we present our conclusions to this study. The aspect of mediation that we have noted is the role Paul plays in enabling the offering of the Gentiles to be acceptable. Through gospel ministry, the Gentiles are made acceptable to God, sanctified by the Holy Spirit. This is indeed the simplest and clearest aspect of the metaphorical language, and it should be stressed.

The second aspect of the mediating role is implicit in the first, and is an expansion on the first. It begins by noting that Paul's mediating ministry can be seen simply as that of being the means of Christ's own ministry through the apostle (15:18 and note Schlier above with whom we disagreed in part, but who emphasizes strongly this aspect of Paul's mediating ministry, although related specifically to the concept of grace). Surely this understanding of being the apostle of Christ, not just as proclaimer, but actually bringing people into obedience to Christ lends itself to sacred and cultic description. We argued above that there was no need to see a specific Levite - Priest relationship between Paul and Christ, and this seems true. But that does not mean that Paul did not see himself as mediating the grace of God and the Lordship of Christ in the most realistic and specific sense. This ministry was undoubtedly seen as continuous with the Christ-event (death-resurrection), and thus part of God's offering of salvation. In a real sense, because

the gospel is the power of God resulting in salvation (1:16), the role of the apostle is part of that salvation history, in fact a mediating part. Thus, Paul becomes the mediator of a salvation offered by God in Christ, and sealed by the Holy Spirit.

The priestly role certainly needs to be exegeted first in terms of its narrower meaning in context. But it may be that the message of the letter can be related to this broader priestly role.

Excursus: The Eschatological Priesthood to the Gentiles and the Testament of Levi

The idea of a new eschatological priesthood is not emphasized in Rom 15:16, although Paul's idea of priestly service for Christ Jesus could be seen in this way. It is interesting to note the eschatological Levitical priesthood presented in T. Levi as a possible parallel and even expansion of similar ideas expressed so briefly by Paul.¹⁶⁵ Because of uncertainties about any relationship between T. Levi and Paul's writings, we present some interesting uses of *λειτουργός* and related cultic ideas, without suggesting dependence in either direction.

An angel in 2:10 tells Levi that he (Levi) will be the Lord's minister (*λειτουργός αὐτοῦ*) and that he will declare *μυστήρια αὐτοῦ* to men, and make proclamation (*κηρύξεις*) concerning the one who is about to redeem Israel. In 3:5-6 the angels are ministers (*οἱ λειτουργοῦντες*) involved in sacrificial service which includes the offering of a *προσφορά*. In 4:2 God makes Levi (evidently) a son, a servant, a *λειτουργὸν τοῦ*

προσώπων αὐτοῦ. The λειτουργός will have a ministry to Jacob and Israel, and will receive a blessing along with his seed, until the Lord visits all the Gentiles in his mercies forever. In 8:1-17 there is a vision of the investiture of the new priesthood. Levi's seed is divided into three (8:14), and a third will be called by a new name, because a king will arise from Judah, and will establish a new priesthood (ἱερατεῖον νέον), according to the type of the Gentiles, to all the Gentiles. In 18:1-2, after the failing of the priesthood, the Lord will raise up a new priest to whom all the words of the Lord will be revealed. In his priesthood (18:9) the Gentiles will be multiplied in knowledge and will be enlightened through the grace (χάρις) of the Lord.

The following aspects of this priesthood in T. Levi are of special interest. (1) It is interesting to note the emphasis on proclamation as an aspect of Levi's calling (2:10). (2) The role that the new priesthood has to the Gentiles is significant (4:2, 8:14, 18:9). (3) The concept of a new priesthood itself, especially one appointed by a king that arises from Judah (8:14), is also worth mentioning. These concepts parallel the priestly role of Paul in his proclamation, his mission to the Gentiles, and his service of Christ Jesus, who is descended from David (1:3-4).

This evidence portrays a future hope, a Messianic priesthood of an ideal and supra-cultic nature that reaches to the nations.¹⁶⁶ It is difficult to be sure of the various sources or different pictures that are included in the flat reading of the text that we have presented

above.¹⁶⁷ It is interesting, though, to see the priestly role expanded in the way it is, and associated with a Messianic figure.¹⁶⁸ Despite possible lines of connection between T. Levi and the writings of Paul,¹⁶⁹ it seems best to present this material, noting the simplicity of Paul's cultic description of ministry in comparison. His metaphorical language is undeveloped, and does not allow for the apocalyptic or idealized picture that is presented in at least some of the material in T. Levi.

Footnotes

¹BAG, p. 507. The difficulty of translating ἀπό μέρους is illustrated by comparing Barrett, Schlier, and Cranfield. Barrett views ἀπό μέρους connected to the following words and therefore it is speaking of part of Paul's intention in writing (Romans, p. 275). Schlier connects ἀπό μέρους with "Kühnheit", suggesting that Paul is softening his statement about boldness (Römerbrief, p. 428). Cranfield associates ἀπό μέρους with ἔγραψα and suggests that the meaning is simply "in part of the letter" (Romans, vol. 2, p. 753). We favour Cranfield's suggestion. It seems likely that Paul is thinking back over the letter, and those teachings and instructions which address Rome most pointedly.

²Romans 6:17 reveals Paul's recognition of teaching already received in Rome. Michel stresses Paul's awareness of tradition (Römerbrief, p. 456), and Cranfield notes that "Paul is specially desirous of drawing attention to the fact that he has been appealing to knowledge already possessed by the Christians of Rome" (Romans, vol. 2, p. 754).

³Gal 1:15-2:20; 1 Cor 3:10-17; 2 Cor 2:14-7:1; for description of ministry in less overtly apologetical situations see Phil 2:17; Col 1:24-29; Eph 3:1-13; Tit 1:11-15.

⁴ἔχω οὖν τὴν καύχασιν ... (15:17) reflects Paul's recognition of his strong affirmation of his own authority in the previous description of ministry (15:15b-16).

⁵ὕπό is preferred to ἀπό by Nestle-Aland's 26th ed., and the UBS 3rd ed.

⁶Nigel Turner, Syntax, vol. 3 of A Grammar of New Testament Greek ed. by James Hope Moulton, (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1963), p. 336.

⁷See also 1 Cor 15:10, and Eph 3:2.

⁸Akira Satake stresses Paul's understanding of his own ministry as a unique calling, one that is reflected in Paul's use of καλέω, κλητός, and χάρις ("Apostolat und Gnade bei Paulus", NTS 15 (1968-1969), 96-107, esp. pp. 100-103. According to Satake the uniqueness of Paul's calling in his own mind can be seen in that Paul views his personal experience of grace and his responsibility of apostleship inseparable (pp. 97-99). Paul's apostleship was so closely tied to his experience that salvation was dependent upon his fulfillment of his apostolic ministry (so Satake, p. 104). That Paul saw his apostleship as grace, saw his ministry as fundamental to the church in a special sense, and that he saw that salvation was being mediated through apostleship service we would agree. But, Satake is stressing that Paul's own salvation was dependent upon fulfilling his mission as well as stressing the uniqueness of Paul's ministry (pp. 106-107).

We believe that Satake has overemphasized the individuality of Paul's understanding of his ministry, and we would agree with the general criticisms of his work by Seyoon Kim (The Origin of Paul's Gospel [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck) 1981], pp. 289-296). Kim primarily faults Satake on his exegesis of passages that suggest Paul's calling was unique in his own mind (esp. Gal 2:7-9; Phil 1:19; 1 Cor 3:10). It would appear from Rom 15:20 that Paul recognised the foundational ministry of others. The very fact that Paul assumed and praised the maturity of the Roman church (15:14), and hoped to be sent on from Rome to Spain by them (15:24) suggests that one should not overstress Paul's sense of his own uniqueness.

For Paul's view of his mission see Paul Bower's "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission" (Ph. D., Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1976); countering the individualistic understanding of Paul's ministry is A. T. Hanson's The Pioneer Ministry (London: SCM Press, 1961); on Paul's view of authority see, John H. Schutz, Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority SNTS 26 (Cambridge: CUP, 1975).

⁹Schlier, "Die 'Liturgie'".

¹⁰In Gal 1:15-16, where Paul speaks of his call *ἐν τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ*, the accompanying imagery seems to be that of a prophetic calling, and probably that of the servant in Isa 49:1 instead of Jer 1:5. A cultic description of ministry is far removed from Paul's mind in Galatians, even as it is from the servant in Isa 49:1 ff. It is not apparent from other Pauline reflections on his call that he viewed his ministry in specifically cultic terms, except for Phil 2:17, which does not contain the word *χάρις*. Paul's use of cultic language in Rom 15:16 is not explained by the noting of *χάρις* in the context therefore, although the word may be significant. (On the relationship between Gal 1:15-16 and Isa 49:1, see Paul Bower's "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission", pp. 135-136).

¹¹See 1 Cor 15:10; Rom 1:5, 12:3; Gal 1:15, 2:9; Eph 3:2. The 1 Cor 3:10 is questionable, since although the immediate picture of ministry is that of building, the actual building image seems to lead to the Temple language in 3:16-17.

¹²Treating 15:14-33 as a unit is Robert W. Funk's study, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance"; also Wuellner's "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation", pp. 162-168, where Wuellner sees 15:14-33 as a section of the peroration.

¹³BAG, p. 472; LSMJ, p. 1036; MM, p. 373; H. Strathmann, R. Meyer, " *λειτουργία*, κτλ ", TDNT vol. 4, pp. 215-231, esp. pp. 229-231. See also discussion in Schlier's "Die 'Liturgie'", pp. 248-251.

¹⁴R. Corriveau suggests that *λειτουργός* has a "profane" sense and that it does not have "the special liturgical value which both *λειτουργία* and *λειτουργεῖν*

have" (Liturgy of Life, pp. 149-150).

¹⁵Gottlob Schrenk, "ἱερός, κτλ", TDNT, vol. 3, 221-283, (p. 263); and Jürgen Baehr, "Priest, High Priest", NIDNTTh, vol. 3, 32-44, (p. 33).

¹⁶BDB, p. 1058; and Hermann J. Austel's study of "לֵוִי", in TWOT, vol. 2, p. 958.

¹⁷Texts B and S have added *καί* to emphasize distinction between *ἱερεῖς* and *λειτουργοί*.

¹⁸The significance of these references to the collection will be discussed below; see D2.

¹⁹These are all the uses of *λειτουργός*, *λειτουργέω*, and *λειτουργία* in Paul's letters.

²⁰In thinking of possible alternatives, it is important to note that Paul never uses *ἱερεύς*, and in 1 Cor 9:13 when he uses a "priestly model" as one argument for the support of apostolic ministry, he uses the lengthy phrase *οἱ τὰ ἱερά ἔργαζόμενοι*. It is obvious that priestly language as such is not common in Paul's letters.

²¹Exact or approximate equivalents: 1 Cor 1:1; 2 Cor 1:1; Col 1:1; Eph 1:1; 1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1; Tit 1:1.

²²Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; Tit 1:1.

²³Phm 1,9; Eph 3:1, 4:1?; 2 Tim 1:8.

²⁴*Θεοῦ διάκονοι* (2 Cor 6:4) represents another genitive construction in a description of ministry, but Paul does not use *διάκονος* of himself accompanied by *Χριστοῦ*, *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, or *Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ*.

²⁵Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 755.

²⁶Ibid., pp. 755-756.

²⁷See Isa 61:6 LXX, which does not isolate the Levites as the referent; the other references of interest are Sir 7:30, and 2 Esdr 20:40. The Sir 7:30 reference is ambiguous as to the specific role of the ministers spoken of. 2 Esdr 20:40 seems to differentiate between the Levites and ... *οἱ ἱερεῖς οἱ λειτουργοί* ..., which are part of the central cultus.

²⁸Cranfield presents this data fairly (Romans, vol. 2, p. 755). He notes that the reading of 2 Esdr 20:40 has *καί* between *οἱ ἱερεῖς* and *οἱ λειτουργοί* in B and S. He suggests that if one adopts the reading of B, S, then this "would be an example of *λειτουργός* used to denote a Levite ...", (p. 755). This could be correct if one sees the list of groups in 20:29 as a parallel, and therefore *οἱ Λευῖται* would be in the same order as *οἱ λειτουργοί* in 20:40. It would seem that the LXX translator(s) should have used a participle to translate *וְהָיָה* if he(they) was being consistent with the translation in

v. 37, τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν for
 ὁ ἄλλ' ὅσων ὁ ἰησοῦς. His use of οἱ λειτουργοί shows an attempt to continue with the same word-group for the Hebrew, with the influence of the listing of positions possibly changing a ptc. to a substantive here. But even so, this says little concerning whether or not the translator had the Levites in mind when he translated the Hebrew. He was seeking to be faithful to the Hebrew and at this point seems to have produced a rather "wooden" and difficult reading. B and S probably added καί to make it more readable in the light of the list context. But again, this does not mean that the scribes of B and S thought of the λειτουργοί as Levites. Levites are consistently translated with οἱ Λευῖται or some similar form of the word. There are no explicit examples of Levites being translated by λειτουργοί. With the Levites mentioned in 20:39, and the sons of Levi in 20:40, the recognition of οἱ λειτουργοί in 20:40 by B and S could speak of a general group of ministers, a group involved in Temple service. It is definitely not clear that this is a use of οἱ λειτουργοί for Levites. It is more likely an example of textual variation that is probably not relevant to the issue, or at least not certain.

²⁹Käsemann sees Paul as speaking of himself as "priest of the Messiah" (Romans, p. 393), and the emphasis here is eschatological, not cultic. Therefore, the distinction between Levitical priest and priest would not be that significant, at least in the sense in which such a distinction was maintained in the cultus in Israel.

³⁰Patrick Boylan, St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Translation and Commentary, second impression (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son Ltd., 1947[1934]), p. 231.

³¹Bernhard Weiss, Brief des Paulus an die Römer KEH, Vierte Abtheilung, Sechste Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1881), "... sondern als Herrn und Regenten der Kirche" (p. 633).

³²We are not denying that Paul saw χριστός Ἰησοῦς as fulfilling the role of a priest in some way in his present Messiahship, which is Lordship. We are simply suggesting that the priestly function of Christ is not emphasized in 15:16-21. Furthermore, the role of Paul in relation to Christ transcends the Levite-Priest relationship to such an extent that it is not a sufficient paradigm to explain the specific words used.

³³See also Rom 15:30: διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ which is parallel with διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ πνεύματος.

³⁴Barrett, Romans, p. 275; Leenhardt, Romans, p. 368; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope" in Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday, ed. by Robert Banks (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), p. 231.

³⁵Robinson, "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope", p. 231.

³⁶Ibid., p. 231.

³⁷Weiss, "Paulus - Priester", p. 362. Weiss argues this on the basis of: (1) the qualitative difference between cultic terminology and the simple pictures Paul uses and (2) the fact that Paul would not appeal to pagan practices to support his own practice as 1 Cor 10:20 ff. would indicate. In the light of the possible allusion to general cultic practice in 1 Cor 9:13-14, we are not sure about Weiss' second line of reasoning, although it seems most likely that Paul thinks generally within Jewish cultic categories especially when thinking theologically. This is probably the case in Rom 15:16.

³⁸Caird, The Language and Imagery of the Bible, p. 145. Caird is speaking of metaphor itself. We are not suggesting that Paul has presented a pure metaphor. But we still believe that it is right when dealing with language that is metaphorical to be careful not to force more into the picture suggested than is evident from point of the metaphor conveyed.

³⁹We are assuming that B has made an omission at this point.

⁴⁰Note Rom 11:13-16, especially in the light of the discussion above (Part 2 Chapter 5).

⁴¹Linguistically and ideologically "Gentiles" and "Nations" are difficult to distinguish, if it in fact is possible. BAG, p. 217, reveals the appropriateness of both meanings. ἔθνη is usually the LXX translation for $\text{ג} \text{ו} \text{י} \text{ל} \text{ו} \text{ם}$, and occasionally for $\text{ג} \text{ו} \text{י} \text{מ}$.

⁴²ἔθνος occurs 29 times in Romans, 10 in Galatians, 5 in the Corinthian letters, 2 in Thessalonian letters, once in Colossians, 5 in Ephesians, 3 in pastorals.

⁴³Of the 29 uses of ἔθνος in Romans, 9 are in quotations from the OT (2:24, 4:17, 10:19[2], 15:9,10,11, 12[2]). Paul appears to be dependent usually upon the LXX for his readings, and this is true in 15:9-12. E. Earle Ellis lists 9 quotations agreeing with the LXX against the Hebrew, and only 11:35 (Job 41:3) as a reading that agrees with the Hebrew against the LXX, in Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1957), pp. 150-151.

⁴⁴Cranfield helpfully presents six possible interpretations of these difficult and theologically weighty verses, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 742-744.

⁴⁵Robinson, in "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope", suggests that the aim of the whole epistle can be summarized as follows: "to show the Gentiles how their hope rests on Israel's Messiah: how that through the prior fulfillment of the promises to Israel a stepping stone is made for the Gentiles" (p. 232). We agree with the

emphasis of this summary statement, but we do not want to leave the Jews out of the intended audience.

J. Christiaan Beker, in Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), speaks of Christ as ratifying the OT promises and giving a new basis for hope for the future (p. 148). He goes on to say,

"For although the Christ-event as confirmation of the promise and as catalyst of the hope determines the quality of the future hope, the eschatological hope contains the expectation of the new acts of God, such as Israel's conversion or the liberation of creation or the 'mystery' of change (1 Cor 15:50) or the 'mystery' of Israel's salvation (Rom 11:25)". See also p. 128.

⁴⁶Along with Cranfield and Bruce we suggest that the reference to Jerusalem has more to do with the theological and recognised starting point of Christian mission than it does with Paul's specific ministry in Jerusalem and surroundings (Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, pp. 760-761; Bruce, Romans, p. 261, quoted by Cranfield).

⁴⁷See Paul Bowers, "Paul and Religious Propaganda" in NovTest 22 (4, 1980), 316-323. Here Bowers emphasizes Paul's definite geographical programme, although he treats the subject more fully in his dissertation, "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission".

⁴⁸R. W. Funk's study, "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Significance", indicate the need to read Romans in the light of Paul's expected visit, and the relationship necessary for fulfilling his plans while there.

⁴⁹15:25-28a is actually necessary to explain why Paul is not coming immediately to Rome. In 28b-29 Paul returns to the plan of coming to Rome, and in 30-32 he calls on their prayers for the collection in the meanwhile.

⁵⁰Claude Wiener, "ἸΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ (Rom. 15:16)" in Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961 vol 2, (Romae: E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963), 399-404.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 402-403.

⁵²Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, p. 150.

⁵³Wiener, "ἸΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ", p. 403.

⁵⁴Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, p. 151.

⁵⁵G. Schrenk, "ἵερός - ἄρχιερέυς", TDNT, vol 3, pp. 221-283, (p. 252).

⁵⁶Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 756. The appropriateness of such a reading is supported by BAG (p. 373), MM (p. 301), and LSMJ (p. 823). The idea of doing sacred service is common to each.

⁵⁷The reading in Rahlfs' Septuaginta seems the best

one (*δημιουργούντας* - 4 Macc 7:8). *ἱεραρχούντας* comes from the Sixtine edition of 1587. Our translation below is adapted from Metzger's The Apocrypha RSV (1977), p. 317.

⁵⁸The reading *ἱεραρχούντας* is not hard to understand in light of the priesthood of Eleazar, the closeness of the word to *δημιουργούντας*, the context of suffering, and the use of *ἱεραρχία* in 4 Macc 3:20. But *δημιουργούντας* must be preferred on textual grounds.

⁵⁹The accusative *τὸ εὐαγγέλιον* is labelled "simple accusative of external object" by Turner (in GNTG, vol. 3, p. 244), and is seen here as an accusative after a verb that was originally intransitive. BDF has this accusative under "The Simple Accusative of the Object" subsection "Transitive use of the original intransitive", p. 82. One must be careful about viewing the accusative too simply, since *ἱεραρχέω* is originally an intransitive verb, and we are in a metaphorical context. Therefore we disagree with the Vulgate's reading: "sanctificans evangelium Dei"; as Boylan points out, this is "inadequate", St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 231.

⁶⁰H. A. W. Meyer sees the gospel as the institution within which the sacrificial service is conducted (Brief des Paulus an die Römer funfte verbesserte, vermehrte auflage [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1872], p. 618). This is a helpful picture as long as it does not create another metaphorical framework to incorporate into the existing one.

⁶¹Rom 1:1; 2 Cor 11:7; 1 Thess 2:2,8,9.

⁶²The presence of Christ, God, and the Holy Spirit in 15:16 is an evidence of the heightened language that seeks to convey divine activity in the ministry. The mentioning of three divine persons in cooperation is also an evidence of liturgical language, which is indeed appropriate in a context where a priestly image is presented. See Gerhard Dellling's Worship in the New Testament, translated by Percy Scott (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1962), pp. 55-57, for discussion of liturgical formulas that have similar elements.

⁶³There are nine uses of *εὐαγγέλιον* in Romans (1:1,9,16, 2:16, 10:16, 11:28, 15:16,19, 16:25).

⁶⁴Hermann Strathmann, "*λατρεύω, λατρεία*", TDNT, vol. 4, pp. 58-65. In the NT the religious character predominates (p. 62), and in general maintains the "sacral significance" that the word has in the LXX (p. 60). But the word is not as closely associated with priestly functions as the *λειτουργία* - words are.

⁶⁵Other uses of the noun *λατρεία* in Paul's writings are found in Rom 9:4, and 12:1, whereas the verb is used in Rom 1:9,25 and Phil 3:3, 2 Tim 1:3.

⁶⁶*Εὐάρετος* and *δεκτός* are LXX words that would be used in a similar way to *εὐπρόσδεκτος*.

⁶⁷In 1 Peter 2:5 the community is presented cultically, being involved in spiritual sacrifices that are *εὐπρόσδεκτος* to God through Jesus Christ. In Rom 15:31, Paul asks for prayer that his service might be *εὐπρόσδεκτος* to the saints. Although the 2 Cor 8:12 reference is in the context of discussion of the collection, it represents, along with 2 Cor 6:2, a more general usage of *εὐπρόσδεκτος* meaning 'acceptable, proper, appropriate'.

⁶⁸The view - that the collection is what Paul has in mind and therefore he does not use *τῷ θεῷ* since *τοῖς ἁγίοις* are the real recipients of the offering or gift - seems forced.

⁶⁹See Walter Grundmann, "δέχομαι ... εὐπρόσδεκτος", TDNT, vol. 2, 50-59, (p. 58); BAG, p. 324; LSMJ, p. 728; MM p. 264.

⁷⁰Grundmann, "δέχομαι ... εὐπρόσδεκτος", p. 59.

⁷¹Johannes Behm has pointed out that the tendency in Tannaitic midrash was to express detailed cultic images in general terms of acceptability to God ("*θῶν, κτλ*", p. 187). This, of course, needs to be balanced with the Mishnaic interest in the details of the cultus. The midrash would obviously represent the attempt to make sacrificial texts relevant to a cult-less Judaism. But, as such, it may not represent anything more than what was intrinsic to the nature of the cultus to begin with, and is reflected in literature before the destruction of the Temple. See the discussion of R. J. Daly (in Christian Sacrifice, pp. 70-86) on the divine acceptance of sacrifice. One does not have to wait for the Tannaitic material to see such tendencies; they are present in the OT, and inter-testamental literature as well.

⁷²Otto Procksch, Karl G. Kuhn, "*ἅγιος, κτλ*", TDNT, vol. 1, 88-115, (p. 111).

⁷³See numerous possibilities in BAG (p. 8), LSMJ (p. 9), MM (p. 4), Procksch, Kuhn, "*ἅγιος, κτλ*", pp. 111-112.

⁷⁴A similar sense is in the problematic section (2 Cor 6:14-7:2). See especially vv. 16-18.

⁷⁵Lev 20:8, 21:8, 15, 23, 22:9, 16, 32.

⁷⁶The perfect passive ptc. *ἁγιασμένη* (15:16) functions adjectivally, and emphasizes the certainty of the state of sanctification. The time factor is not emphasized, although it could be antecedent to or coincident with the main verb of the clause. Here, because the image is of what is necessary to render an offering acceptable, the sanctification is seen as part of that process of making the offering acceptable, and antecedent to the assumed act of offering. Thus, the accompanying work of the Holy Spirit (15:19) is what Paul is probably thinking of, although within the metaphorical

context this is spoken of in a general and complete sense.

⁷⁷The theme of Gentile acceptability (in general) has been emphasized strongly by Paul in Romans in the form of the gospel of justification by faith, his own missionary calling, and the need for mutual acceptance between Jews and Gentiles (1:5,16, 3:27-31, 10:12-13, 11:11-12, 11:32, implicitly in 12:1-2, 15:7-12). For a discussion of views concerning Gentile uncleanness around the NT era, see Gedalyahu Alon's "The Levitical Uncleanness of Gentiles" in Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud translated by Israel Abrahams (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977), 146-189.

⁷⁸A. M. Denis' "La Liturgie Nouvelle" emphasizes the role of the Spirit in the apostolic ministry of the 'new cult'.

⁷⁹This is the case, although $\pi\eta\lambda\iota$ is mainly translated by $\thetaυσία$ in the LXX; note Daly, Christian Sacrifice, p. 143.

⁸⁰Sir 14:11, 34:18,19, 35:1,6, 38:11, 46:16, 50:13,14; 3 Kings 7:48; 1 Esdr 5:52; Ps 40:6, Dan 3:38 LXX, 4:34 LXX, 3:38 Theod. 9 of 15 are in Ben Sira.

⁸¹Konrad Weiss, " $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega \dots \phi\omicron\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega$ ", TDNT, vol. 9, 56-87, (p. 68).

⁸²Acts 21:26, 24:17; Rom 15:16; Eph 5:2; Heb 10:5,8,10,14,18.

⁸³Uses in Hebrews are found in 10:5 (Ps 39:7 LXX), 10:8 (Ps 39:7 LXX), 10:10,14 (of Christ's sacrifice or offering), and 10:18 (speaking of there being no more sacrifice for sin).

⁸⁴According to 10:14 it would appear that Christ himself offers the sacrifice, which according to 10:10 is his own body. $\tau\omicron\upsilon \sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{ 'I}\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ could be labelled expegetical genitive, genitive of content or descriptive genitive, or objective genitive in that it relates to the active aspect of $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\phi\omicron\rho\acute{\alpha}$. The emphasis of the verse is that the sanctification has taken place through a specific offering. It is thus the result of the sacrifice that is stressed. In view of 10:5-9 it is appropriate to see both the content of the offering and the activity of the offerer as implied (see 7:27, 9:26, 10:14).

⁸⁵The author's more common word for sacrifice, $\thetaυσία$, is used directly in reference to Christ's sacrifice in 9:26, and in a similar reading to 10:18, $\thetaυσία$ is used in 10:26 to speak of no sacrifice for sins remaining. For a discussion of the conception of offering in Hebrews, see W. Stott's "The Conception of 'Offering' in the Epistle to the Hebrews", NTS 9 (1962-1963) 62-67.

⁸⁶F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews (London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964),

pp. 235-236.

⁸⁷Corriveau sees ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν as "reminiscent of the expiatory sacrifices of the Old Testament" (Liturgy of Life, p. 200). ἡμῶν is favoured to ἡμῶν by Metzger in TCGNT (p. 606). Paul seems to prefer ὑπὲρ to περὶ in references to Christ's death or sacrifice (note Rom 5:6-8, 8:32; 1 Cor 1:13, 11:24, 15:3; 2 Cor 5:15; Gal 1:4, 2:20, 3:13; Eph 5:2,25; 1 Thess 5:10).

⁸⁸See Gal 2:20 and Eph 5:25 for other uses of ἀγαπᾶω and παραδίδομι together in relation to Christ's love and death.

⁸⁹See Gerhard Delling, "ὄσμη", TDNT, vol 5, 493-495. Ἐυωδία means "pleasing", "acceptable", "give satisfaction" (BAG, p. 319). Note especially Phil 4:18.

⁹⁰In 5:25 Paul commands that husbands love their wives as Christ loved the church and gave himself for "the church". Three ἵνα clauses follow with cultic language that speaks of: (1) Christ's sanctifying work which is seen as accomplished through cleansing associated with the word "ῥύσις", (2) Christ's presentation to himself of the church "in splendour" (RSV) without any corruptions of any kind, (3) the holiness and blamelessness of the church as the final result of what has been mentioned before. These ἵνα clauses all explain the significance of Christ's love for and death on behalf of his church. Such concepts have cultic origins, but have transcended the local cult due to the transcendence of Christ's cultic acts. The proclamation of the gospel is probably the referent as Paul speaks of the sanctification associated with the word (note Rom 10:8). One need also note that the nature of the eschatological thrust of this text as the presentation of the church in total holiness is spoken of not so much as a future event (although this may be assumed), but as a definite act and accomplishment of Christ. In Rom 15:16 we see the transcending of a local cultic picture, the obvious significance of gospel ministry, and the definite accomplishment of an acceptable sacrifice.

⁹¹Rom 1:5 (16:26), 15:14-21; also note 12:1, 14:18, 6:12-13.

⁹²Especially when a sacrifice is seen as an act of obedience, acceptance of a sacrifice cannot really be separated from divine acceptance of the sacrificer.

⁹³We mention here those that will not be mentioned in the rest of the paragraph: Commentaries; Meyer, Brief des Paulus an die Römer, p. 618; Boylan, St Paul's Epistle to the Romans, p. 231; ; also see Wenschkewitz, "Die Spiritualisierung", p. 128-129); L. Gaugusch, "Untersuchungen zum Römerbrief. Der Epilog (15, 14-16, 27)", Biblische Zeitschrift, Band 24, Heft 1, 1938-1939, 164-184, 252-266, (p. 166); Weiss, "Paulus - Priester", p. 357; N. D. Nott, "Paul's Apostolate and Mission", p. 55; M. Hengel, "Die Ursprunge der christlichen Mission" NTS,

1971-1972, 15-38 (pp. 19-20); D. Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973), pp. 282-284 for an argument that the offering involves the Gentiles and not the collection specifically; Nils Dahl, "The Missionary Theology in the Epistle to the Romans", 70-94 in Studies in Paul, p. 87; P. Bowers, "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission", pp. 153-154.

⁹⁴Barrett, Romans, p. 275.

⁹⁵Käsemann, Romans, p. 393. Similarly E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983), p. 171.

⁹⁶Cranfield, Romans, vol. 2, p. 756.

⁹⁷Schlier, "Die 'Liturgie'", p. 250; Romerbrief, p. 431.

⁹⁸Leenhardt, Romans, pp. 367-368.

⁹⁹Ibid., p. 368.

¹⁰⁰See SB, vol. 3, pp. 153, 315; Michel, Römerbrief, pp. 457-458; a passing reference is made by Leenhardt, Romans, p. 368; Eduard Schweizer, "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ", NTS 8 (1961) 1-11 (p. 3); Black, Romans, p. 175; R. J. Daly, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 247-248; Most significantly for our concern is Roger Aus' "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Romans XI 25", NovTest 21 (1979) 232-262, (pp. 236-237), this work mentioned before publication by Nils Dahl, "The Future of Israel", pp. 137-158 in Studies in Paul, and referred to by F. F. Bruce in "The Romans Debate -- Continued", p. 355; also note E. P. Sanders, Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People, who suggests that "Paul's entire work, both evangelizing and collecting money had its setting in the expected pilgrimage of the Gentiles to Mount Zion in the last days" (pp. 171).

¹⁰¹Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle", pp. 405-406; Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, pp. 151-154; D. W. B. Robinson, "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope", p. 231.

¹⁰²Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle", pp. 405-406.

¹⁰³Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, p. 154.

¹⁰⁴The chief expounder of this interpretation was Johannes Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind translated by Frank Clarke (London: SCM Press, 1959), pp. 49-55. Munck has woven the collection project into the foundation of Paul's ministry (pp. 36-42).

¹⁰⁵Munck, Paul and the Salvation of Mankind, pp. 51-52.

¹⁰⁶Keith Nickle, The Collection: A Study in Paul's

Strategy (London: SCM Press, 1966), p. 134. He suggests that δωροφορία was the original reading (noting B, D, G). Although Metzger adds Ambrosiaster and Ephraem to the list, he rejects it, suggesting that δωροφορία is a later explanatory gloss, and that its general absence from the NT should make us aware of its secondary nature (TCGNT, pp. 537-538). We agree with Metzger, noting the lateness of other uses of δωροφορία (MM p. 175). Although δωροφορία was probably not the original reading, the parallels between 15:16 and 15:31 need to be recognised.

¹⁰⁷Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans", pp. 232-262.

¹⁰⁸Ibid., p. 236.

¹⁰⁹Munck's thesis has not gained general acceptance. Three works that challenge Munck's interpretation of the collection enterprise are N. D. Pott's, "Paul's Apostolate and Mission", pp. 210-241; Paul Bowers' "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission", pp. 122-170; Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus, pp. 72-74, 279-284. For general critiques of Munck's perspective see W. D. Davies' review of Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte in NTS 2 (1955-1956), 60-72, and Morton Smith's "Pauline Problems: Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'", HTR, 50 (1957) 107-131; Dieter Georgi's Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem (Hamburg: Herbert Reich, 1965), along with Nickle's The Collection seem to be the discussions that are most sympathetic to Munck's emphasis if not the details of his argument.

¹¹⁰Dodd, Romans, pp. 226-227. ¹¹¹Ibid., p. 227.

¹¹²Ibid., p. 227. ¹¹³Ibid., p. 227.

¹¹⁴Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle", pp. 405-406.

¹¹⁵The concepts of apostolic calling of the Gentiles and the Holy Spirit's sanctification of the Gentiles are both under the Lordship of Christ, and in the general sense eschatological events.

¹¹⁶Käsemann, Romans, p. 393.

¹¹⁷Besides ἀπόστολος (which is used explicitly concerning Paul 18 times [once in Ephesians, and 5 times in the Pastorals]), titles used are δούλος (Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; Tit 1:1), διάκονος (1 Cor 3:5; 2 Cor 3:6, 6:4, 11:32?; Col 1:23,25; Eph 3:7), δέσμιος (Phm 1,9; Eph 3:1, 4:1; 2 Tim 1:8) which is obviously used in the light of circumstances. Paul also speaks of himself as ὑπηρέτης Χριστοῦ (1 Cor 4:1), and πρεσβύτερος (Phm 9). The following are examples of the many images or metaphors that Paul uses to describe his ministry. Some are explicitly stated, and others can be seen from the "language world" from which Paul borrows the image: architect (1 Cor 3:10); farmer (Rom 1:13, 15:28?); labourer (Phil 2:16); runner (1 Cor 9:25?, Phil 2:16); boxer (1 Cor 9:26-27); soldier (2 Cor 10:3-6); "match-maker" (2 Cor 11:2); parent (1 Cor 4:14-15), 2 Cor 12:14,

Gal 4:19, Phm 10, Phil 2:22?); nurse (1 Thess 2:7); member of cultic procession of some sort (2 Cor 2:14-16); peddler (2 Cor 2:17); ambassador (2 Cor 5:20). Two roles of Paul that appear as self-descriptions in the pastorals are κήρυξ (1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11; see also Rom 10:8; 1 Cor 1:23, 9:27, 15:11; 2 Cor 1:19, 4:5, 11:4; Gal 2:2, 5:11; 1 Thess 2:9) and διδάσκαλος (1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11; see 1 Cor 4:17; Col 1:28). One must keep in mind the many references to εὐαγγέλιον, and Paul's use of the verb εὐαγγελίζομαι to sense Paul's self-understanding. Such references reinforce the picture of the κήρυξ. References to διδαχή and παραδίδωμι must also be viewed to understand the importance of Paul's teaching ministry. Lastly, λειτουργός (Rom 15:16) and cultic associations with ministry need to be mentioned (1 Cor 9:13?, Phil 2:17, Rom 1:9, 2 Tim 1:3, 4:6). (That Paul speaks of himself as an ἄφρων (2 Cor 12:11) and a παραφρονῶν (2 Cor 11:23) need not be taken too seriously as a ministerial role! But these references do reveal how easily Paul becomes metaphorical or figurative in his attempts to explain himself and his gospel.

¹¹⁸1 Cor 9:13-14 is a general reference to priestly ministry, and 2 Cor 2:14-16 contains cultic language, although the image is difficult to be sure of.

¹¹⁹We agree with those that see τῆ θουσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ as hendiadys (ex. Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, p. 119, Ralph P. Martin, Philippians (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976), p. 107.

¹²⁰N. D. Pott in "Paul's Apostolate and Mission" (p. 56) argues that Paul is the active agent in the offering up of the faith of the Philippians in sacrificial service. He argues this on the grounds that (1) ὑμῶν would be expected without πίστεως if the contrary was the case, (2) it is not consistent with Rom 15:16, (3) it fails to see the relationship Paul maintains with the community until the Day of the Lord. Thus, Pott disagrees with J. B. Lightfoot, (Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians [London: Macmillan and Co., 1898], p. 119), when he states, "the Philippians are the priests; their faith (or their good works springing from their faith) is the sacrifice: St Paul's life-blood the accompanying libation. Commentators have much confused the image by representing St Paul as the sacrificer" (similarly Marvin R. Vincent, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and Philemon [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897], p. 71, Martin, Philippians, p. 107, and in basic agreement is Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle", pp. 622-626, and Corriveau, Liturgy of Life, pp. 117-138). With such strong support for the priestly service of the Philippians, we present our view tentatively. It does seem, though, that one does not have to negate the sacrificial service of the Philippians altogether (note Phil 4:18), even if it is thought that Paul is speaking of his own ministry towards the Philippians here. In any case, the emphasis is not on an actual presentation, but the nature of the Philippians' lives and faith, which will prove by their perseverance that Paul has not run in vain (2:16). It is

Pott's first and third points above that are the most helpful, and this eschatological picture of Paul's own responsibility allows for the idea that it is Paul who faithfully administers the self-offering of the Philippians' faith.

121 We have seen this developed above by Denis, "La Liturgie Nouvelle", and Schlier "Die 'Liturgie'" especially.

122 Nickle estimates that the collection took eight years to organize (The Collection, p. 92). Regardless of the exact time involved it is clear from Paul's letters that the project was significant (1 Cor 16:1-4; 2 Cor 8-9; Rom 15:25-32).

123 " ἵνα ... ἡ διακονία μου ἢ εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ
εὐπρόσδεκτος τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς γένηται, and ἵνα γένηται
ἡ προσφορά τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐπρόσδεκτος. We have underlined the words common to both ἵνα clauses.

124 Paul does not present the collection project with grandeur, but with explanation and a call to prayer. It functions to say why he is not coming to Rome directly and to speak more of the nature of his ministry. We do not believe that Paul is hiding the real significance of the collection from the Roman church, because of uncertainty or unhappiness with the mother-church's position on it (contra K. Holl, "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde" in Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte, vol. 2, pp. 44-67, esp. p. 59). Nor do we think that the collection need be seen as a type of taxation, recognising Jerusalem as the centre of the world (contra Holl, pp. 58-62). This does not negate the possibility that the mechanics of the collection may have resembled the Temple tax (note Nickle, The Collection, pp. 74-99, where he concludes that the Temple tax probably provided a model for procedure, but was not the equivalent or impetus in any real way). For discussions of the collection that do not stress the Temple tax, a specific apocalyptic intention, or Isa 66:20, see Beker, Paul the Apostle, pp. 332-333; and Zeller, Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus, pp. 72-74, 279-284. Also see Gordon Fee's "ΧΑΡΙΣ in II Corinthians I.15: Apostolic Parousia and Paul - Corinth Chronology" (NTS 24 [1977-1978], 533-538), and Klaus Berger's "Almosen für Israel" (NTS 23 [1977], 180-204). We suggest that general ethical motives within the desire for unity between Jews and Gentiles under the Lordship of Christ can be seen as the backbone of the project rather than a specific apocalyptic hope.

125 Weiss, "Paulus - Priester", see this type of spiritualization as intrinsic to the cultus (p. 361). One could argue that the sacred or cultic nature of the community itself led to an easy transference of cultic language to other aspects of life (Exod 19:6; Isa 61:6). Israel was to be holy, because Yahweh was holy (Lev 20:7-9, 22-26).

126 Such references demonstrate the need for righteous

behaviour for cultic participation to be acceptable to God (Jer 6:20, 14:10-12; Amos 5:22; Micah 6:6-8; Hosea 6:6, 8:13-14; Isa 1:10-23; Mal 1:8-12 in light of 2:13-17). Along another line of emphasis, cultic language is used in Isaiah's expression of hope for the glory of Israel, including the idea of the pilgrimage of the nations to Jerusalem (Isa 60:5-7, 61:5-6, 66:19-21). For many other relevant texts see Roger Aus' "Paul's Travel Plans", pp. 242-260.

¹²⁷See Leo G. Perdue's Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977). Perdue speaks of the "appropriation of cultic language by the wise to express the sapiential emphasis on wise and righteous behaviour as contrasted to that of wicked and foolish behaviour" (p. 361). See for example, Wis 3:4-19; Sir 34:18-19, 35:1-6; 7:29-32, and passages like Sir 7:10 and 3:30. Also see Prov 15:8, 21:3,7; Pss 50:14,23, 51:15-19, 49:6-8.

¹²⁸It is interesting to compare Paul's comments in 15:29 (*ἐν πληρώματι εὐλογίας Χριστοῦ ἡλευσόμεαι*) after speaking about the collection (15:25-28) with the blessing added in Ben Sira after the reference to the aid to the poor (Sir 7:32).

¹²⁹Note especially Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament; Klinzing, Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumran Gemeinde und im Neuen Testament, Florenza, "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament" for numerous references. Other studies that seek to see the NT and Qumran in the light of each other, especially in view of cultic language are Best's "Spiritual Sacrifice: General Priesthood in the New Testament"; McKelvey's The New Temple; and Daly, Christian Sacrifice, pp. 157-174. Daly sees the Qumran evidence as "the single most important non-biblical source for the background of the Christian idea of sacrifice" (p. 174). Although this may be the case, Paul's thought does not seem to be closely associated with the thought expressed in the documents of Qumran.

¹³⁰This seems to take up the idea of Israel's priestly standing Exod 19:6 (cf. 1 Pet 2:5,9; Rev 1:6, 5:10). For a discussion of formal and literary questions, see K. R. Snodgrass' "I Peter 2:1-10: Its Formation and Literary Affinities", NTS 24, 1978, 97-106.

¹³¹As in b. B. Bat. 10a-10b. For numerous references, George F. Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The age of the Tannaim (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927), pp. 165-178; Ernst Bammel, " *πιτυχός, κτλ* ", TDNT, vol. 6, 885-915, pp. 900-901; Schrenk, " *δικη, κτλ* ", TDNT, vol. 2, 174-225, pp. 196-197; Bultmann, " *ἕλεος, κτλ* ", TDNT, vol. 2, 477-487, pp. 485-487; Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, pp. 113, 133, 200-205; and Benno Przybylski, Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought SNTS 41 (Cambridge: CUP, 1980), pp. 67-73.

¹³²Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 208 with reference to b. B. Bat. 10a.

¹³³Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, p. 212, and the whole section for overview (pp. 206-212).

¹³⁴Nickle, The Collection, p. 88.

¹³⁵BAG, pp. 803-804; MM, pp. 617-618.

¹³⁶One needs to be careful in seeing too much in the harvest motif, especially as the diversity of contexts do not suggest a technical nuance to harvest words (1 Cor 9:7; Gal 5:22; Eph 5:9; Phil 1:11,22, 4:17; 2 Tim 2:6; and Rom 1:13, 6:21,22, 15:28). It could be, though, that Rom 1:13, and 15:28 indicate a harvest motif is in Paul's mind in relation to ministry, and suggest a particular emphasis due to Paul's reflection or the time of writing.

¹³⁷See J. L. Magnus, "Pentecost", Jewish Encyclopaedia, vol. 9, pp. 592-595; G. F. Moore, Judaism, vol. 2, pp. 43-54; E. Lohse, "Πεντηκοστή", TDNT vol. 6, pp. 44-53; J. C. Rylaarsdam "Feast of Weeks", in IDB, vol. R-Z, pp. 827-828; J. D. G. Dunn, "Pentecost", NIDNTTh, vol. 2, pp. 783-788. This would have been a good time for the delivery of the collection; Josephus, Ant. 14.10.12 [Loeb 7, pp. 568-569] and Philo, Leg. 311-318 [Loeb 10, pp. 156-159] 156 [Loeb 10, pp. 78-81] 216 [Loeb 10, pp. 112-113].

¹³⁸Lohse, "Πεντηκοστή", p. 47; Rylaarsdam, "Feast of Weeks", p. 827; Samuel Sandmel, Judaism and Christian Beginnings (New York: OUP, 1978), p. 217. See Exod 34:22; Deut 16:10; Lev 23:16; Num 28:16; Tob 2:1, Jub 6:21, 22:1-5; 2 Macc 12:32; Josephus, Ant. 3.10.6 - 3.12.3 [Loeb 4, pp. 438-457]

¹³⁹Lev 23:16, Num 28:16.

¹⁴⁰Num 28:26-31, the cereal offering of the new grain at the feast of weeks, also Lev 23:16; Neh 10:32-39 with the connection between Temple tax and bringing of the first fruits; 1 Chron 16:28-29 (Ps 96:7-8) with its call to the people to bring an offering and to come before the Lord; 2 Chron 32:23 with gifts brought to the Lord so that the nations respected Hezekiah greatly. Note also, Mal 1:10-12 with its Θυσία καθαρά (1:11) offered among the Gentiles, for the Lord's name is great among the nations. The idea of the wealth of the nations coming to Jerusalem, and the acceptable offering being presented will be dealt with below (Isa 60:5-7, 61:6, 66:20). That so many texts do present themselves as having some relevance should make one very careful in suggesting any one text as a specific source, unless Paul makes this clear.

¹⁴¹Roger Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans", p. 232-262.

¹⁴²Ibid., p. 237. ¹⁴³Ibid., p. 238.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 241. ¹⁴⁵Ibid., pp. 242-246.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 246-247. ¹⁴⁷Ibid., pp. 257-260.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., pp. 260-261. ¹⁴⁹Ibid., p. 261.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., p. 261.

¹⁵¹The exception could be, according to Aus, in 2 Thess, which he argues elsewhere is dependent on Isa 66 ("Comfort in Judgment: The Use of the Day of the Lord and Theophany Traditions in Second Thessalonians 1" [Ph. D. Diss. Yale University, New Haven, Conn, 1971]). Also see, "The Relevance of Isaiah 66:7 to Rev. 12 and 2 Thess. 1", ZNW 67 (1976) 252-268; "God's Plan and God's Power: Isaiah 66 and the Restraining Factors of 2 Thess 2:6-7", JBL 96/4, 1977, 537-553; for Aus' dealing with this objection of little Pauline evidence for the pilgrimage motif and its relevance to the collection, see "Paul's Travel Plans", pp. 261-262.

¹⁵²Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans", p. 262.

¹⁵³Ibid., p. 262. ¹⁵⁴Ibid., p. 262.

¹⁵⁵See Nils Dahl's Studies in Paul, and specifically "The Missionary Theology of Romans", "Promise and Fulfillment", pp. 121-136, "The Future of Israel", pp. 137-158; also J. C. Beker, Paul the Apostle, pp. 328-347, and studies cited in note 109. In general, we agree with the eschatological picture put forth by Gordon E. Ladd in A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974), pp. 550-568.

¹⁵⁶If Paul was using Isa 66:20 messianically, he might have included *κυριῶ* (*קִרְיָוֹ*) to show that he was thinking of a presentation of an offering at the feet of the Lord Jesus. He does not do this, and it would not seem to be a likely interpretation.

¹⁵⁷J. F. Stenning has *קִרְיָוֹ* for *קִרְיָוֹ* and *כִּנְיָוֹ* for *כִּנְיָוֹ* (The Targum of Isaiah [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949], p. 223).

¹⁵⁸No apocalyptic scheme is explicit in 1 Cor 16:1-4, 2 Cor 8-9, or Rom 15:25-27, even in light of Gal 2:10.

¹⁵⁹Aus, "Paul's Travel Plans", p. 262.

¹⁶⁰John G. Gager Jr. (in "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language", JBL 89 (1970) 325-337) shows the need for care in the evaluation and connection of such language.

¹⁶¹Wuellner, "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans", pp. 162-168.

¹⁶²As we have mentioned, this may be why Paul appeals to past teaching (6:17, 16:17-19), and why he leads into the apology in 15:15b-21.

¹⁶³For a listing of the OT quotations in Romans, see Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament, pp. 156-172. The OT references below are according to LXX notation. (1) On mission itself: Rom 10:15 - Isa 52:7; Rom 10:19 - Ps 18:5; Rom 15:21 - Isa 52:15. (2) On the gospel and Gentile inclusion: ?Rom 1:17 - Hab 2:4?; Rom 4:17 - Gen 17:5; Rom 9:25-26 - Hos 2:23, 1:10; Rom 10:11 - Isa 28:16; Rom 10:13 - Joel 2:32; Rom 10:19 - Deut 32:21; Rom 10:20 - Isa 65:1; Rom 15:9-12 - Ps 17:50, Deut 32:43, Ps 11:61, Isa 11:10. (3) On Israel's rejection of the gospel, the remnant, and inclusion: Rom 2:24 - Isa 52:5; Rom 9:27-29 - Isa 10:22-23, 1:9; Rom 9:33 - Isa 8:14, 28:16; Rom 10:16 - Isa 53:1; Rom 10:21 - Isa 65:2; Rom 11:3-4 - 3 Kgs 19:14,18; Rom 11:8 - Isa 29:10, Deut 29:4; Rom 11:9-10 - Ps 68:23-24; Rom 11:26-27 - Isa 59:20-21, 27:9.

¹⁶⁴Paul could have seen his own ministry within this servant-framework, but it is more likely that he saw himself as the sacred minister of the Messiah, who is able to continue his eschatological ministry through Paul. Thus Paul acts as the priestly servant of Christ, enabling the servant of the circumcision (15:8) now to be the hope of the Gentiles as Son of God in power (15:13, 1:3-4). The Christ as Lord calls forth the obedience of the Gentiles through his apostle, and thus the Messiah of Israel is proclaimed to the nations. (For an interesting parallel to the idea of being a priestly servant on behalf of the Messiah to the Gentiles, see the excursus at the end of the chapter on the Testament of Levi).

¹⁶⁵For text, M. De Jonge, The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978), pp. 24-50; also R. H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. 2, Pseudepigrapha (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), pp. 304-315. On critical issues, which cause us to be very cautious in making any further connections between T. Levi and the NT, see H. D. Slingerland's The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), and M. De Jonge, "The Main Issues in the Study of the Twelve Patriarchs", NTS 26 (1979-1980), 508-524.

¹⁶⁶Anders Hultgard, "The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah and the Saviour Priest in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs", in Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms, ed. by J. J. Collins, and G. W. E. Nickelsburg (Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1980), 93-110.

¹⁶⁷Ibid., Hultgard attempts carefully to discern sources, and reconstruct the history of the document. We have just presented a flat reading of the text, since we are less sure about the pre-history of the text.

¹⁶⁸Barbara E. Thiering, "Inner and Outer Cleansing at Qumran as a Background to New Testament Baptism" NTS 26 (1980), 266-277, (p. 277).

¹⁶⁹Charles, Pseudepigrapha, p. 292, and notes.

PART THREE

CONCLUSIONS

A. Basic Conclusions¹

In the light of the two main sections of this study, we now offer the following conclusions. Romans is a valuable document for the study of Pauline, and indeed early Christian use of cultic language. It is important, because instead of comparing uses of cultic language from various sources, Romans stands as a unified piece of Pauline apologetic and paraenesis in the form of an apostolic-ambassadorial letter. As datum it is a source for possible differing uses of cultic language that can be studied with the purpose(s), situation, structure, and argument of one document in mind.²

We stated after our evaluation of Wenschkewitz that the burden of proof lay upon those who would seek to unify the various uses of cultic language, especially within a theological structure.³ This is the case for Romans as well. Our study of Romans 11:16a indicated that one need not see all the cultic language in Romans as integrated within an intended cultic picture. Rather, this text reminds us of Paul's ability to use cultic language abruptly, almost in passing, in a situation that does not call for it.⁴ Consequently, we need to state our understanding of Paul's intention in his use of cultic language before we can suggest further implications.

(1) Paul does not use cultic language to form a unified picture of a Christian cultus which would challenge or deny the Jewish cultus. The language itself is not unified, nor possible images (in such texts as [(3:25, 5:9), 8:3], [12:1], [1:9, 15:16]), and there is no overt polemic against the cult. The uses of cultic language

that we have observed, suggest that Paul was not attempting to challenge Jewish cultic practice explicitly.

(2) Although, it is probably not the case that Paul expected his readers to combine the cultic ideas expressed in (3:25 [5:9], 8:3), 12:1 and 15:16, it is the case that the 'cultic' structuring of the letter, and the purpose of the letter can be viewed together to help in assessing the role of the cultic language. The purpose is apologetic, and in the light of 1:9, 12:1, 15:16, it seems that a priestly understanding of gospel ministry may be a structuring theme. We do not suggest that the cultic elements of Paul's apologetic for the gospel (3:25 [5:9], 8:3), as they have been presented, have been constructed carefully to support this structure and theme, but they are also understandable as a part of Paul's apologetic. But the possibility that Paul has used cultic language and ideas to support his gospel of justification is strengthened by noting the broader 'priestly' structure.

Therefore, although the cultic images may not combine ('vehicles'), the referents they explain and illustrate ('tenors') may need to be viewed together because of the various uses of cultic language, and the structure of the letter. Paul has creatively used cultic language to explain and strengthen his apologia for his gospel, as he does later with his paraenesis and apostleship.⁵ The formality intrinsic to this letter of introduction, the Jewish-Christian roots of the church of Rome, and especially Paul's own reflection on the gospel and ministry at that specific time are all factors in the way he chose his language in the letter.⁶ The nature and structure of the

letter directs attention to the texts with cultic language (especially 3:25, 12:1, 15:16), and allows one to view these texts together, even though Paul does not appear to combine the cultic ideas or associated images.

Having noted our dependence upon H. Schlier at the outset of this study, here we state the difference between our conclusions. We differ from Schlier in that we do not present a unified picture of sacrifice drawn from the implications of Paul's priestly apostleship. It is Paul's union of gospel and mission that we emphasize, and that union allows for the union of 'cultic' elements in a general way. Interpreters like Schlier may seek to view the implications of Paul's cultic language for presenting a unified picture of sacrifice, but we must stop before this point because it seems to us that in attempting to do this we would be moving away from Paul's intention in the letter. Implications in the light of Paul's intention in the letter will be suggested in our Final Comments.

With the help of cultic language, Paul, the priestly apostle defends his missionary theology and ministry in Romans. Paul's cultic language in 3:25, 5:9, and 8:3 is probably used in the light of the Jewish-Christian tradition at Rome, and so Paul used cultic language to support his gospel. Although the cultic language in 12:1 and 15:16 need not be Jewish cultic language specifically, we have suggested that it probably reflects Paul's use of basic cultic ideas that he ultimately would associate with the Jerusalem cultus, rather than general pagan cults. Here again Paul uses language that is fundamental not only to religion in general, but to the Jewish religion in

particular, because of the central role of cultic ideas and indeed the cultus in the history of Israel. Cultic language is the language of worship, appropriate for a formal correspondence and a correspondence that seeks to argue from common ground. The effect of the cultic language is to strengthen Paul's apologetic by appealing to fundamental and central truths that his audience would understand and respect.

The cultic language has the effect of grounding the eschatological gospel in religious tradition, as expressed in the OT, and revered at Rome. Paul clearly ties his gospel of justification by faith into the history of salvation (4:1-25, chapters 9-11), and he states agreement with the tradition received at Rome (6:17, 16:17). He is concerned about dissensions (16:17-19), and the paraenesis clearly emphasizes unity and tolerance on the basis of faith (esp. 14:1-15:13). The cultic language is formal religious language that has a cohesive role with his audience. Occurring at the significant places it does, it presents basic religious ideas that will support the priestly apostle's message. Paul's gospel of salvation and his apostleship are grounded in the history of salvation by using ideas associated with one of the central elements of that history: cultic sacrifice.

B. Historical Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans (footnote 7)

Romans suggests that Paul did not present the cultus as an aspect of his gospel or ethic, although he recognised its place in the history of Israel and therefore in the history of salvation (9:4). More significantly,

Romans indicates that Paul could use cultic language in an apologetic way without any substantial statement about the cultus itself. We have assumed that Paul's audience consists of both Jews and Gentiles. If Paul was concerned particularly with the issue of unity, then it would seem that he did not expect this cultic language to be a problem for interpretation or of controversy, even at Rome. With these basic observations in mind, we will consider further historical implications.

(1) It is difficult to isolate any one aspect of early Judaism that seems most similar to Paul in respect of his use of cultic language outside of Jewish-Christianity itself. Paul does not give evidence for having the same type of interests or the same kind of synthesis of Hellenistic and mystical ideas as Philo does.⁸ At the same time, Paul does not seem to reflect, in his use of cultic language, the extreme cultic-ethical thought presented in the Qumran documents.⁹ Paul, a man of Pharisaic background,¹⁰ stands possibly as the first user (in terms of extant material) of cultic language in relation to the eschatological saving activity of God in Christ.¹¹ This distinctive element within Paul's thought and the expression of it in cultic language places Paul at the beginning of Christian tradition.¹² The use of cultic language in a soteriological context is an indication of a shift within early Judaism, here represented by Paul, in which Christ is placed within a new understanding of God's salvation. At the same time it is an indication of Paul's desire to place his eschatological gospel within a tradition of familiar religious ideas. This

eschatological gospel indicated the fulfillment of God's promise to the patriarchs, and the continued faithfulness of God to Israel.

(2) It is the distinctiveness of Paul's 'Christian' eschatological and universal soteriology, that has allowed for the use of cultic language which does not have explicit effect on the present cultus. There is a broad dimension to Paul's soteriological thought here that leaves Jewish cultic religion as something that may have been faced at the practical level occasionally, but was not an issue in the formulation of Paul's gospel. The fact of Christ's Lordship, in view of death and resurrection, causes Paul to re-structure his Jewish religious tradition in the light of this eschatological situation and the saving events themselves. God's salvation according to His promise and covenantal righteousness is now revealed and therefore understood as being in and through Christ, and proclaimed in the gospel. It is at the most fundamental level that God's activity in Christ causes the renewed understanding of Paul's religious tradition.

In Paul's theology, Christ and Temple are not seen as potential rivals, probably because of the subservience of all things to Christ, and the viewing of all things in light of God's salvation in Christ.¹³ Paul's ministry, and especially his foreseen ministry in Rome, did not apparently involve him in direct conflict over issues specifically related to Temple practice. There was obvious conflict concerning Torah obedience, and although this may have included some responsibility towards the

Temple, this was not in and of itself an issue for the Gentiles to whom Paul ministered.¹⁴ This issue would have been dealt with as subsidiary to the circumcision issue under the fundamental question - does a Gentile convert to Christ need to become a proselyte to Judaism? Paul clearly did not see circumcision as a responsibility of converts, and thus he clearly did not desire that converts become religious Jews, nor apparently take on the Jewish responsibility for Temple maintenance. Paul deals with the issue of Torah obedience in relation to his argument concerning justification by faith, but there are no clear indications that the Temple has any role in that argument.

The problem of Gentile uncleanness, which was a reason for Temple prohibition, may have been in Paul's mind in Rom 15:16 when he speaks of sanctification through the Holy Spirit as the assurance of the acceptable offering of the Gentiles.¹⁵ But here Paul seems to be concerned with the fundamental idea of acceptability before God, rather than entrance into the literal Temple. Again, we are dealing with the suggestive use of cultic ideas that can function meaningfully outside of the specific issue related to the Temple. It may have been that insistence upon Gentile support of the Jewish cultus would have resulted in a stern response from Paul, but this does not seem to have been the primary issue in the mission context. Issues of initiation and the nature of the gospel itself were crucial to Paul and, at this level, he makes it clear that justification is by faith, and initiation into the Christian community does not involve circumcision but faith and baptismal union with Christ.

(3) In Paul's gospel Christ becomes God's means of dealing with sin for both Gentiles and Jews in an absolute, eschatological sense, and thus any soteriological significance to the cultus seems surpassed. In principle, cultic atonement becomes a paradigm which gives theological support to Paul's gospel of justification by faith (3:25). But what is interesting is that this did not demand careful further explanation on Paul's part. This may have been the case because Paul's audience was familiar with cultic ideas, and because cultic language was already used within the Christian tradition (especially when one considers worship contexts [e. g., Eucharistic and baptismal settings]). Within this framework, Paul's positive use of cultic language explains his gospel without clear further implications. But, this is possible because salvation in Judaism was not confined to the Temple as such, but God's elective grace and divine acceptance. Temple worship and functions expressed this grace and acceptance, but it did not possess it or confine it absolutely. This was especially the case after 586 B. C., when exilic and diaspora Judaism formed around the Law and synagogue. It may be that, although the Temple maintained its national and religious significance, cultic thought affected piety at a broader level even when the cultus itself was not a concern. Cultic ideas, and the basic belief in the efficacy of the cultus, were maintained in Jewish communities through the reading of the Law itself, regardless of actual Temple involvement. The pervasiveness of cultic thought is reflected in the common use of cultic language in such a diversity of ways

and within such a diversity of groups. The using of cultic thought for God's justification in Christ may therefore draw on cultic ideas that were familiar without necessarily focusing attention on the issue of the cultus itself.

Although this evidence would seem to support Frances Young's perspective presented earlier, the disagreement of Hengel and Young is not ultimately settled by the evidence in Romans.¹⁶ Paul's eschatological understanding of salvation would seem to render the cultus unnecessary, but this does not mean that he in some formal sense rejected the Temple or called others to do so. It is helpful, though, to keep in mind the fact that sacrifice, and the cultus itself, could be understood on different levels, and that makes us cautious about seeing any formal break with the Temple. The suggestion of early church detachment from the Temple may be explained on the basis of practical, political, or soteriological grounds. Romans does not clearly affirm such a detachment, although it may present possible soteriological reasons for it.

(4) Paul says little directly about his understanding of the present priesthood, or the Temple. What must be seen as most significant is the Christ-centred theology and soteriology of Paul. It is within this broad perspective that one must view Paul's use of cultic language, which does not seem to be part of a programmatic attempt to 'spiritualize' cultic ideas. Cultic language is caught up in the attempt to explain the gospel, ethics, and apostleship.

C. Theological Implications of Paul's Use of Cultic Language in Romans (footnote 17)

1. Cultic Language in the Apologetic for the Gospel

The cultic language used in this context is the most difficult to describe. It seems to support Paul's argument, but cultic ideas are not developed as such. Paul does not use the word *Θυσία* speaking of Christ, and this at least indicates that Paul is thinking more broadly. Paul is speaking of the role of Christ within salvation understood theologically and eschatologically. The implicit sacrificial role of Christ within this framework is not viewed so much as an act of Christ, but as God's purposeful activity. This is especially the case, if we are right in suggesting Paul's awareness of the 'mercy seat' connotations of the word *ἱλαστήριον* used in relation to Christ. Christ is set forth by God as the one who makes possible an atonement that can be received through faith, and this was made possible by means of Christ's own blood. Although the self-offering of Christ may be implicit in these verses, in 3:21-26 the focus is on the righteousness of God and justification by God. Christ functions within this eschatological revelation to bring about deliverance from sin, which involves the just justification of sinners.

The cultic language and ideas give traditional theological content to Paul's eschatological-forensic notion of justification. The ultimate cultic model and type for eschatological acquittal is the atonement offered by God on the Day of Atonement through the sprinkling of sacrificial blood before and on the mercy seat. On the basis of such a provision within the covenant context, the

cumulation of unforgiven sins throughout the year were forgiven by God. Paul's understanding of the death of Christ operative within the eschatological activity of God could have received support by means of this cultic background. Christ's death functions in such a way that He can be spoken of as the atonement for and through faith. "Through faith" designates the basis of God's covenantal blessing of forgiveness. Paul does not develop this in context, but it is clear that faith is the basic covenantal responsibility of God's people (4:1-25). The traditional theology affirms the justice of God in providing a just means of forgiveness for the sins of all (3:23-24), a justification received through faith (3:21-22). Man, as sinner (3:23), awaiting the judgment of God (2:16), and indeed subject to the wrath of God (already revealed 1:18, and to be revealed 5:9-11), is justified by faith.

The mediating role of Christ is expanded in 5:9-11, because Paul distinguishes between justification and salvation. On the basis of justification salvation from wrath is secure through Christ. Here Paul seems to be referring to the resurrection life of Christ as well as his death. It also seems that Paul moves away from cultic language when speaking of salvation through the life of Christ. The sacrificial language served its purpose in explaining the death of Christ within the eschatological purpose of God: but the sacrificial language is not needed to explain the continuing role of Christ in view of his resurrection life.

The theological framework for sacrificial language

may be seen again in 8:3-4, where God's ability to save is presented in terms of Christ's role in relation to sin within his God-given mission. Here again the act of sacrifice is not emphasized as being Christ's. The language indicates that Christ functioned in a way that the Law could not to bring about forgiveness of sin and life in the Spirit. The idea of no condemnation is intrinsically tied here to eschatological existence which is brought about through the death of the body of Christ, and the potential and actual life in the Spirit.

The cultic language does not seem to describe so much the activity of Christ as the role of Christ within this salvation that is the result of the power of God revealed and presented in the gospel that Paul proclaims. In this regard, S. W. Sykes' bifocal view of sacrifice may be mentioned, since he has noted the fact that sacrifice can function at different levels of the Christian story. In Rom 1-11 the theological framework places cultic and indeed sacrificial thought within the 'God' side of the Christian gospel. That does not mean that the cultic language does not centre around the death of Christ, because it does. But, it means that this death is viewed within the broader purpose of God's saving activity, rather than as a sacrificial act that can be repeated by Christians. Christ's own self-offering is not the emphasis of the cultic thought in this section of Paul's letter, regardless of Paul's teaching elsewhere.¹⁸

2. Cultic Language Introducing the Ethics of the Gospel (footnote 19)

The sacrificial language in 12:1-2 speaks of the

justified-baptized community's consecration and renewal, which should result in obedience to the paraenesis to follow. The unity between chapter 6 and 12:1-2 must be acknowledged, although any implicit reference to the sacrifice of Christ must be assumed and is not emphasized by Paul. The language in Rom 12:1-2 is more reminiscent of Rom 1:25-28, and so we suggest that Paul here calls for a response to the gospel that is authentic and God-pleasing rather than the false worship that characterizes man subject to wrath. The pericope is primarily theological (3 uses of *θεός*), rather than Christological, which leads us to state a few implications that are important for the discussion of Christian sacrifice.

The paraenesis of 12:3-15:13 is descriptive of the particular outworkings of the rational worship of God that Paul desires for the Roman church. Paul does not repeat his sacrificial description of bodily presentation, but his climax in 15:7-13, and the cultic self-description of 15:16 maintain this worship and cultic framework for the paraenesis. As Daly has noted, the Christian sacrifice, at least in this context, is "practical and ethical".²⁰ This 'sacrifice' is a response to the gospel, mediated by the apostle, resulting in a contingent ethic that emphasizes the need for unity within the worship and life of the church. In this context, Christ is an example of self-denial and acceptance of others (15:3, 7), and indeed the Christian is to be like Christ in moral purity (13:14, is to be clothed with the Lord Jesus). But the sacrificial language itself does not seem to be related to the sacrifice of Christ as expressed in the earlier part of

the letter.²¹ It is the general concept of life yielded to God and pleasing to God in response to God's mercy (as indeed pictured in baptism) that seems to have called forth the sacrificial description. This description implicitly places Paul before the community in the role of priestly exhorter calling forth that which pleases God.

3. Cultic Language in the Description of the Apostolic Ministry of the Gospel (footnote 22)

The cultic language in 15:16 emphasizes the authority and universality of Paul's ministry.²³ Paul's authority gives him the right to expect acceptance at Rome and to hope for support for future mission. The cultic image does not define the cultic acts of the apostle as such, but speaks of gospel ministry as a sacrificial service. This means enabling the acceptable offering of the Gentiles to take place, which is assured through the Holy Spirit. Although it is clear that Paul does mediate Christ to the nations (15:18 and the emphasis of Schlier), this is not the priority of the actual cultic thought. One should not think in terms of mystical union with Christ, either mediated through baptism or Eucharist.²⁴ Rather, Paul's cultic idea is particularly relevant to the notion of Gentile acceptability, and consequently is eschatological. The Christ who ministered to the circumcision (15:8), now as risen Son of God (1:4) and ruler of the Gentiles (15:12) calls for the obedience of the nations through his chosen apostle (1:5, 15:18). This ministry is a grace, a divine appointment (1:5, 12:3, 15:15b) that brings the Gentiles into the acceptable worship of God's people by means of the Holy Spirit (12:1, 15:16). The cultic aspects of these ideas are commensurate with

the nature of the present Lordship of Christ. They are not tied so much to the sacrifice of Christ as to Christ's Lordship and the Gentile mission. As Denis has noted, the present realm of the reigning Messiah is that of the Spirit.²⁵ For us, this means that the proleptic experience of the salvation of God has come in Christ, although the redemption of the body and the parousia of Christ are still awaited. This salvation, which involves the forming of the church of God, is mediated through the gospel (1:16); it is proclaimed by the priestly ambassador of Christ Jesus. At the same time, the risen Lord calls forth the obedience due him from the Gentiles through this same agent.

D. Final Comments: Cultic Language in Romans

One needs to keep in mind the missionary purpose of Paul in the letter, and the way his mission is tied to his soteriology in seeking to describe Paul's use of cultic language in Romans. Paul presents the gospel as the 'locus' or means of salvation (1:16-17), since through the gospel proclamation justification is accepted and entered into by faith. This gospel/faith relationship, which is fundamental to the missionary proclamation and task, brings salvation to the hearer of the word of Christ, as well as the agent of sanctification (15:16).

The use of cultic language affirms the fundamental sufficiency of Paul's missionary gospel for salvation. Included in the gospel is the means of atonement, the call for authentic worship, both of which are presented by the

priestly apostle.²⁶ Such supportive ideas convey the 'power of the gospel' and the authority of the apostle.

Implicit within the dynamic of this gospel of salvation is universality, and geographical decentralization, although Jerusalem may still be respected. Salvation, including deliverance and forgiveness, can be experienced wherever the gospel is preached, and is not associated with a temple or shrine. One enters into the realm of divine grace by faith, and thus the gospel message is 'power', that which can facilitate divine-human encounter on peaceful terms. The priestly apostle functions as a mediator of divine grace and power, indeed the very work of Christ himself takes place through the apostolic ministry.

As the concluding thrust of this thesis we want to highlight the astounding claims of Paul in Romans concerning 'power', a 'power' that he ministers. For Paul claims to proclaim a gospel that is salvation for those who respond to it. In a sense, he is a travelling priest *who* calls people into the place of God's grace and power, where they can experience peace with the deity, and offer authentic and pleasing sacrifice.

The cultus, in the history of Israel, symbolized and actualized the means of salvation, being the place of revelation and atonement. Although the Law itself was now more significant in the daily life of the Jews, the cultus was the place where God had chosen to dwell, and constantly re-affirmed His covenantal relationship. Through atonement and forgiveness the people of God were able to worship God with ritual sacrifices. Thus, the

Temple was a place where the 'power' of God for salvation was symbolized and demonstrated.

Within Paul's gospel, these basic Jewish cultic ideas that ultimately have to do with God's gracious power of salvation, are clearly 'mobile'.²⁷ This is the case without criticism of the cultus, or a conscious unified Christian interpretation of the cultus. Rather, without attempting either, Paul has supported his gospel and ministry with cultic ideas in a remarkably comprehensive way. The effect of this, regardless of Paul's intention, is that the gospel becomes the 'locus' or means of cult-like religious power. Basic ideas of propitiation and atonement, sacrifice and worship, and priestly service and sacrifice are incorporated into the gospel. In short, basic religious ideas are caught up and proclaimed as part of Paul's gospel.

Paul's gospel was not an appendix to his Judaism. It 'relativized' his religion in a particular way so that it pointed to Christ as the Lord of God's salvation to Jew and Greek (see footnote 27). Thus despite the varying uses of cultic language in Romans and the different degrees of Pauline creativity, the letter can be viewed as announcing that the power of a religious cultus is made available to men wherever they are. We are not saying that this was a new phenomenon, since this was happening generally, and even within Judaism (as Smith suggests). But this observation indicates the religious strength of Paul's claims in this letter.

The content of Romans is such that it is easy to focus on the details of Paul's argument, and in the

process to lose the boldness and the dynamic of the message. Paul claims to speak of, and to mediate in his ministry, the power of God. The purpose and result of this power is salvation, a justification and forgiveness by grace, leading to a worship that involves obedience to God as a community. This is no small claim.

Paul's audience is being prepared to meet a man who functions as a priest, bringing the means of atonement, and administering sacrifice. Such a description calls for the acceptance of the gospel, and the support of the priestly ministry. Paul may not have realized how the cultic elements of his gospel apologia fit within the broader picture. But the very nature of Paul's gospel, within the 'cultic' structure of Romans, allows for this simple observation.

Excursus: Cultic Language and Theology Today

This study raises many questions that we have not dealt with such as the importance of religious tradition, and the need for re-shaping such traditions for numerous reasons. It would seem that as long as the OT and NT are in any sense fundamental to theology then there will continue to be interaction with 'traditional' material that is full of cultic language and ideas. It may be that some type of equivalent language and ideas will be used in the ultimate expression of the traditional cultic language and ideas. But one must ask if this will be helpful when the cultic language and ideas are preserved and passed on so consistently within the religious community by way of its scripture. As long as there is a living tradition of the

use of cultic language there will be the need for explanation, rather than simple replacement. This is also the case when ritual activity, like baptism and Eucharist, have taken on and perpetuated certain cultic ideas, rightly or wrongly.

It may be that Paul's example in Romans is worthy of consideration in this discussion. In an apologetic situation with those within the same religious tradition, and particularly with Jewish roots, Paul uses cultic language to support and unify his argument and presentation. The language functioned to ground the new in the old, and to clarify the new by the old. There are obviously other situations for the communication of the gospel than apologetic ones, so this example is not comprehensive. But it may be that one criterion for the reshaping of theology or religious thought is to assess the tradition with which one is in dialogue, and to explain the new by way of the old, grounding the new in the old. Thus, Christian theology, as it serves the church, will probably always need to maintain a place for cultic thought, because it is so much a part of its origins. It may be that in the expression of theology or gospel to those outside the tradition temporary equivalents will be necessary. As soon as one seeks the roots of Christian theology, interaction with cultic thought and language will be inevitable.

This is clearly a simplistic understanding of the issues involved, because one must ask whether traditional language and ideas are meaningful, can be made meaningful again, or ought to be made meaningful again if they lose

their meaning or immediate relevance. In relation to cultic thought and sacrificial thought specifically, we agree with the general perspective of Frances Young:

"In the concept of sacrifice are enshrined the deepest experiences of the Christian religion and the most far-reaching challenges, both to the individual believer and to the Church as a community. It covers the basic gospel of forgiveness in Christ, and its outworking in worship and service. Can any other image or symbol claim so much?" (footnote 28)

Cultic thought is too rooted in Christian history and tradition to be ignored. We do not despair at the task of making it meaningful or relevant today, despite misunderstanding in the past and the present. How this is done is another issue, but it is probably best to start by viewing original meanings of the cultic language and its use within subsequent Christian theology. We have sought to show how one significant man may have used cultic language in a significant document and in this respect this study is part of the ongoing consideration of the issue. To understand Paul, as is true for other writers of scripture, it is necessary to explain and re-explain his use of cultic language.

Footnotes

¹Conclusions were presented: concerning the direction of questioning (pp. 24-25); concerning historical implications of Paul's cultic language (pp. 54-58); and concerning theological implications of Paul's cultic language (pp. 98-102). Primary exegetical conclusions were presented: concerning cultic language in apologetic for the gospel in Romans (pp. 264-267); concerning cultic language and ethics in Romans (pp. 334-338); and concerning cultic language and Paul's ministry in Romans (pp. 409-411).

²For our perspective on Romans see pp. 116-142.

³Above, p. 22.

⁴If our interpretation of 11:16a is correct, though, it may be that Paul's cultic description of his own ministry to the Gentiles may make the first fruits image in 11:16a more understandable.

⁵Paul does not present a polemic concerning the cultus in the prophetic tradition; he does not symbolically interpret the cultus; he doesn't develop cultic ideas at length, nor does he seem to be deliberately replacing Jewish cultic ideas with Christian ones to state the superiority of Christ or the superiority of the salvation offered in the gospel.

⁶There are indications of why Paul has chosen to use the particular cultic language in each case, but this is something we have sought to express in each section of exegesis. These reasons differ, and thus there is not a unified metaphorical cult presented.

⁷Note pp. 54-58.

⁸When comparing Paul and Philo, the distinctives of Paul's gospel and therefore his sectarian stance in relation to many Jews (Pharisees, for instance), needs to be kept in mind. Also, if Philo represents the type of apologetic for Judaism needed in Alexandria, it may be that Paul did not need to develop his own apologetic along the same lines. Paul's gospel, and the nature of his ministry, added to the different use of the OT he presents to that of Philo, makes one cautious in drawing parallels.

⁹In the Qumran documents, the soteriological role and ethical responsibility of the community are very closely related, and this is reflected in the cultic language. This represents a crisis theology in which, through righteousness and purity the community acts sacrificially for Israel. There is a corporate aspect and a sectarian dimension to the ethical tradition at Qumran that makes it an extreme example of the ethical tradition of early Judaism.

¹⁰It seems that it is best to view Paul according to

his own testimony as coming from Pharisaic circles (Phil 3:5), a man who probably viewed the Temple as an aspect of his nomistic religion. Documents like Wisdom of Solomon, Ben Sira, 1 and 2 Maccabees, and Psalms of Solomon seem to be the type of evidence one should view for the piety within which Paul arose.

¹¹At the same time, his use of cultic language to speak of response to the gospel seems similar to contemporary ethical traditions, despite the distinctive elements due to his Christology and soteriology.

¹²There may have been Christians before Paul who used cultic language to express the meaning of the death of Jesus, and certainly early tradition such as that at Rome could have included a cultic understanding of the death of Jesus. But Paul has supplied us with early and direct evidence of cultic language used in relation to Christ.

¹³Paul's cultic thought does not seem to be related to any confrontation that the historical Jesus had with the religious leadership in Jerusalem, nor Jesus' own statements about the cultus. We are not suggesting that there is any disagreement between Jesus and Paul on this point, although the evidence is scarce. What we are noting is that Paul adapts traditional cultic language to his gospel, and thus historical issues are left hidden.

¹⁴Although Gentiles undoubtedly did contribute to the Temple (S. Safrai, "Relations between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel", in Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section one, The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, vol. 1, pp. 184-215 [p. 188, noting Josephus, Ant. 3. 318.]), it seems to have been on a "free-will" basis, since they were not obliged to pay the Temple tax (S. Safrai, "The Temple", in Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum, section one, The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, vol. 2, 865-907, [p. 880]). Thus, although gifts, offerings, and pilgrimages took place, Temple support was not a Gentile responsibility.

¹⁵Gedalyahu Alon, Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple, translated by Israel Abrahams, (Jerusalem: The Magnes Press, 1977), p. 167.

¹⁶Note pp. 49-54.

¹⁷Note pp. 264-267.

¹⁸1 Cor 5:7, 11:25; 2 Cor 5:21; Eph 1:7, 2:13, 5:2. Of these texts only Eph 5:2 emphasizes what Christ demonstrated in his giving of himself. Thus, the insights of Seidensticker and Corriveau need to be assessed in view of this lack of development of the nature of Christ's self-offering.

¹⁹Note pp. 334-338.

²⁰Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, p. 83.

²¹Thus, we can see the reason for Horvath's lack of connection between the earlier part of Romans and 12:1 and 15:16. This does not mean, though, that there are no cultic connections generally speaking between 1-11 and 12-15. It does mean that the sacrifice of Christ is not equated by Paul (in Romans) with the sacrifice of the believer.

²²Note pp. 409-411.

²³Paul clearly allows for the ministry of others, as the geographical limits, and 15:20 indicate, but his self-description speaks of his authority for ministry among all the Gentiles, which includes those at Rome.

²⁴Paul is not "institutionalizing" his ministry by means of cultic language, except in the sense of affirming its divine origins and blessing (note Daly's third category in the processes of 'spiritualization', Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice, pp. 139-140). Daly does not see Paul as part of this institutionalizing aspect.

²⁵"Liturgie Nouvelle", p. 402.

²⁶Paul does not use Temple language in Romans explicitly, which is surprising, except for the fact that his emphasis is on the dynamic of gospel and mission (what makes justification and sanctification possible for Jews and Gentiles), rather than the sanctified nature of the individual or church itself.

²⁷J. Z. Smith in "The Temple and the Magician" speaks of a change in late antiquity wherein "the archaic language and ideology of the cult will be revalorized -- only those elements which contribute to the new anthropological and highly mobile understanding of religion will be retained" (God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl, edited by J. Jervell, W. M. Meeks, [Oslo-Bergen-Tromsø: Universitetsforlaget, 1977], pp. 233-247, p. 238. [The period of time that Smith is concerned with includes the first century A. D.]) Smith desires that we move past the formula 'spiritualization of the cult' to a broader understanding of change in the ancient world. (Smith's particular interest is with magical papyri, theurgic and alchemical treatises and their employment of "sacrificial structures and terminology", "The Temple and the Magician", [p. 238].) He suggests that "the faith of the clergy in the efficacy of their rituals" and "the Temple as the chief focus of revelation ... have been relativized in favor of a direct experience of a mobile magician with his equally mobile divinity" ("The Temple and the Magician", p. 239). Smith considers other elements that are 'relativized', but these are of concern for our study. Now at the conclusion of this study we are not seeking to

compare Paul to a magician, but note Smith's suggestion to put Romans within a broader perspective.

²⁸Sacrifice, p. 138; also see section pp. 132-138.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES MENTIONED IN THESIS

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

- Aland, K., Black, M., Martini, C. M., Metzger, B. M., Wikgren, A. NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRAECE. 26th Edition of the Eberhard Nestle and Erwin Nestle text. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.
- _____, Black, M., Martini, C. M., Metzger, B. M., Wikgren, A. The Greek New Testament. 3rd Edition, following the 25th Edition of the Nestle-Aland text. London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.
- Cary, Ernest. Dio's Roman History: with an English Translation, on the basis of the version of H. B. Foster. 9 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1914, 1969.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- _____. The Book of Enoch (I Enoch). London: SPCK, 1917.
- Colson, F. H., Marcus, R. Philo: with an English Translation. 11 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1949-1969.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.
- De Jonge, M. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1978.
- de Lagarde, P. A. Constitutiones Apostolorum. London: Williams and Norgate, 1862.
- Epstein, I., Simon, M. Berakoth: Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud. London, Jerusalem, New York: The Soncino Press, 1960, 1980.
- Grenfell, B. P., Hunt, A. S., Hogarth, D. G. Fayûm Towns and their Papyri. London: Egypt Exploration Fund Graeco-Roman Branch, 1900.
- Griesbach, J. J. Novum Testamentum Graece. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Sumtibus G. J. Goschen, 1803.
- Kassel, Rudolf. Aristotelis: De Arte Poetica Liber Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1965.
- Kilpatrick, G. D., Nestle, E. Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. 2nd Edition. London: British and Foreign Bible

Societies, 1958.

- Kittel, Rudolf. Biblica Hebraica. 3rd Edition; with P. Kahle, and revised by A. Alt and O. Eissfeldt. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.
- Lake, Kirsopp. The Apostolic Fathers: with an English Translation. The Loeb Classical Library. 2 Vols. (Vol. 1). London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1977.
- Lake, Kirsopp, Oulton, J. E. L., Lawlor, H. J., Eusebius: The Ecclesiastical History with an English Translation 2 Vols. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1942, 1965. K. Lake (Vol. 1), Oulton, and Lawlor (Vol. 2).
- Metzger, B. M. The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocrypha of the Old Testament (Revised Standard Version). Expanded edition containing the third and fourth books of the Maccabees and Psalm 151. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Nelson Inc., Thomas. The Old and New Testaments of the Holy Bible (Revised Standard Version). Camden, N. J., 1952.
- Oldfather, W. A. Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported By Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments, with an English Translation. 2 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1966, 1967.
- Rahlf, Alfred. Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes. 2 Vols. Editio Nona. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Reynolds, L. D. L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium: Epistulae Morales. 2 Vols. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis. Oxonii: E. Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1965.
- Rolfe, J. C. Suetonius: with an English Translation in 2 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1964, 1965.
- Stenning, J. F. The Targum of Isaiah. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949.
- Thackeray, H. St. J., Marcus, R., Feldman, L. H. Josephus: with an English Translation. 9 Vols. The Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961-1965.
- Tischendorff, Constantinus. Novum Testamentum Graece. Vol 2. 8th Edition. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1872.
- Tregelles, S. P. The Greek New Testament. Part 4:

Romans to 2 Thessalonians. London:
Macmillan and Co., 1857-1879.

von Soden, Hermann F. Die Schrift des Neuen Testamentes in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte. 4 Vols. Vol. 1. Text mit Apparat. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.

Westcott, B. F., Hort, F. J. A. The New Testament in the Original Greek. London: Macmillan and Co., 1909.

Wettstein, J. J. Novum Testamentum Graecum. Vol 2. Amsterdam: ex Officina Dommeriana, 1752.

Zondervan Bible Publishers, The Holy Bible (New International Version), Containing the Old Testament and the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corp., 1978.

REFERENCE WORKS

Arndt, W. F., Gingrich, F. W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur (4th ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and Revised by R. W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bromiley, Geoffrey., et. al., The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia. Fully Revised. 2 of 4 Vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979-1982.

Brown, Colin. New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Corp., 1975-1978.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., Briggs, Charles A. The New Brown, Driver, and Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament: based on the lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson. Lafayette, Indiana: Associated Publishers and Authors, Inc., 1981.

Buttrick, George, A., et. al. The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 Vols. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962, Supplementary Volume, edited by Keith Crim, et. al., 1976.

Cheyne, T. K. Black, J. Sutherland. Encyclopaedia Biblica: A Critical Dictionary of the Literary

Political and Religious History, the Archaeology, Geography and Natural History of the Bible. 4 Vols. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899-1903.

- Harris, R. L., Archer, Jr., G. L., Waltke, B. K. Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament. 2 Vols. Chicago: Moody Press, 1980.
- Hatch, Edwin. and Redpath, Henry A. Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books) 2 Vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897, Supplement by H. A. Redpath 1906.
- Kautzsche, E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2nd English Edition. Translated by A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 10 Vols. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
- Lampe, Geoffrey. A Patristic Greek Lexicon. Oxford: OUP, 1961-1968.
- Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. A Greek-English Lexicon. Edited by H. S. Jones with the assistance of R. McKenzie; with a Supplement (1968) edited by E. A. Barber, with the assistance of P. Mans, M. Scheller, and M. L. West. 9th ed. Oxford: OUP, 1940.
- Mayer, Günther. Index Philoneus. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1974.
- Metzger, B. M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (third edition). London/New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Moule, C. F. D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: CUP, 1953.
- Moulton, J. H. A Grammar of New Testament Greek. 4 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1906-1976. Syntax. Vol. 3. by Nigel Turner. 1963.
- _____, Milligan, G. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976, first issued 1930.
- _____, W. F., Geden, A. S. A Concordance to the Greek Testament: according to the texts of Wescott and Hort, Tischendorff and the English revisers. 4th edition revised by H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

- Renstorff, Karl H. A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus. Vol. 1 (A-Δ). Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973.
- Robertson, A. T., Davis, W. Hersey. A New Shorter Grammar of the Greek Testament. (10th edition, originally published in 1933). Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1977.
- Roth, C., Wigoder, G., et. al. Encyclopaedia Judaica. 16 Vols. Jerusalem: Keter Publishing House, 1972.
- Singer, Isidore, et. al. The Jewish Encyclopedia. 12 Vols. New York: Funk and Wagnells Comp., 1901-1906.
- Strack, H. L., Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 5 Vols. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926-1961.

COMMENTARIES

- Barrett, Charles K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. London: A. & C. Black, 1957.
- Best, Ernest. 1 Peter. NCB. London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 1971.
- Black, Matthew. Romans. NCB. London: Marshall, Morgan, & Scott, 1973.
- Boylan, Patrick. St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Translation and Commentary. 2nd Impression. Dublin: M. H. McGill and Son Ltd., 1947 [1934].
- Bruce, Frederick F. The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London: Tyndale Press, 1951.
- _____. Commentary on the Book of Acts. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1956.
- _____. Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Marshall, Morgan and Scott, 1964.
- _____. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC. London: Tyndale Press, 1963.
- Cranfield, Charles, E. B. The Epistle to the Romans. 2 Vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975-1979.
- Dodd, Charles H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1932.

- Gifford, E. H. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans. Reprinted from the "Speaker's Commentary", published in 1877. Minneapolis, Minn.: The James Family, 1977.
- Gray, George B. Numbers. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1903.
- Haenchen, Ernst. Die Apostlegeschichte: Neu übersetzt und erklärt. KEK. 6th Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- Käsemann, Ernst. Commentary on Romans. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Römerbrief. 3 Vols. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1963-1978.
- Lake, Kirsopp, Chadwick, Henry. The Beginning of Christianity: Part I; The Acts of the Apostles 5 Vols. London: Macmillan and Co., 1922-1939.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Lietzmann, D. Hans. An die Römer. HNT 8. 5th Edition. Tübingen: J. C. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1971.
- Lightfoot, J. B. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. London: Macmillan and Co., 1898.
- Martin, Ralph P. Philippians. NCB. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1976.
- Meyer, H. A. W. Brief des Paulus an die Römer KEK 4., 5th Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1872.
- Michel, Otto. Der Brief an die Römer. KEK 4, 14th Edition. 5th Edition of Michel's Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.
- Murray, John. The Epistle to the Romans. 2 Vols. NICNT Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1959-1965.
- Nygren, Anders. Commentary on Romans. Translated by C. Rasmussen. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- Sanday, William, Headlam, Arthur C. The Epistle to the Romans. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895.
- Selwyn, Edward G. The First Epistle of St. Peter. London: Macmillan and Co., 1946.
- Vincent, Marvin R. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and Philemon. ICC. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1897.

- Weiss, Bernhard. Brief des Paulus an die Römer. KEK 4, 6th Edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht: 1881.
- Wenham, Gordon. The Book of Leviticus. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1979.
- _____. Numbers: An Introduction and Commentary. TOTC. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1981.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. Der Brief an die Römer. 3 Vols. EKK 6. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1977-1982.

MONOGRAPHS AND ARTICLES

- Alon, Gedalyahu. "The Levitical Uncleanness of Gentiles". In Jews, Judaism, and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud. Translated by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1977. 146-189.
- Attridge, Harold W. Review of Christian Sacrifice by Robert J. Daly. JBL 100 (1981), 145-147.
- Aus, Roger. "The Relevance of Isaiah 66:7 to Rev. 12 and 2 Thess. 1" ZNW 67 (1976), 252-268.
- _____. "God's Plan and God's Power: Isaiah 66 and the Restraining Factors of 2 Thess 2:6-7" JBL 96 (1977), 537-553.
- _____. "Paul's Travel Plans to Spain and the 'Full Number of the Gentiles' of Romans XI 25" NovT 21 (1979), 232-262.
- Austel, Hermann J. "ן ? ץ" TWOT Vol. 2, 958.
- Baehr, Jürgen. "Priest, High Priest" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 32-44.
- Bahr, G. J. "The Superscriptions in the Pauline Letters" JBL 87 (1968), 27-41.
- Bammel, Ernst. "πιτωχός, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 6, 885-915.
- Barfield, Owen. "The meaning of the word 'Literal'". In Metaphor and Symbol. Proceedings of the Twelfth Symposium of the Colston Research Society held in the University of Bristol, March 28th - 31st, 1960. Edited by L. C. Knights and Basil Cottle. London: Butterworths Scientific Pub., 1960. pp. 48-63 and discussion.
- Barth, Markus. Justification. Translated by A. M. Woodruff. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1971.

- Bassler, Jouette M. Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom. SBLDS 59. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Baumgarten, Joseph. "Sacrifice and Worship among the Jewish Sectarians of the Dead Sea (Qumran) Scrolls", HTR 46 (1953), 141-159.
- Behm, Johannes. " ἀίμα, ἀίματεκχυρία " TDNT Vol. 1, 172-177.
- Behm, Johannes. " θύω, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 3, 180-190.
- Beker, J. Christiaan. Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1980.
- Berger, Klaus. "Almosen fur Israel" NTS 23 (1977), 180-204.
- Bertram, Georg, Reicke, Bo. " παρίστημι, παριστάνω " TDNT Vol. 5, 837-841.
- Betz, Hans D. "The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians" NTS 21 (1975), 353-379.
- Bjerklund, Carl J. Parakalo. Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalo - Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1967.
- Blank, Josef. Paulus. Von Jesu zum Christentum: Aspekte der paulinischen Lehre und Praxis. Munchen: Kosel, 1982.
- Bolle, Kees. The Persistence of Religion: An Essay on Tantrism and Sri Aurobindo's Philosophy. Numen suppl. 8 [Studies in the History of Religion]. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. "The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament". Reprinted in The Romans Debate. Edited by K. P. Donfried. Minneapolis Minn.: Augsburg Press, 1977.
- Bowers, Paul. "Paul and Religious Propaganda" NovT 22 (1980), 316-323.
- Bradley, D. G. "The Topos as a Form in the Pauline Paraenesis" JBL 72 (1953), 238-246.
- Brauch, Manfred T. "Perspectives on God's Righteousness in Recent German Discussion". In Paul and Palestinian Judaism by E. P. Sanders. London: SCM Press, 1977, pp. 523-542.
- Brooke - Rose, Christine. A Grammar of Metaphor. London: Secker & Warburg, 1958.

- Brown, C., Link, H.-G., Thiele, F. "Sacrifice" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 415-438.
- _____, Mundle W. "λύτρον" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 189-200.
- Brown, J. P. "The Sacrificial Cult and Its Critique in Hebrew and Greek I" JJS 24 (1979), 159-173.
- _____. "The Sacrificial Cult and Its Critique in Greek and Hebrew II" JSS 25 (1980), 1-21.
- Brown, Raymond E. "Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity" CBQ 45 No. 1 (Jan 1983), 74-79.
- _____, and Meier, John P. Antioch & Rome: New Testament Cradles of Catholic Christianity. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1983.
- Bruce, Frederick F. "The Romans Debate -- Continued" BJRL 64 No. 2 (Spring 1982), 334-359.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. Theology of the New Testament. Vol. 1. Translated by K. Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1952.
- _____. "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ" JBL 83 (1964), 12-16.
- _____. "ἔλεος, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 2, 477-487.
- _____. "πιστεύω, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 6, 174-228.
- Büschel, Friedrich, Hermann, Johannes. "ἔλεος, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 3, 300-323.
- _____. "ἀπολύτρωσις" TDNT Vol. 4, 351-356.
- Caird, George B. The Language and Imagery of the Bible London: Duckworth, 1980.
- Campbell, William S. "Why Did Paul Write Romans?" ExpTim 85 (1974), 264-269.
- _____. "Revisiting Romans", Scripture Bulletin 12 No. 1 (Summer 1980), 2-10.
- _____. "Romans III As a Key to the Structure and Thought of the Letter" NovT 23 Fasc. 1 (1981), 22-40.
- Carrington, Philip. The Primitive Christian Catechism. Cambridge: CUP, 1940.
- Carson, Donald A. "The Function of the Paraclete in John 16:7-11" JBL 98 (1979), 547-566.
- Cavallin, H. C. C. "The Righteous Shall Live By Faith: A Decisive Argument for the traditional Interpretation" ST 32 No. 1 (1978), 33-43.

- Cerfaux, Lucian. Le Chrétien dans la théologie paulinienne. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1962.
- Cole, Alan. The New Temple: A Study of the Origins of the Catechetical 'Form' of the Church in the New Testament. Tyndale Monograph. London: Tyndale Press, 1950.
- Corriveau, Raymond. The Liturgy of Life: A Study of the Ethical Thought of St. Paul in His Letters to the Early Christian Communities. Studia Travaux de Recherche 25. Bruxelles - Paris: Desclee De Brouwer, 1970
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "St. Paul and the Law" SJTh 17 (1964), 43-68.
- _____. "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5. 12" SJTh 22 (1969), 324-341.
- Dahl, Nils A. Studies in Paul. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Pub. House, 1977. "The Missionary Theology in the Epistle to the Romans", 70-94. "The Future of Israel", 137-158.
- Daly, Robert J. Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen. The Catholic University of America Studies in Christian Antiquity 18. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1978.
- _____. The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd Ltd, 1978.
- Davies, William D. Review of Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte by Johannes Munck. In NTS 2 (1955-1956), 60-72.
- _____. The Gospel and the Land: Early Christianity and Jewish Territorial Doctrine. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press, 1974.
- _____. "Paul and the People of Israel", NTS 24 (1978), 4-39.
- _____. "Romans 11:13-24. A Suggestion". In Paganisme, Judaïsme, Christianisme: Influences et affrontements dans le monde antique; Mélanges offerts à Marcel Simon. Edited by A. Benoit, M. Philonenko, C. Vogel. Paris: Editions E. De Boccard, 1978.
- _____. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. 4th Edition. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1980. (First edition 1948).

- Deissmann, G. Adolf. Die neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu". Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892.
- _____. " ἰλαστήριος and ἰλαστήριον ". In Biblical Studies: Contributions Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity. Translated by Alexander Grieve. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901. 124-135.
- _____. " Ἰλαστήριος und Ἰλαστήριον : Eine lexikalische Studie" ZNW 4 (1903), 193-212.
- _____. "The Mercy Seat". In Encyclopaedia Biblica Vol. 3, Cols. 3027-3035.
- De Jonge, M. "The Main Issues in the Study of the Twelve Patriarchs" NTS 26 (1979-1980), 508-524.
- Delling, Gerhard. Worship in the New Testament. Translated by Percy Scott. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1962.
- _____. " ἄρχω, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 1, 478-489.
- _____. " ὄρη " TDNT Vol. 5, 493-495.
- Denis, Albert-Marie. "La Fonction Apostolique Et La Liturgie Nouvelle En Esprit: Étude Thématique des métaphores pauliniennes du culte nouveau", RSPHTh 42 No. 3 (1958), 401-436; and 42 No. 4 (1958), 617-656.
- de Vaux, Roland. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by John McHugh. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961.
- Dodd, Charles H. " Ἰλασκεσθαι, Its Cognates, Derivatives, and Synonyms, in the Septuagint" JTS 32 (1931), 352-360.
- _____. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- _____. Gospel and Law: The Relationship of Faith and Ethics in Early Christianity. Cambridge: CUP, 1951.
- _____. New Testament Studies. Manchester University Press, 1953.
- _____. The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: CUP, 1953.
- _____. "The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel and Christian Worship". In Studies in the Fourth Gospel. Edited by F. L. Cross. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1957.

- Dodd, Charles H. More New Testament Studies. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968. " Ἐννομος Χριστοῦ ", 134-148. "The 'Primitive Catechism' and the Sayings of Jesus", 11-29.
- Donfried, Karl P. "Justification and the Last Judgment in Paul" ZNW 67 (1976), 90-110.
- _____. The Romans Debate. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Press, 1977. Reprinted in The Romans Debate are articles by K. P. Donfried; "A Short Note on Romans 16", 50-60. "False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans", 120-148.
- Doty, William. Letters in Primitive Christianity. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1973.
- Drane, John. "Why Did Paul Write Romans?". In Pauline Studies: Essays presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday. Edited by Donald A. Hagner and Murray J. Harris. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980, 208-227.
- Dumbell, W. J. "Malachi and the Ezra-Nehemiah Reforms" RTR 35 (1976), 42-52.
- Dunn, J. D. G. "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Jesus". In Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday. Edited by Robert Banks. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1974, 125-141.
- _____. "Pentecost" NIDNTTh Vol. 2, 783-788.
- Edmundson, George. The Church in Rome in the First Century: An Examination of Various Controverted Questions Related to its History, Chronology, Literature and Traditions. Bampton Lectures for 1913. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1913.
- Eliade, Mircea. Yoga: Immortality and Freedom. Translated by W. R. Trask. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958.
- Elliott, J. H. The Elect and the Holy: An Exegetical Examination of I Peter 2:4-10 and the Phrase βασιλειον ὑπαγευμα. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Ellis, Earle E. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1957.
- Evans, Christopher. "Rom 12. 1-2 The True Worship". In Dimensions De La Vie Chrétienne (Rm 12-13). Monographie de ((Benedictina)) Section Biblio-Oecumenique 4. Edited by Lorenzo De Lorenzi. Rome: Abbaye de S. Paul h.l.m., 1979, 7-49.

- Fee, Gordon. "XAPIZ in II Corinthians I:15: Apostolic Parousia and Paul-Corinth Chronology" NTS 24 (1977-1978), 533-538.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment". In Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der Neueren Forschung; II. Principat, Vol. 23, part 2: Religion (Vorkonstantinisches Christentum: Verhältnis zu Römischen Staat und Heidnischer Religion [Forts.], 1151-1189. Edited by Wolfgang Haase. Berlin/New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1980.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth S. "Cultic Language in Qumran and in the New Testament", CBQ 38 (1976), 159-177.
- Funk, Robert W. Language, Hermeneutic, and Word of God: The Problem of Language in the New Testament and Contemporary Theology. New York: Harper and Row, 1966.
- _____. "The Apostolic Parousia: Form and Function". In Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox. Edited by W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, and R. R. Niebuhr. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967, 249-268.
- Furnish, Victor P. Theology and Ethics in Paul. Nashville-New York: Abingdon, 1968.
- Gager Jr., John G. "Functional Diversity in Paul's Use of End-Time Language" JBL 89 (1970), 325-337.
- Gamble, Jr., Harry. The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: A Study in Textual and Literary Criticism. Studies and Documents 42. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977.
- Garnet, Paul. Salvation and Atonement in the Qumran Scrolls. WUNT 2. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1977.
- Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple and Community in Qumran and the New Testament: A Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament. SNTS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "Abraham and the Righteousness of God" Horizons of Biblical Theology 2 (1980), 39-68.
- Gaugusch, L. "Untersuchungen zum Römerbrief. Der Epilog (15,14 - 16,27)" Biblische Zeitschrift 24 Heft 1 (1938-1939), 164-184, 252-266.
- Georgi, Dieter. Die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem. Hamburg: Herbert Reich, 1965.

- Goodenough, Erwin R., Kraabel, A. Thomas. "Paul and the Hellenization of Christianity". In Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Rashdall Goodenough. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968, 23-68.
- Grayston, Kenneth. "Hilaskesthai and Related Words in LXX" NTS 27 (1980-1981), 640-656.
- Greenwood, David. "Jesus as Hilasterion in Romans 3:25" BThB 3 (1973), 316-322.
- Grundmann, Walter. "δέχομαι, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 2, 50-59.
- Gundry, Robert. Soma in Biblical Theology with emphasis on Pauline Anthropology. SNTS 29. Cambridge: CUP, 1976.
- Gunther, Walther, Bauder, Wolfgang. "Sin" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 573-587.
- Hahn, Ferdinand. "Taufe und Rechtfertigung: Ein Beitrag zur paulinischen Theologie in ihrer Vor- und Nachgeschichte". In Rechtfertigung: Festschrift für Ernst Käsemann zum 70 Geburtstag. Edited by Johannes Friedrich, Wolfgang Pohlmann, Peter Stuhlmacher. Tübingen/Göttingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1976, 95-124.
- Hanson, Anthony T. The Pioneer Ministry. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- _____. Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Harris, Murray J. "Appendix: Prepositions and Theology in the Greek New Testament" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 1171-1215.
- Hawkes, Terence. Metaphor. London: Methuen, 1972.
- Hays, Richard B. The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11. SBLDS 56. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1983.
- Hebert, Gabriel. "'Faithfulness' and 'Faith'" Theology 58 (Oct 1955), 373-379.
- Heitmuller, Wilhelm. Taufe und Abendmahl bei Paulus: Darstellung und religionsgeschichtliche Beleuchtung. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1903.
- Hengel, Martin. "Die Ursprünge der christlichen Mission" NTS 18 (1971-1972), 15-38.
- _____. "The Expiatory Sacrifice of Christ", BJRL 62 (1980), 454-475.

- Hengel, Martin. The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament. Translated by John Bowden. London: SCM Press, 1981.
- Hermisson, Hans-Jürgen. Sprache und Ritus im Altisraelitischen Kult: zur "Spiritualisierung" der Kultusbegriffe im Alten Testament. WMZANT 19. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965.
- Hess, Klaus, " λατρίων " NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 549-551.
- Hill, David. Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms. SNTS 5. Cambridge: CUP, 1967.
- _____. "'To Offer Spiritual Sacrifices" (I Peter 2:5): Liturgical Formulations and Christian Paraenesis in I Peter" JSNT 16 (1982), 45-62.
- Hicks, F. C. N. The Fullness of Sacrifice: An Essay in Reconciliation. London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1930.
- Holl, K. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte. 3 Vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1927-1928. "Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde". Vol. 2, 44-67.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich J. Lehrbuch der Neutestament Theologie. 2 Vols. Freiburg/Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1897.
- Hooker, Morna. "Interchange in Christ" JTS NS 22 (1971), 349-361.
- _____. "Interchange and Atonement" BJRL 60 (1978), 462-481.
- _____. "Interchange and Suffering". In Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies presented to G. M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar. Edited by William Horbury and Brian McNeill. Cambridge: CUP, 1981, 70-83.
- Horvath, Tibor. The Sacrificial Interpretation of Jesus' Achievement in the New Testament: Historical Development and Its Reason. New York: Philosophical Library, 1979.
- Hubert, H., Mauss, M. Sacrifice, Its Nature and Function. Translated by W. D. Halls. London: Cohen and West, 1964.
- Hughes, J. J. "Hebrews IX 15ff. and Galatians III 15ff." NovT 21 (1979), 27-96.
- Hultgard, Anders. "The Ideal 'Levite', the Davidic Messiah and the Saviour Priest in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs". In Ideal Figures in

- Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms. SCS 12
 Edited by J. J. Collins, and G. W. E. Nickelsburg.
 Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1980, 93-110.
- Hunter, Archibald M. Paul and His Predecessors. London:
 SCM Press, 1961.
- Janowski, Bernd. Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Studien zur
 Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift und zur Wurzel
 KPR im Alten Orient und im Alten Testament.
 WMZANT 55. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener
 Verlag, 1982.
- Jewett, Robert. Paul's Anthropological Terms: A Study of
 their use in Conflict Settings. Leiden: E. J.
 Brill, 1971.
- _____. "Romans as an Ambassadorial Letter" Int 36
 (1982), 5-20.
- Johnson, Luke T. "Rom 3:21-26 and the Faith of Jesus" CBQ
 44 (1982), 77-90.
- Jungel, Eberhard. "The Sacrifice of Jesus Christ as
sacramentum et exemplum", Diakonie 5 (Mai 1981),
 7-21.
- Karris, R. J. "Romans 14:1-15:13 and the Occasion of
 Romans". Reprinted in The Romans Debate. Edited
 by K. P. Donfried. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg
 Press, 1977, 75-99.
- Käsemann, Ernst. "Zum Verständnis von Rom. 3:24-26" ZNW
 43 (1950-1951), 150-154.
- _____. New Testament Questions of Today. Translated by
 W. J. Montague. London: SCM Press, 1969. "'The
 Righteousness of God' in Paul", 168-182.
 "Worship in Everyday Life", 188-195.
- Kaye, Bruce N. "'To the Romans and Others' Revisited"
NovT 18 fasc. 1 (1976), 37-77.
- _____. The Thought Structure of Romans with Special
 Reference to Chapter 6. Austin, Texas: Schola
 Press, 1979.
- Keck, Leander. "The Law and 'The Law of Sin and Death'
 (Rom 8:1-4): Reflections on the Spirit and Ethics
 in Paul". In The Divine Helmsman: Studies on
 God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou
 H. Silberman. Edited by James L. Crenshaw and
 Samuel Sandmel. New York: KTAV Pub. House, 1980,
 41-57.
- Kim, Seyoon. The Origin of Paul's Gospel. WUZNT 4.
 Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981.
- Kittel, G. "λογικός" TDNT Vol. 4, 142-143.

- Klein, Günther. "Righteousness in the NT." In IDB Suppl. Vol., 750-752.
- Klinzing, Georg. Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumran-gemeinde und im Neuen Testament. SUNT 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Koenig, John. "Vision, Self-Offering and Transformation for Ministry (Rom 12:1-8)". In Sin, Salvation, and the Spirit: Commemorating the Fiftieth Year of the Liturgical Press. Edited by D. Durken. Collegeville, Minn.: The Order of St. Benedict, Inc., 1979, 307-323.
- Krol, Eugenius. "De sacrificiis Iudaicis quid senserit S. Paulus", Verbum Domini 14 (1934), 296-305.
- Kümmel, Werner G. "Πάροις and Ἐνδαιξίς . A Contribution to the Understanding of the Pauline Doctrine of Justification." Translated by J. E. Crouch. Journal for Theology and the Church 3 (1967), 1-13.
- Ladd, G. Eldon. "Paul and the Law". In Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson. Edited by J. McDowell Richards. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1968, 50-67.
- _____. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1974.
- Laubach, Fritz, Beasley-Murray, G. R., Bietenhard, Hans. "Blood, Sprinkled, Strangled" NIDNTTh Vol. 1, 220-226.
- Leon, Harry J. The Jews of Ancient Rome. Phila.: Jewish Publications Society of America, 1960.
- _____. "The Jews of Rome in the First Century of Christianity". In The Teacher's Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham. Edited by E. J. Vardaman, J. L. Garrett, Jr., and assist. ed. J. B. Adair. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1964, 208-227.
- Levertoff, Paul. "First Fruits" ISBE Vol. 2, 307-308.
- Levine, Baruch A. "First Fruits" EJ Vol. 6, cols. 1312-1316.
- _____. In the Presence of the Lord: A Study of Cult and Some Cultic Terms in Ancient Israel. SJLA 5 Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974.
- Lewis, C. S. "Bluspels and Flalansfers". In The Importance of Language. Edited by Max Black. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1969, 36-50.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Atonement and Sacrifice in the

- Qumran Community". In Approaches to Ancient Judaism. Vol. 2. Edited by William Scott Green. BUBJS 9. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1980.
- Link, Hans Georg, and Brown, Colin. " ἰλάσκαμος " NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 148-166.
- _____, and Brown, Colin. "Sacrifice, First Fruits, Altar, Offering" NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 415-438.
- Lohse, Eduard. Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
- _____. " Πεντηκοστή " TDNT Vol. 6, 44-53.
- Longenecker, Richard R. Paul, the Apostle of Liberty: The Origins and Nature of Paul's Christianity. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1974. (Originally pub. by Harper & Row, 1964).
- Lyonnet, S., and Sabourin, L. Sin, Redemption, and Sacrifice: A Biblical and Patristic Study. Analecta Biblica 48. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970.
- Magnes, J. L. "Pentecost" JE Vol. 9, 592-595.
- MacCormac, Earl R. Metaphor and Myth in Science and Religion. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press, 1976.
- McCullough, J. C. "The Old Testament Quotations in Hebrews" NTS 26 (1980), 363-379.
- McDonald, James I. Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message. SNTS 37. Cambridge: CUP, 1980.
- McIntosh, Argus. "Pattern and Ranges" Language 37 (1961), 325-337.
- McKelvey, R. J. The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament. London: OUP, 1969.
- McKenzie, S. L., Wallace, H. N. "Covenant Themes in Malachi" CBQ 45 (1983), 549-563.
- Manson, Thomas W. " ἸΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ " JTS 46 (1945), 1-10.
- _____. "St Paul's Letter to the Romans - and Others" BJRL 31 (1948), 224-240.
- Martin, Ralph P. Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1981.
- Marxsen, Willi. Introduction to the New Testament: An Approach to the Problems. Translated by G. Buswell. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1970.

- Maurer, Christian. " πίνα, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 6, 985-990.
- Meyer, Ben F. "The Pre-Pauline Formula in Rom. 3. 25-26a" NTS 29 (April 1983), 198-208.
- Milgrom, Jacob. "A Prolegomena to Leviticus 17:11" JBL 90 (1971), 149-156.
- _____. "Sin-Offering or Purification-Offering" VT 21 (1971), 237-239.
- _____. "The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance" RB 82 (1975), 186-205.
- _____. Cult and Conscience: The Asham and the Priestly Doctrine of Repentance. SJLA 18. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- _____. "Two Kinds of HATTA'T" VT 26 (1976), 333-337.
- _____. "Israel's Sanctuary: The Priestly ((Picture of Dorian Gray))" RB 83 (1976), 390-399.
- _____. Studies in Cultic Theology and Terminology. SJLA 36. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1983.
- Minear, Paul S. The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans. London: SCM Press, 1971.
- Mollaun, Rommuald. St. Paul's Conception of ἑλασθήριον according to Romans 3:25: An Historic-Exegetical Investigation. New Testament Studies 4. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1923.
- Moore, George F. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim. 3 Vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930.
- Morgenstern, Julian. "First Fruits" IDB Vol. 2, 270.
- Morris, Leon. "The Use of ἑλάσκειν etc. in Biblical Greek" ExpTim 62 (May 1951), 227-233.
- _____. The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1955.
- _____. "The Meaning of ἑΛΑΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ in Romans III:25" NTS 2 (1956), 33-43.
- _____. The Cross in the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965.
- Morris, Leon. The Atonement: Its Meaning and Significance. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1983.

- Moule, Charles F. D. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament", JTS NS 1 (1950), 29-41.
- _____. Review of Lebendiges Opfer by Philipp Seidensticker. JTS NS 6 (1955), 281-284.
- _____. Worship in the New Testament. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- _____. "'Justification' in its Relation to the Condition κατὰ πνεῦμα (Rom 8:1-11)". In Battesimo e giustizia in Rom 6 e 8. Edited by Lorenzo De Lorenzi with M. Bouttier, A. Descamps, E. Dinkler, E. Lohse, C. F. D. Moule, R. Schnackenburg, with other contributors. Serie Monographici di ((Benedictina)) Sezione Biblico-ecumenica 2. Roma: Abbazia S. Paulo fuori le mura, 1974. 177-201, discussion pp. 187-201.
- _____. The Birth of the New Testament. Third edition. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1982.
- _____. Essays in New Testament. Cambridge: CUP, 1982. "The Sacrifice of the People of God", 287-297.
- _____. "Preaching the Atonement", Epworth Review 10 No. 2 (May 1983), 70-78.
- Mullins, T. Y. "Topos as a New Testament Form" JBL 99 (1980), 541-547.
- Munck, Johannes. Paul and the Salvation of Mankind. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: SCM Press, 1959.
- _____. Christ & Israel: An Interpretation of Romans 9-11. Translated by Ingeborg Nixon. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Neusner, Jacob. The Rabbinic Traditions About the Pharisees Before 70, Part III: Conclusions. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E., Stone M. E. Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Nickle, Keith. The Collection: A Study in Paul's Strategy. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Nicole, Roger. "C. H. Dodd and the Doctrine of Propitiation" WTJ 17 (1955), 117-157.
- O'Rourke, John J. "Pistis in Romans" CBQ 35 (1973), 188-194.
- Patte, Daniel. Paul's Faith and the Power of the Gospel: A Structural Introduction to the Pauline Letters.

- Phila.: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Paulsen, Henning. Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- Perdue, Leo G. Wisdom and Cult: A Critical Analysis of the Views of Cult in the Wisdom Literature of Israel and the Ancient Near East. SBLDS 30 Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Piper, John. "The Demonstration of the Righteousness of God in Romans" JSNT 7 (1980), 2-32.
- Pluta, Alfons. Gottes Bundestreue: Ein Schlüsselbegriff in Rom 3:25a. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1969.
- Procksch, Otto, Kuhn, Karl Georg, " ἄγιος, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 1, 88-115.
- Przybylski, Benno. Righteousness in Matthew and His World of Thought. SNTS 41. Cambridge; CUP, 1980.
- Quell, Gottfried, Bertram, Georg, Stahlin, Gustav, Grundmann, Walter. " ἀμαρτάνω, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 1, 267-316.
- _____, and Schrenk, Gottlob. " δική, κτλ " TDNT Vol. 2, 174-225.
- Rashdall, Hastings. The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology. London: Macmillan and Co., 1925.
- Reicke, Bo. "Paul's Understanding of Righteousness". In Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson. Edited by J. McDowell Richards. Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1968, 37-49.
- Reitzenstein, Richard. Hellenistic Mystery - Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance. Translated by J. E. Steely from third edition. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978.
- Rengstorff, Karl H. "Das Ölbaum-Gleichnis in Rom 11,16ff.: Versuch einer weiterführenden Deutung". In Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube. Edited by E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, 127-164.
- Reumann, John. "The Gospel of the Righteousness of God: Pauline Reinterpretation in Romans 3. 21-31" Int 20 (1966), 432-452.
- Rhyne, C. T. Faith Establishes the Law. SBLDS 55. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Richards, Ivor Armstrong. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. London: Oxford University Press, 1936.

- Riceour, Paul. "The Metaphorical Process", in "Biblical Hermeneutics" Semeia 4 (1975), 75-106.
- _____. The Rule of Metaphor. Translated by R. Czerny with K. McLaughlin and J. Costello. London and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978.
- Ridderbos, Hermann N. "The Earliest Confession of the Atonement in Paul". Translated by J. W. Deenick. In Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday. Edited by Robert Banks. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974, 76-89.
- _____. Paul: An Outline of His Theology. Translated by J. R. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1975.
- Riesenfeld, Ernst H. "περί" TDNT Vol. 6, 53-56.
- Ritschl, Albrecht. Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. 3 Vols. Bonn: Adolph Marcus, 1870-1874.
- Robinson, D. W. B. "The Priesthood of Paul in the Gospel of Hope". In Reconciliation and Hope: New Testament Essays on Atonement and Eschatology presented to L. L. Morris on his 60th Birthday. Edited by Robert Banks. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1974, 231-245.
- Robuck Jr., C. M. "What is the Meaning of Hilasterion in Romans 3:25?" Studia Biblica Et Theologica 4 (1974), 21-36.
- Russell, Ronald. "Pauline Letter Structure in Philippians" JETS 25 (Sept 1982), 295-306.
- Rylaarsdam, J. C. "Feast of Weeks" IDB Vol. R-Z, 827-828.
- Safrai, S. "Relations Between the Diaspora and the Land of Israel". In Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section One: The Jewish People in the First Century; Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions. In Two Volumes. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern in cooperation with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik. Vol. 1. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. B. V., 1974, 184-215.
- _____. "The Temple". In Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum. Section One: The Jewish People in the First Century; Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions. In Two Volumes. Edited by S. Safrai and M. Stern in cooperation with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik.

Vol. 2. Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. B. V., 1974, 865-907.

- Sanders, E. P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion. London: SCM Press, 1977.
- _____. "On Fulfilling the Law in Paul and Rabbinic Judaism". In Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honour of David Daube. Edited by E. Bammel, C. K. Barrett, and W. D. Davies. Oxford: OUP, 1978, 103-126.
- _____. Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People. Phila.: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Sandmel, Samuel. Judaism and Christian Beginnings. New York: OUP, 1978.
- Satake, Akira. "Apostolat und Gnade bei Paulus" NTS 15 (1968-1969), 96-107.
- Schelkle, Karl H. "I. Abhandlungen 1. Der Apostel als Priester", ThQ 136 (1956), 257-286.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "Die 'Liturgie' des apostolischen Evangeliums (Rom 15, 14-21)". In Martyria, Leiturgia, Diakonia: Festschrift für Hermann Volk, 247-259. Edited by Otto Semmelrath, Rudolf Haubot, Karl Rahner. Mainz: Matthias-Grunewald-Verlag, 1968.
- _____. Das Ende der Zeit: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge III. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1971.
- _____. Die Zeit der Kirche: Exegetische Aufsätze und Vorträge. 5th Edition. Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1972. "Vom Wesen der Apostolischen Ermahnung nach Römerbrief 12:1-2", 74-89.
- Schmitz, Otto. Die Opferanschauung des späteren Judentums und die Opferaussagen des Neuen Testaments: eine Untersuchung ihres geschichtlichen Verhältnisses. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1910.
- Schoeps, Hans J. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. Studien zu Paulus. Zurich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1954. "Der Römerbrief als Missionsdokument", 81-106.
- _____. "ἵερός, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 3, 221-283.
- Schutz, John H. Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority SNTS 26. Cambridge: CUP, 1975.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ" NTS 8 (1961), 1-11.

- Schweitzer, E., Kleinknecht, H., Baumgartel, F., Bieder, W., Sjoberg, E. "πνεῦμα, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 6, 332-455.
- _____. "Rechtfertigung". In Foi Et Salut Selon S Paul (Epitre aux Romains 1, 16). Edited by M. Barth, C. K. Barrett, C. Butler, J. Dupont, J. Gnllka, J. Jeremias, S. Lyonnet, P. H. Menond, B. Rigaux. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1970, 137-204, M. Barth's reply pp. 202-204.
- Scroggs, Robin. "Paul as Rhetorician: Two Homilies in Romans 1-11". In Jews, Greeks and Christians: Religious Cultures in Late Antiquity; Essays in Honor of William David Davies. Edited by Robert Hamerton-Kelly and Robin Scroggs. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, 271-298.
- Seebass, Horst. "Holy, Consecrate, Sanctify, Saints, Devout" NIDNTTh Vol. 2, 223-238.
- _____, Brown, Colin. "Righteousness, Justification". In NIDNTTh Vol. 3, 352-377.
- Seidensticker, Philipp. Lebendiges Opfer (Rom 12, 1): Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Apostels Paulus. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen 20. Munster Westf.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954.
- Siebeneck, Robert T. Review of Lebendiges Opfer by Philipp Seidensticker. CBQ 17 (1955), 658-659.
- Silva, Moises. Biblical Words and Their Meanings: An Introduction to Textual Semantics Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub. House, 1983.
- Slingerland, H. D. The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical History of Research. SBLMS 21. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Smith, Jonathan Z. "The Bare Facts of Ritual", History of Religion 20 (1980), 112-127.
- _____. "The Temple and the Magician". In God's People and His Christ: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl. Edited By J. Jervell, and W. A. Meeks. Oslo-Bergen-Tromso: Universitetsforlaget, 1977, 233-247.
- Smith, Morton. "Pauline Problems: Apropos of J. Munck, 'Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte'" HTR 50 (1957), 107-131.
- Spence, R. M. "Romans VIII:3" ExpTim 9 (1898), 479-480.
- Stoessel, Horace, E. "Notes on Romans 12:1-2 The Renewal of the Mind and Internalizing the Truth" Int 17 (1963), 161-175.

- Stott, W. "The Concept of 'Offering' in the Epistle to the Hebrews" NTS 9 (1962-1963), 62-67.
- Stowers, S. K. The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans. SBLDS 57. Chico, Cal.: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Strathmann, H. "λατρεύω, λατρεία" TDNT Vol. 4, 58-65.
- _____, Meyer, R. "λειτουργέω, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 4, 215-231.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus, 2nd Edition. FRLANT 87. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Sykes, Stephen W. "Sacrifice in the New Testament and Christian Theology". In Sacrifice, edited by M. F. C. Bourdillon and Meyer Fortes. London: Academic Press, 1980, 61-83.
- Talbert, Charles H. "A Non-Pauline Fragment at Rom 3 24-26" JBL 85 (1966), 287-296.
- Tannehill, Robert. Dying and Rising with Christ: A Study in Pauline Theology. Berlin: Topelmann, 1967.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. 2nd Edition. London: Epworth Press, 1954.
- _____, "Great Texts Reconsidered" ExpTim 50 (1939), 295-300.
- Teicher, J. L. "Priests and Sacrifice in the Dead Sea Scrolls (A Question of Method in Historical Research)", JJS 5 (1954), 93-99.
- Thiering, Barbara E. "Inner and Outer Cleansing as Qumran as a Background to New Testament Baptism" NTS 26 (1980), 266-277.
- Thiselton, Anthony. "Realized Eschatology at Corinth" NTS 24 (1978), 510-528.
- _____. The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, Wittgenstein. Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1980.
- Thompson, James W. "Hebrews 9 and Hellenistic Concepts of Sacrifice" JBL 98 (1979), 567-578.
- Thornton, T. C. G. "Propitiation or Expiation? ἱλαστήριον and ἱλασμός in Romans and I John" ExpTim 80 (1968), 53-55.
- _____. "The Meaning of καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8. 3" JTS NS 22 (1971), 515-517.

- Torrance, Thomas F. "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith" ExpTim 68 (Jan 1957), 111-114.
- _____. "The Biblical Conception of Faith" ExpTim 68 (April 1957), 221-222.
- van de Sandt, H. W. M. "Research into Rom. 8,4a: The Legal Claim of the Law" Bijdragen 37 (1976), 252-269.
- _____. "An Explanation of Rom. 8,4a" Bijdragen 37 (1976), 361-378.
- van der Leeuw, Gerhardus. Religion in Essence and Manifestation. Vol. 2. Translated by J. E. Turner from 2nd edition. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1967.
- von der Osten-Sacken. Römer 8 als Beispiel paulinischer Soteriologie. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975.
- Wagner, Gunther. Pauline Baptism and the Pagan Mysteries. English trans. Edinburgh & London: Oliver and Boyd Ltd., 1967.
- Wedderburn, Andrew J. M. "The Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again", ExpTim 90 (1978-1979), 137-141.
- Weinel, Heinrich. Die Lebensfragen. 28 Vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1904-1920. Vol. 14: Jesu Blut ein Geheimnis?, by Paul W. J. Fiebig (1906).
- Weiss, Konrad. "Paulus - Priester der christlichen Kultgemeinde", TLZ 79 (1954), 355-364.
- _____. "φέρω, κτλ" TDNT Vol. 9, 56-87.
- Wenham, John W. "Did Peter go to Rome in AD 42?" TynBul 23 (1972), 94-102.
- Wenschkewitz, Hans. "Die Spiritualisierung der Kultusbegriffe: Tempel, Priester und Opfer im Neuen Testament", Angelos 4 (1932), 6-166.
- Wheelwright, Philip. Metaphor and Reality. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1962.
- White, John L. The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter. A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-Literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle. SBLDS 2. Missoula, Mont.: Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.
- Whiteley, D. E. H. "Hard Sayings - VIII" Theology 67 (1964), 114-116.

- Whiteley, D. E. H. The Theology of St. Paul. Oxford: Blackwell, 1964.
- Wiefel, Wolfgang. "The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity". Reprinted in English by K. P. Donfried with Jochen Hoffman. In The Romans Debate. Edited by K. P. Donfried. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Press, 1977, 100-119.
- Wiener, Claude. "ἸΕΡΟΥΣΑΛΗΜ (Rom 15:16)". In Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus, Internationalis Catholicus 1961. Vol. 2. Romae: E. Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1963, 399-403.
- Williams, Sam K. Jesus' Death as a Saving Event: The Background and Origin of a Concept. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 2. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1975.
- _____. "The 'Righteousness of God' in Romans" JBL 99 (1980), 241-290.
- Wood, H. G. "Didache, Kerygma, and Euangelium. In New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959, 306-314.
- Wright, N. T. "The Meaning of περὶ ἀμαρτίας in Romans 8.3". In Studia Biblica 1978: III Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Edited by Elisabeth A. Livingstone. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980, 453-459.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Paul's Rhetoric of Argumentation in Romans: An Alternative to the Donfried-Karris Debate Over Romans". Reprinted in The Romans Debate. Edited by K. P. Donfried. Minneapolis, Minn.: Augsburg Press, 1977, 152-174.
- Yerkes, Royden K. Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1953.
- Young, Frances. "Temple Cult and Law in Early Christianity: a Study in the Relationship Between Jews and Christians in the Early Centuries", NTS 19 (1973), 325-338.
- _____. "New Wine in Old Wineskins: XIV. Sacrifice", ExpTim 86 (1975), 305-309.
- _____. Sacrifice and the Death of Christ. London: SPCK, 1975.
- _____. The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom. Patristic Monograph Series, No. 5. Cambridge, Mass.: The Philadelphia Patristics

Foundation, Ltd., 1979.

Young, Norman. "C. H. Dodd, 'Hilaskesthai' and his Critics" EvQ 48 (1976), 67-78.

Zeller, D. Juden und Heiden in der Mission des Paulus Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1973.

Ziesler, J. A. The Meaning of Righteousness in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Enquirey. SNTS 20. Cambridge: CUP, 1972.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS AND LECTURES

Aus, Roger. "Comfort in Judgment: The Use of the Day of the Lord and Theophany Traditions in Second Thessalonians 1". Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1971.

Bowers, Paul. "Studies in Paul's Understanding of His Mission". Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1976.

Bremer, Paul L. "Paul's Understanding of the Death of Christ According to Romans 1-8". Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1974.

Crump, Warren W. "The Structure and Soteriology of Romans in Light of the Function of 5:1-11 in the Argument of the Epistle". Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1979.

Hecht, Richard D. "Sacrifice, Comparative Study and Interpretation". Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1976.

Koch, Hebert. "Romer 3,21-31 in der Paulusinterpretation der letzten 150 Jahre". D.Th. Dissertation, Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1971.

Moule, Charles F. D. "Do Biblical Meanings Demand Biblical Words?". Hort Society Lecture, Cambridge University, January 20th, 1983.

Riese, Gerd. "Die Alttestamentlichen Zitate im Römerbrief: Eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Schriftauslegung". D.Th. Dissertation, München Universität, 1977.

Rodriguez, Angel Manuel. "Substitution in the Hebrew Cultus and in Cult-Related Texts". D. Th. dissertation, Andrews University, Seventh-day Adventists Theological Seminary, 1979.

Stuhlmacher, P. Lectures on the Book of Romans [10 Tapes] The Fuller Theological Seminary. Pasadena, Cal. 10/10/83-21/10/83

Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the Background of I Corinthians xv and Romans v 12-21". Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1970.

Wright, N. T. "The Messiah and His People: A Study in Pauline Theology with Particular Reference to the Argument of the Epistle to the Romans". D. Phil. dissertation, Oxford University, 1980.