



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	A Semantic Analysis of Paul' s Epistle to the Romans : Ergon and Logos
Author(s)	千葉, 恵
Citation	北海道大学文学研究科紀要, 143, 1(左)-97(左)
Issue Date	2014-07-25
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/56673
Type	departmental bulletin paper
File Information	143_03_chiba.pdf



A Semantic Analysis of Paul's Epistle to the Romans

— Ergon and Logos —

Kei CHIBA

1. Introduction: A Semantic Analysis of the Language of Revelation

In his Epistle to the Romans, Paul proclaims the gospel in joy of a discoverer of 'faithfulness of Jesus Christ'. He has reported in it that a faithful life of Jesus of Nazareth has brought '*kairos* (a present opportunity)' for both God and man to create a new relation between them (cf. Rom. 3:22, 26). It is not hard to imagine, however, difficulties which are accompanied in describing the relationship between the being who is sufficient in terms of both cognitive virtue and character (moral) virtue and the being who is not sufficient in these respects by the same grammar and vocabulary under the same language. Every presumable version of interpretations has been raised to explain this event within the range from a skepticism which reduces all words into Paul's personal mental states up to the position of verbal inspiration.

Since I have not been convinced by any interpretation thus far raised in the flood of historical, theological and religious interpretations by biblical scholars and theologians (though my acquaintance is no doubt very limited), I have devised my own method to secure some steadfast and

definite reading by focusing on what we can say about this epistle in the minimum sense as something certain⁽¹⁾. It is true that even this ‘something certain’ is obviously no more than what can be understood by human beings. But there is no other clue than focusing to the linguistic characteristics in seeking to say something solid on this text, insofar as Paul cannot convey God’s act in any other way than by employing mere human language. In fact, he dictates this epistle on the assumption that he can convey it despite of this limitation. Therefore, I try to understand the *erga* (works) of God and Spirit, whose activities Paul definitely reports as something solid, to the extent as far as they emerge under scrutiny of the grammatical and semantic analyses of the text.

I will analyze Pauline language in his Romans from the perspective of semantic analysis in the commensurate dimension of both people who believe and people who do not⁽²⁾. I carry out this work by intending this analysis to be placed as a pre-stage of such approaches as hermeneutic romanticism called ‘a mysterious communion of souls’ (Schleiermacher) and ‘a sharing of a common meaning’ through historical understanding called ‘the fusion of horizons’ (H. Gadamer) between the past (text) and the present (interpreter). Through this work, I will hopefully reduce at least room for excessive, subjective and even historical interpretations of the text⁽³⁾. I think that this attitude is shared by Paul himself who keeps the commensurability in mind in his clear intention, when he proceeds to Gentiles apart from Jews and proclaims the gospel for both wise and fool.

In general, any semantic theory is concerned with the relations among language, soul/mind as the agent and reality by gazing at which an agent spins the words. When we make a semantic analysis of Romans, we find out that Paul articulated plural networks of language so as for each of them to be independent and coherent. Paul, in my view, constitutes three mutually independent and coherent language networks; A

righteous man before God through the revelation of faithfulness of Jesus Christ (e.g. 3:21-26), *B* sinner before God under the Mosaic Law (e.g. 3:19-20) and *C* autonomous free and responsible human beings (e.g. 3:27-31).

Paul is a realist in his linguistic behavior concerning how the meaning of a term is determined, just as his notion of 'revelation (*apokalupsis*)' implies the independent reality in the following five passages (1:17(3:21), 18, 8:18(2:6)). This word in the verbal form in these passages solely conveys God's act towards human beings. The word 'revelation' is crucial so as to open the new dimensions of reality in sight of God as *A* (1:17, 3:21) and *B* (1:18, 2:6). Its third and last occurrence conveys the revelation of new heaven and earth in the day of last judgment (*A* and/or *B*) (8:18, 2:6). When Paul reports the revelation, the language space formed in the report is presented as the event thoroughly in sight of God without involving any human initiative (except Jesus of Nazareth). His reports of *A* and *B* language networks are carried out by gazing at two kinds of corresponding realities which are revealed by God. God's revelation primarily shows the realities of human beings before God. It conveys God's cognition, judgment and will concerning human beings. Thus the meanings of words and sentences which constitute the language networks of revelation *A* and *B* must primarily understood by God. Paul reports what is understood by God as *A* and *B*.

In the realist semantic theory, the meaning of a term or what a term signifies is supposed to correspond to the way in which the relevant thing in the world consists. The significance of a term is fixed by an object in the world through the causal impact of the object against human soul⁽⁴⁾. In our context, what God thinks and acts primarily establishes the reality at first before Him and this reality as God's thought and act requires the mediators to be revealed to some groups of people before God. In this sense, God's revelation is a self contained notion, insofar as the mediators

such as Jesus Christ and heaven are considered as God's tools for His revelation by Himself (3:22, 1:18('from heaven')).

Paul regards that a current human language such as Greek, however it is limited, can capture God's initiative act as the revelation including His will, cognition and judgment on mankind. In this paper, I am simply concerned with Paul's language networks without considering his biblical, historical and theological backgrounds so that we can establish the basic constraints within which any kind of biblical and theological interpretations should be carried out. As a necessary consequence of the semantic analysis of Romans 3:19-31, I will suggest several different translations in the passage from the traditional ones. In his commentary on 3:21-26, E. Käsemann assessed this passage as 'einer der schwerfälligen und undurchsichtigsten des ganzen Briefes'⁽⁵⁾. On the contrary, I will make it clear that this passage can be clearly analyzed and understood without leaving any room for different readings.

2. The Complexity of Works (*erga*) and Its Articulated Argument (*logos*): Proclaiming the gospel 'by word and work (*logōi kai ergōi*)'

It is true that Paul does not merely intend to convey the linguistic understanding, but intends to convey God's act being at-work and eternal life in hope brought by that act. He recognizes of himself that the proclamation of gospel is trusted to him as a vocation under God's plan. He says:

Are not you my *ergon* (work [the result of proclamation])⁽⁶⁾ in the Lord?..for the seal of mine apostleship are you in the Lord. ..If we sowed to you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things?..For if I preach the gospel, I have nothing to glory of;

for necessity is laid upon me; for woe is unto me, if I preach not the gospel. For if I do this of mine own will, I have a reward: but if not of mine own will, I have a stewardship entrusted to me. What then is my reward? That, when I preach the gospel, I may make the gospel (*euaggelizomenos*) without charge, so as not to use to the full my right in the gospel...I do all things for the gospel's sake, that I may be a joint partaker (*sugkoinōnos*) of the gospel (1Cor. 9:1-23).

Preaching the gospel according to God's plan which is identified with sowing spiritual things is intended by Paul for himself to become freely without charge a joint partaker of the gospel with people to whom he addresses the gospel. That is, the reward of his entrusted proclamation of the gospel is nothing but becoming a joint partaker of the gospel. Thus 'the gospel' means both something real to be shared by and something to be understood by the preacher of the gospel and its listeners. That is, the gospel is the very thing signified by Paul's speech act or hand written letter of proclaiming the gospel. What is free grace to which he owes everything must be shared freely with his fellows without executing any carnal right from his part. Otherwise, 'the gospel' would mean something other than the gospel.

This kind of speech act cannot be limited in the ordinary communication of exchanging information, but must be understood to be spiritual so as to convey the gospel of justifying a sinner in that the Spirit intercedes by making a fact before God to be the fact for his own. In this sense, the word or account (*logos*) which preaches the gospel is supposed to be being at-work (*energein* < *ergon*) as the compounded powers of God, Spirit and man. Insofar as the salvation as becoming a joint partaker of the gospel is nothing but 'Christ being formed in man', this kind of claim is hard to be agreed and shared by everyone (Gal. 4:19). To share the gospel with all other people is the challenge which Paul undertook in his work of

proclamation.

According to his own awareness and declaration, Paul intends to convey his speech act itself being carried out within ‘the gospel’, that is, ‘the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes’ (Rom. 1:17). Paul’s basic attitude in proclaiming the gospel in Romans consists in the complexity of his *ergon* (work, deed) and its articulation by *logos* (word, argument). He says that

I will not dare to speak of anything save those which Christ brought through me, for the obedience of the Gentiles, by word and work (*logōi kai ergōi*), in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of Spirit (15:18).

Paul tells here his own cognition of his act in that he proclaims and practices ultimately in the power of Spirit of God through his own account i.e. demonstration and his *ergon* (work) so that Gentiles may be convinced to believe in the gospel. It is reasonable to suppose that unless a creature Paul himself is set in the new relation with God, he cannot convey what he intends to convey.

This passage, however, suggests also that the word or argument (*logos*) which is somehow contrasted with the work (*ergon*) by being juxtaposed with each other must have its own characteristic, although it can be complementary with the work of Spirit by the argument itself being spirited. This epistle is no doubt a product of a man who carries out his speech act as a free and responsible agent. While Paul’s epistle describes the works of God and Spirit and God’s association with man and the interaction between them, it remains to be his own speech act. This may be a constituent of the compound work together with the works of God and of Spirit. Thus, we can say that it is a human *ergon* (work) language in the most basic sense of *ergon* and also in the minimum sense, because the initiative is limited only to man in this approach. I shall

symbolize the human *ergon* according to man's responsibility as 'Ergon C' and its general articulated account or argument as 'Logos C'. It must be the case that we can describe and understand everything including God's revelatory *ergon* (work) from the perspective of the language which man employs. Man could not understand what Paul says, unless Paul thoroughly describes about the Creator and the Mediator and their relations with the creatures under the constraint of human language. God's revelatory act is discussed, insofar as His will, cognition and judgment can be undertaken by human language. We can say that this is one 'certain' thing.

When Paul delivers God's cognition, judgment and act within this constraint, however, he regards that the meanings of the words and sentences of his reports must be first of all understood by God himself. This is because what he understands by the word 'revelation' is nothing but God's making manifest His own states and acts of Mind (On Paul's realist account of 'revelation', see p. 3 and section 5). Insofar as we adopt the realist account of the meaning of the term, the content of God's revelation should be primarily treated as a reality in sight of God. Then, it grounds and endorses the meanings of the relevant terms which a speaker like Paul utters by gazing at the reality. In spite of the limit of human language, Paul assumes that he can deliver what God's cognition and act concerning human beings. I will symbolize the facts before God such as His cognition, will and judgment by themselves as either Ergon A and its corresponding account Logos A or Ergon B and its corresponding account Logos B. While nothing hinders God's act as Er A and Er B from being simultaneously mediated by the Holy Spirit, Paul proclaims the gospel in such ways as letting his readers extract *A*-type and *B*-type Ergon languages.

As we shall analyze in detail later, Paul orders to the Romans that

‘The faith [C] which you have according to yourself (*kata seauton*), have you before God [A]’ (14:22). The attempt of receiving a fact before God or in sight of God as one’s own from the human perspective is the reception of gospel within the constraint of insufficient human cognitive and moral abilities. Thus an execution of man’s own *ergon* of receiving a fact before God can be described as ErC (a-in C), where ‘a-’ stands for a fact before God A, insofar as it is received within human limited ability. The important thing in our analysis is that nothing prevents from this human *ergon* being pleased well by God and His Spirit being simultaneously poured. I shall symbolize the intercession by the Holy Spirit as ErD=Er(AviaC), where ‘AviaC’ stands for an intercession of the Holy Spirit symbolized ‘via’ between a fact before God symbolized ‘A’ and a fact before Man symbolized ‘C’.

Whether or not the Spirit was actually poured in to the human mind is judged by its consequent results which can be confirmed in man’s perspective C, just as the nature of a tree can be known in its fruits (cf. Luk. 6:44). This is a clue for the expansion of commensurability between people who believe and people who do not.

What is the right way to read the text concerning how strong the work of Spirit is involved? The strongest interpretation will be that since he conveys precisely without any mistake what God recognizes just as it is, Paul who utters and acts in a particular time and space embodies the identity between the fact before God and the fact before man. The demonstration by words as the vibration of air and act as the bodily movement is taken to copy the act of Spirit in particular time and space. This assimilation theory between the fact before God and the one before man is denied by Paul himself who is in flesh. He says that ‘In like manner the Spirit also helps our infirmity: for we know not how to pray as we ought; but the Spirit himself makes intercession for us with

groaning which cannot be uttered; and He [God] that searches the hearts knows what is the mind of the Spirit, because He makes intercession for the saints in accordance with God' (Rom. 8:26-27). Spirit intercedes in the present time by groaning and caring the weakness of flesh as the mediator between God and man. Man cannot thoroughly overcome the infirmity, even if one receives the Spirit, insofar as he is in flesh on the earth.

While Paul understands the *ergon* of Spirit in this way, the dictation of Paul must be understood and analyzed by securing the dimension which corresponds to the urge and work by Spirit in here and now. In this *ergon* language (which will be categorized either into 'Ergon D' or 'Ergon E'), Paul pays his meticulous care by making his readers possible to receive and understand both *erga* (works) of God's act and of his own speech act in the commensurable dimension as something being non-contradictory within the Greek language currently employed by people. When one articulates the text as the result of these works which may not in itself be separated according to the *ergon* (work) but merely according to the account (*logos*), he may be able to understand at least the meanings of sentences and vocabularies in the commensurate dimension.

Paul aims to make the text bear the function of proclamation as the demonstration which can be generally understood. Paul raises as some epistemological and emotional evidences in the human soul of having received the Spirit such as the knowledge that everything works together to bring about good things and good *pathos* (emotion) such as hope and peace (5:1-5, 8:28). This will be later discussed in section 9.

These matters make inevitable the semantic analysis on the basis of the syntactical and the stylistic analyses of the text in the *logos* dimension. By '*logos* dimension', I mean a coherent sphere of language in which the articulated language layer is abstracted from the *ergon* lan-

guage which is supposed to be composed by plural agents' works such as God, Spirit and man. I shall call this 'the general language' which is the general explanation being applied to the *ergon* language uttered in here and now. Concerning the *ergon* of Spirit which intercedes between God and man too, one can understand Paul's utterance, when we analyze it from the semantic perspective. Because Paul consciously or unconsciously (in such way as being embodied) delivers the words by permitting readers to analyze the text by a philosophical perspective in a commensurable dimension, insofar as all human beings employ the same language (ignoring regional differences) and are wrapped by the same mind and body (as the *homo sapiens*). In this sense, Paul simultaneously delivers both the *ergon* and the general language (*logos*).

Since Paul has debated more than twenty years with Greek philosophers, Judaist Christians and Scribes, he proclaims the gospel and tries to convince them on the basis of his knowledge of their positions and arguments (e.g. Act. 17:17, 1Cor. 9:19-23). His writing takes such a form that the proclamation itself simultaneously contains the refutation against his critics such as current philosophers and scribes. In Romans, when Paul refutes his opponents by uttering a simple denunciation 'May it never be (*mē genoito*)' in his writing style called '*diatribē*', he presupposes opponents' criticisms against his theses especially on justification by faith⁽⁷⁾. For example, his opponents doubt under the theses of Paul God's righteousness, truth, the efficacy and goodness of law and thus leads to the anomalism by praising sin (3:3, 5, 31, 6:1, 15, 7:7, 13, 9:14, 11:1, 11). Thus it is reasonable to suppose that he presents his own experience and understanding at the commensurate dimension with his opponents in this epistle. Or at least Paul believes what he says can be expanded to and accepted by everyone whoever he is.

I will make it clear that on the basis of these complex *erga* (works,

deeds), Paul writes in such an articulated way that anyone can understand what he means without appealing to the interceding Spirit in one's soul. In one passage, he says that 'we write none other things unto you, than what you read and you understand' (2Cor. 1:13). Paul grasps his mission of proclaiming the gospels for Gentiles to the effect that 'I am debtor both to Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish' (1:14). I construe it that in order to persuade both wise and foolish people among gentiles, Paul adopted two methods in this epistle.

3. Two Methodological Accesses to the Gospel

In 1 Corinthians, Paul distinguishes the method of 'the persuasion of wisdom' from the one of 'the demonstration of Spirit and power' (2:4). Likewise, he adopted in Romans too the former access in order to persuade wise people through the articulation of complexity of *erga* (works). Paul, as I have noted, constitutes three mutually independent and coherent language networks, *A* righteous man before God through the revelation of faithfulness of Jesus Christ (e.g. 3:21-26), *B* sinner before God under the Mosaic Law (e.g. 3:19-20) and *C* autonomous free and responsible human beings (e.g. 3:27-31). These three dimensions are articulated without referring to Spirit so that these are constituted by 'the general language'.

On the other hand, Paul also adopted the demonstration of Spirit and power without conceding the weakness of flesh in connecting God's act and man's act as well as man's passive state (e.g. ch. 5, 6 (except ch. 6:12-20), 7 (except 7:2-3) and 8). This constitutes 'the *ergon* language'. In my view, Paul offers this demonstration in that one can extract the general language at the *logos* level from the *ergon* level. When he says, for example, that 'Love of God has been poured in our hearts through the

Spirit which was given to us' (Rom. 5:5), this utterance is false, if it has not been the case at the time of his utterance. His *ergon* of speech act cannot be severed from God's love having poured in his soul through its mediation by Spirit.

On the other hand, we can understand this sentence as a general language at the *logos* level in such a general way that *whenever* God's love is poured into our hearts, it is interceded by the Spirit. God and man are distinguished in terms of account and then combined by Spirit. I shall symbolize this type of intercession by '+' in such case as Logos D=Log(A+C) and the other type of intercession which cannot be severed at the time of Spirit's being poured by 'via' such as Ergon D=Er(AviaC) which indicates the unity of complex *erga*, where 'via' stands for its actual intercession in particular time and space and '+' stands for its mediation in general way at the *logos* level.

Now I will offer an interpretation within the linguistic analysis concerning his distinction between the persuasion of wisdom and the demonstration of Spirit and power in 1Corinthians 2:1. This passage can be examined from the perspective of linguistic commensurability. In this epistle which is a few years earlier than Romans, Paul contrasts his own proclamation with the one of his competitors who appeal to the persuasiveness of wisdom and characterizes his proclamation as the demonstration of Spirit and power. Paul says:

This word of the cross is sheer folly to those on their way to ruin, but to us who are on the way to salvation it is the power of God. Scripture says, 'I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and bring to nothing the prudence of the prudent.' ...As God in His wisdom ordained, the world failed to find Him by its wisdom, and He chose to save those who have faith by the folly of the Gospel. Jews call for miracles, Greeks look for wisdom; but we proclaim Christ—yes,

Christ nailed to the cross; and thought this is a stumbling-block to Jews and folly to Greeks, yet to those who have heard his call, Jews and Greeks alike, he is the power of God and the wisdom of God. Divine folly is wiser (*sophōteron*) than the men, and Divine weakness stronger (*ischuroteron*) than the men (*hoti to mōron tū theū sophōteron tōn anthrōpōn estin kai to asthenes tū theū ischuroteron tōn anthrōpōn*). ..My word and my proclamation consist not in the [arguments of] persuasiveness of wisdom, but in demonstration of Spirit and power (*ho logos mū kai to kērugma mū ūk en peithoi sophias [logois] all' en apodeixei pneumatos kai dunameōs*), so that your faith might be built not upon human wisdom but upon the power of God (1Cor. 1:18-24).

As the context of this utterance, it is supposed that there are people in the church of Corinth who try to persuade their fellows by the wisdom as the method of proclaiming Christ and Paul emphasizes his own method being different from the wisdom approach of these people. Irrespective of the context, however, Paul's claim here sounds *prima facie* irrational and anti-Greek. In his proclamation by the demonstration of Spirit and power, Paul conveys the *ergon* (work) of Christ on the cross which is reported to hold victory against the sin and the death as its sting and thus which contains eternal life. By 'Divine folly' and 'Divine weakness' Paul understands the Christ event on the cross. It sounds indeed folly, as a Latin father states, that 'the son of God was dead on a tree'. This event which appeared to be folly and weak has taken place so as for the faith of man to be embraced by God's power. The goal of the proclamation is set as follows; 'so that your faith might be built not upon human wisdom but upon the power of God'. That is, 'the demonstration of Spirit and power' signifies Paul's persuasion assisted by the power of God being necessarily accompanied by God's work. God gives the strength to the

people whose faith He is pleased with. It appears to be consisted of a different dimension from a universal dimension in which the reason tries to bring forth the belief as the human wisdom. It is meant to convey the power of God working in man's faith.

In this passage, the proclamation and argument of gospel are contrasted with the demonstration by 'the persuasiveness of wisdom' which is based on Greek philosophy. When Paul says that 'Greeks look for wisdom', it is reasonable to suppose that he has the Greek traditional understanding of 'wisdom' in his mind. In the discussion of soul's faculties 'concerning the practice and the truth', Aristotle raises five cognitive faculties by means of which soul possesses truth (*Nicomachean Ethics*.VI2, 3). He says that 'Let it be assumed that the states by virtue of which the soul possesses truth by way of affirmation or denial are five in number, i.e. art (*technē*), scientific knowledge (*epistēmē*), practical knowledge (*phronēsis*), wisdom (*sophia*), comprehension (*nūs*); for belief and opinion may be mistaken' (VI2.1139b15-18). Aristotle takes it that any human successful cognitive activity eventually belongs to one of these five states. They are mutually distinguished according to their functions with respect to their objects. Indeed, the knowledge of what the whole universe exists for and the self-knowledge of soul may not be able to be reduced into ordinary scientific knowledge.

It is an interesting fact that Paul mentions three Aristotelian names of cognitive faculties in his epistles, not only 'wisdom' but also 'comprehension (*nūs*)' (e.g. Rom. 12:2) and 'practical knowledge (*phronēsis*)' (Gal. 5:10, Eph. 1:8) among these five exhaustive true cognitive faculties⁽⁸⁾. Although what Paul meant by mentioning these faculties may not be exactly the same as the ones Aristotle meant, we cannot deny that Paul needed such names to employ so as to express some cognitive states of soul especially with respect to the one concerned with a transcendent

entity. It is worth being called by the honorific title of 'wisdom', if there comes about such most comprehensive cognitive state of 'scientific knowledge and comprehension of the things that are highest by nature' (1141b3). Aristotle says as follows;

Wisdom must plainly be the most accurate of the forms of scientific knowledge (*akribestatē tōn epistēmōn*). It follows that the wise (*sophos*) must not only know what follows from the first principles, but must also possess truth about the first principles which ground the being of all other entities. Therefore wisdom must be comprehension combined with scientific knowledge—scientific knowledge of the highest valuable object (*timiōtatōn*) which has received as it were its proper completion (*Nic. Eth.* VI.1141a16-20).

While Aristotelian wisdom is concerned with the supreme entity of the universe as the primary principle of all other entities, the Pauline gospel concerning a historical event of Christ is a kind of commitment to the history of God. The theoretical knowledge of the highest valuable object seems to be very powerful. Paul claims, however, that 'Divine folly is wiser (*sophōteron*) than the men, and Divine weakness stronger (*ischuroteron*) than the men'. Since Christ as the substance of the gospel is 'the power of God' and 'the wisdom of God', Paul tries to convey it by 'the demonstration of Spirit and power' (cf. Rom. 1:16). But one may simply cast a doubt of this claim by asking what discerns the Spirit from soul's other faculties such as wisdom and what confirms the faith belonging to the power of God. Furthermore, one may ask whether man can grasp the Spirit as the Spirit from the external point of view and *inter alia* whether man can discern oneself being in the Spirit from being outside of the Spirit. Even if the faith belongs to 'the power of God', one may further ask whether it is not the case that it can be described after all as the faith which man holds. As I shall argue later, since Paul

concedes to the weakness of flesh, we can discuss the work of Spirit as being reduced in human power. Or rather Paul concedes to the weakness of flesh in such a way of argument that the complex *erga* involving God, Spirit and man can be made analyzed from the human perspective, given that Ergon D is composed of (AviaC). If we symbolize it, we can describe the concession as Ergon C (a- in C) or Ergon C ((AviaC) in C) instead of Ergon D (AviaC).

4. Philosophy of Faithfulness

My project called ‘philosophy of faithfulness’ ultimately pursues to make it clear the faith (fulness) to be the most fundamental state of mind in terms of both cognitive and character (ethical) faculties. If there is anything which combines Sages representing cognitive virtues and Saint representing character virtues, it must be faith (fulness) because of its distinctive characteristic which can be held by anyone at his most basic state of mind. A motto of philosophy of faithfulness is ‘*intellectus ante fidem*’ (understanding before faith (fulness)). I aim to anatomize the Spirit at the commensurable *logos* level between people who believe and people who do not believe as the analysis of Pauline text itself.

All theological and biblical interpretations must be carried out within the basis and the constraint of Paul’s linguistic behaviors in the written text which necessarily contain the grammatical and semantic characteristics. In the Corinthian passage above quoted too, Paul’s claim by employing the comparative usage of words ‘wiser’ and ‘stronger’ which contrasts the word of cross with man’s word involving human wisdom shows that these two kinds of wisdom can be compared to each other and thus imply that there is a commensurate criterion between them. Paul does not deny that human wisdom is wise and strong. He does not deny

either that the faithfulness which man holds according to him/herself within his/her ability can be governed by the power of God's wisdom (cf. Rom. 15.13). On the top of these, Paul claims that 'the demonstration of Spirit and power' which is wiser than human wisdom can be understood in its extension by the commensurable language which everyone basically can understand. In order to know that 'wiser' is wiser than 'wise', we require a commensurate measurement between them. We can consider the criterion of this comparison from the perspective of grasping mankind in its totality which receives the power through God too.

One can legitimately ask whether Paul's judgment on human cognitive ability which is rendered in the past tense such that 'the world failed to know God by its wisdom (*ἡκ εἰδὼ ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τῆς θεοῦ*)' (1Cor. 1:21) can be put into scrutiny by raising the following question: whether this same statement can be delivered again by Paul after Paul himself clearly presented the arguments in such epistles as 1 Corinthians and Romans that while the revelation of gospel was argued by the demonstration of Spirit and power in the former, it was more systematically argued in the latter. In 1 Corinthians, Paul addresses his solutions to the various problems in the church which he himself set up by witnessing that his life is carried out within God's power and by proving the gospel practically and personally in the concrete situations. On the other hand, in Romans, while Paul has no longer employed the phrase 'demonstration of Spirit and power' appeared in 1 Corinthians, he offers a demonstration for the gospel in such more theoretical and systematic manners as not being conflict with the words of Spirit so as for their faith to be within God's power. Its real content is the same as the other epistles, i.e. to proclaim Jesus Christ.

The reason why Paul did not overtly mention these two methods in Romans is, I guess, that he has devised a new system in which he can

simultaneously convey the *ergon* language and its general *logos* language. Or he writes the general language without appealing to the intercession of the Holy Spirit in that its *ergon* language can be extracted as something lying behind its general explanation. I construe it that the phrase ‘by word and work (*logōi kai ergōi*)’ (15:18) signifies this systematic device which corresponds to the two methods in 1 Corinthians.

If the wisdom of the world cannot learn the wisdom of God in any way at all, the world will never come to know God through its own wisdom. But this is denied by Paul himself who employs the commensurate criterion whereby he can utter comparative words such as ‘wiser’ and ‘stronger’. In the history of mankind, man has been trying to understand what has happened among men whatever it is, however much being filled by personal intuitions and spiritual experiences, by deciphering and translating it in terms of the universal and third person language.

To know God can be discussed at various layers of thought. Even Paul, insofar as he bears the weakness of flesh, has no clear grasp of the knowledge of God such as the one of immediate acquaintance, as he writes that ‘For now we see in a mirror, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but shall I know even as also I have been known’ (1Cor. 13:12). Paul then characterizes the cognitive relation with God to be reciprocal to the effect that if one can come to know anything of God, it implies the fact that the relevant man is simultaneously known by God (Gal. 4:8-11, 1Cor. 8:1-4, Phil. 3:12-14)⁽⁹⁾. This implies that this kind of knowledge belongs to the character-involved knowledge to the effect that any knowledge does not come about, unless a faithful relationship is established between the relevant persons.

When the fact of revelation is once stated clearly as a general language in Romans, the reason may be able to make a new access to the revelation, putting aside the issue of whether the philosophy of faithful-

ness may be more than 'the wisdom of the world' which Paul criticizes in 1 Corinthians. For one may bring about some knowledge through the thought on the Christ event which is reported to be a past revelation, insofar as it is distinctly demonstrated and also that there is a case in which the reason tries to elucidate a historical incident and it can be made explicit to some extent. The philosophy of faithfulness justly disagrees with such a pessimistic remark as the one of K. Barth that 'Exakte Wissenschaft vom Römerbrief müsste sich genau genommen auf die Entzifferung der Handschriften und auf die Aufstellung einer Konkordanz dazu beschränken'⁽¹⁰⁾.

A man of experience who has somehow touched the power of God may be able to speak that the power of the Creator is stronger than the one of man. Also the word of experience may seek for some kind of universality. The proclamation is vain, if only some people can understand it. To speak in a tongue is put into such class by Paul (1Cor. 14). The philosophy of faithfulness seeks for what these words 'wiser' and 'stronger' signify in a universal dimension. This is an attempt to understand 'the word of the cross' in the commensurability with the human wisdom, by taking such an approach that $\text{Logos } D = \text{Logos}(A + C)$ based on $\text{Ergon } D = \text{Er}(\text{Avia}C)$ can be made access from the Logos C as Logos (a- in C), where 'a' stands for A, insofar as it is dealt with in C. This concession is made by Paul himself due to the infirmity of flesh. An important thing is that nothing prevents from any human *ergon* being simultaneously spirited. The best -whatever it is- human performance may be regarded to be righteous before God.

Generally speaking, insofar as the power of Spirit is demonstrated as something wiser than human power, it must be able to stand against the scrutiny of reason, although it *prima facie* appears to be foolish. In fact, it presupposes the linguistic understanding which makes usual human

understanding possible. The philosophy of faithfulness, as I shall argue in due course, demonstrates the faithfulness based on the power of God which is more comprehensive than the human wisdom such that it can present the faithfulness which is articulated in two kinds either into (f1) 'the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' or into (f2) the state of mind of a particular person in a universal dimension as the analysis of to be human beings as a whole⁽¹¹⁾. Through this work, I aim to expand the commensurable region which enables to establish the agreement among human beings who have the same structure of soul speaking in the same manner among them. In a word, our goal is to understand clearly this 'power of Spirit' through the commensurable account.

This project will be a response to a Luther like criticism why one seeks for an inferior rational universal explanation, when there is a superior wisdom and power. Because it is interesting and worth trying to elucidate how the power of God contributes to the understanding of human beings as a whole, although this attempt does not deny of having *in fact* an experience of the wiser power of God. Since the gospel is based on a historical event of Jesus Christ, it necessarily implies a stumbling-block. It is always accompanied by a tension between pursuing the universality by reason and having a basis of the faith in the particular historical origin of the gospel.

The philosophy of faithfulness respects a *pathos* or a piece of emotion which comes about in man's joy in the simple fact of being able to be faithful to God who is regarded to lead the life of a relevant person in love. Feeling God at hand is not unnatural for the person who is daily living according to the biblical message and learning what God grasps, judges and leads human beings, just as we have a premonition or a hunch of how an intimate friend thinks and responds to a thing. Insofar as the salvation is nothing but Christ being formed in man, it has a phase which

any academic discipline cannot interfere (Gal. 4:19). Our study remains one step basic or before (*ante*) so as to elucidate its generality by respecting man's commitment in each private situation. What the reason can do is to get rid of cognitive stumbling-blocks in the cognitive level and attempts to elucidate generally the relation between the cognitive elements and character elements of soul in the cognitive level.

While man's faith seeks for the faithfulness towards God, the philosophy of faithfulness seeks for understanding and knowledge concerning the nature and functions of *pistis* (faith/fairfulness) in the entire activity and state of the human mind in general. This is not the same as Anselm's investigation by reason alone (*sola ratione*) in two respects⁽¹²⁾. Anselm successfully proves in general by reason alone that God-man alone can redeem the sin of man by 'removing Christ (*remoto Christo*)' from the consideration on the atonement. Our approach does not remove Christ from consideration, but deals with him insofar as the text permits syntactical and semantic analyses on the linguistic dimension. Secondly, Anselm seeks for 'understanding of faith (*ratio fidei*)'. He presupposes the certitude of faith in itself and avows it to Urbanus II the pope of his time in his commendation of *Cur Deus Homo*. It is true that his argument by reason alone is not influenced by this certitude. Anselm claims that his findings by reason alone do not contradict with the messages of Holy Scripture. Anselm asserts, 'I am sure that, if I say anything which is undoubtedly contradictory to Holy Scripture, it is wrong; and, if I become aware of such a contradiction, I do not wish to hold to that opinion' (I18, cf. Praefatio, I1).

The philosophy of faithfulness, on the other hand, investigates the text as a pre-stage of any theological or biblical study. Any theological claim such as the existence of person who is wholly God and wholly man will be examined within the constraints of the results of our linguistic

analyses. We seek for the account or explanation of faith at the linguistic level in the commensurate dimension between people who believe and people who do not. Philosophy of faithfulness suspends Anselm's preceding faith in God for the practice of reason by bracketing the certitude of faith in itself, so that we may secure a limited area of linguistic analysis in which everyone can share and may expand that area in agreement on the basis of the certitude of the relevant analysis. This project may interest both the people who are most obedient to God and the people who are not interested in God but in philosophical analysis of language. Whether this attempt ends up with a kind of human wisdom or it conveys the spirited rational words cannot be known save in its results or fruits of life, although it is not decisive either.

We are concerned with faith as its main theme but adopt a different method from both natural and revelation theologies so that it claims its unique role. I claim that since Paul's thought is philosophically original, our philosophy of faithfulness is possible. He was facing a version of Kant's third antinomy between determinism and human freedom, whose antecedent form is seen in the Pelagian Controversy in the fifth century. Paul offered an original solution for it (See section 12). My project is carried out in joy of discovering the multi layers of language in Paul's argument. While he spins the words inside of his own faith towards God, his words do not demand for the faith of particular readers as the necessary condition of understanding his words but hold a dimension which can be understood by both people who believe and people who do not. The very work of elucidating this dimension seems to offer the linguistic constraints within the framework of which many theological *aporia* thus far carried over should be solved. This analysis in the *logos* dimension presupposes his own *ergon* (work).

5. The Persuasion of Wisdom according to the Three Layers of Language Networks [A][B][C] in Romans

In Romans, Paul argues for as its main theme the righteousness of God from two perspectives i.e. the Mosaic law (1:18-3:20) and the Christ event (3:21-4:25). Now, I shall present his arguments which make it possible to analyze the independent language layers. His two independent demonstrations of a righteous man and a sinner are carried out without appealing to the Spirit. I will show that these are his persuasion by wisdom as his intention, although nothing prevents from his arguments by dictation being simultaneously spirited.

God's cognition of a righteous man and a sinner is reported by Paul. According to his report, the righteousness of God has been revealed in two ways, one of which is based on the Mosaic law of works and the other is through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. The verbal expression 'being revealed (*apokaluptetai*)' is only employed in these two cases and in the prediction of the second coming of Christ at the final day of last judgment (1:17(3:22), 1:18, 8:18(2:6)).

In Romans, Paul articulates at least three layers of human beings which are relatively independent of each other, by gazing at the human realities before God and before man and spinning the words respectively. Two layers are the language networks before God, that is, based on the revelation of God's cognitions of human beings. The one is revealed as the gospel which brings about salvation in Jesus Christ to man and the other is revealed as God's understanding of human beings in His wrath through the law of works.

Paul's two reports of God's revelation of His righteousness involve the same items in terms of (a, b1) the revelatory act, (a, b2) its content, (a,

b3) its mediation and (a, b4) its addressee. It is, thus, important to keep in mind that the language of revelation has a definite structure to convey God's initiative act.

God's cognition of man through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ can be called as (A) 'a report of the revelation of righteous man in Gospel'. God makes known His righteousness based on His faithfulness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. '(a2) God's righteousness (a1) has been manifested (a3) through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (a4) to all those who believe' (3:21). This revelation is reported in its introductory and parallel passage as well that '(a2) God's righteousness (a1) is revealed (a3) in him (Jesus Christ) on the basis of [God's] faithfulness (a4) to [man's] faithfulness. As it is written, 'But the righteous shall live on the basis of [God's] faithfulness' (1:16-17)⁽¹³⁾. God was faithful and thus righteous, when His promise was realized in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. When Paul gazes up 'the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' which is not separated from God's righteousness and spins the words, it constitutes an independent language network on the righteous man before God. It is constituted by putting 'the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' in its center which is accompanied by such words as 'righteousness', 'redemption', 'a locus of divine presence (*hilastērion*)', 'present opportunity' and 'justifying anyone.. on the basis of Jesus' faithfulness'.

Likewise, God makes known His righteousness based on work as a wrath from Heaven through the Mosaic law of works or 'the law written in men's hearts' to evil doers (2:15). God's cognition of man through the law can be labeled as (B) 'a report of the revelation of a sinner under the law'. He reveals His righteousness based on work by applying the Mosaic law to certain types of human deed (1:18-3:20). Paul reports that '(b2) The wrath of God (b1) is revealed (b3) from Heaven (b4) against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in

unrighteousness' (1:18)⁽¹⁴⁾. God is righteous, when He carries out His works by punishing the ungodliness and unrighteousness according to the distributive justice. When Paul gazes up 'the law of works' and spins the words, it constitutes an independent language network on the sinner before God. It is constituted by putting 'a law of works' in its center which is accompanied by such words as 'work', 'sin', 'unrighteousness' and 'wrath'.

When Paul, in turn, gazes at his fellow mankind as being independent of God's initiative, he describes the reality from the man-centric perspective. I shall call the people of third group (C) 'autonomous beings' who live in responsible freedom. Paul describes this third type by saying, 'I speak after the manner of man (*kata anthrōpinon*) because of the weakness of your flesh' (6:19). 'Flesh' means the principle of life for a natural entity having a body made of earth. The weakness of flesh consists of its propensity or tendency to consider the limit of the body as the limit of the self by being unable to think the spiritual realm as his/her own constituent. This phrase, 'the manner of man' suggests that the autonomous being (type C) understands man from a human-centric standpoint, in which, for instance, the word 'slave' is applied in the neutral way either to 'the slave of sin' or to 'the slave of righteousness' (6:17-20). Paul understands such a man to be one who could become either a righteous being (type A) or a sinful being (type B). Groups A and B constitute the languages of 'before God'; and group C constitutes the language of 'before man'. Paul spared no pains to articulate these dimensions because of his love for weak people.

On the basis of this semantic analysis, what I intend to convey in the name of 'philosophy of faithfulness' should be located as a pre-stage of biblical and theological interpretations so that anyone, irrespective of believer or non-believer, can agree with my analysis, insofar as the text

is concerned. I am simply concerned with the language networks which Paul spins by taking God's revelation just as it is from a realist perspective. Any human language which is no doubt created from the human-centric perspective within a given society and environment is inevitably limited and insufficient to capture God's initiative act and state. Nonetheless, Paul assumes that it is possible for him to report God's cognition, judgment and act on human beings, as far as our understanding is concerned.

6. Romans 3:19–31

6.1 New Translation

My translation of the relevant passage (3:19–31) in which we find these three language networks ([B][A][C] in order) is as follows:

[B] ¹⁹ Now we know that whatever things the law says, it speaks to those who are under the law, that every mouth may be closed, and all the world may be brought under the judgment of God. ²⁰ Because on the basis of a law of works, every flesh before God will not be justified. For there is [God's] knowledge of sin through a law.

[A] ²¹ But now apart from a law, God's righteousness, which is witnessed by the law and the prophets, has been manifested, —²² God's righteousness manifested through faithfulness of Jesus Christ to all those who believe. For there is no separation (*ū gar diastolē*) [between the righteousness of God and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ]. ²³ For all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, ²⁴ and are now being justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus, ²⁵ whom God set forth as a locus of divine presence (*hilastērion*) through the faithfulness in his blood resulting in the indication of His righteousness because He passes over sins

committed beforehand ²⁶ in God's forbearance, toward an indication of His righteousness in this present opportunity in which He might Himself be righteous as well [as in the law], in justifying anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faithfulness.

[C] ²⁷ Where then is the boasting? It is excluded. By what manner of law? Of works? No, but by a law of faithfulness. ²⁸ Therefore (*ūn*) we recognize that a man is justified by faith apart from a law of works. ²⁹ Or is God the God of Jews only? Is He not the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, ³⁰ since indeed there is one God who will justify the circumcised on the basis of [his] faithfulness, and the uncircumcised through *the* faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]. ³¹ Do we then nullify a law through the faithfulness? May it never be! No, we confirm a law [of works].

In these passages, Paul distinguishes these three language layers by articulating the initiative of an act which may either belong to God [A], [B] or man [C]. A basic characteristic of the language before God consists in that insofar as the agent of revelation is God, the relevant words and sentences which report God's cognition and act must be understood, first of all, by God Himself as they are. Thus, what Paul does in the language before God is, as it were, translating into Greek what God has revealed through Jesus of Nazareth (group A) and through the law of works (group B). The first thing to be noted in this passage is that the human beings are expressed by the different words in each division. While in the group *B*, man is called 'every flesh before God', 'those who are under the law', in the group *A*, man is called 'all those who believe', 'all...are now being justified' and 'anyone on the basis of Jesus' faithfulness'. In the group *C*, man is called 'man', 'the uncircumcised' and 'the circumcised'. In the *C* only, the subject 'we' which includes Paul is employed. According to the realities to which Paul pours his gaze, the

descriptions of man differ.

According to our understanding of the distributive justice which is seen in the precept, for instance, ‘an eye for an eye’, if man is made righteous through the obedient act of law, he is entitled to claim being righteous as a due wage of his own merit and to claim that he knows God’s righteousness through his own virtuousness. But this is denied by [B] passage (3:19–20). It is already revealed in [B] passage that any flesh on the basis of a law of works has no chance to be righteous through the works of the law, because there is God’s knowledge of sin through a law(*dia gar nomū epignōsis hamartias*) (3:20). This passage must be understood from God’s perspective in that ‘knowledge (*epignōsis*)’ does not primarily belong to man’s mental state as ‘awareness’ of sin as it is usually understood, but belong to God’s knowledge of sin through a law⁽¹⁵⁾.

The traditional translations of [A] passage must be corrected according to the perspective of God’s revelation through the faithful event as well. Concerning the controversial passage v.22 (in my translation ‘through faithfulness of Jesus Christ’), there is a clear linguistic foundation for the endorsement of my reading which consists in the certitude of linguistic behavior of ‘Jesus Christ’.

6.2 Linguistic behavior of ‘Jesus Christ’

God is pleased well of the faithfulness of Jesus of Nazareth and approves to make His righteousness to be known through it (cf. Mark. 1: 11). Thus, Jesus has acquired the honorific title ‘Jesus Christ’ as the anointed and authorized by God. Although prophets and kings have been anointed and bestowed the authority, ‘Christ’ became a proper name which signifies only Jesus of Nazareth. God’s righteousness has been revealed ‘through faithfulness of Jesus Christ’. While Jesus carried out his faith as a free and responsible agent, Jesus Christ is the one who is

anointed by God as having embodied God's will and thus is able to be characterized as the mediator between God and man.

With respect to the theological entity Jesus Christ and the corresponding theological language, there is one extremely important linguistic fact (which has been hitherto escaped from the notice of commentators). The proper name 'Jesus Christ' was never used in Romans (and other authentic epistles) to designate an agent of an action⁽¹⁶⁾. While 'Jesus' was viewed as an agent, as a responsible human beings (see 3:26, 4:24, 8:11, 10:9, 14:14), 'Christ' was viewed as a heavenly resurrected agent who makes intercession for man at the right hand of God (e.g., 8:34, 15:7, 15:18). While we can ascribe action to Jesus of Nazareth and Christ as well, we cannot ascribe action to Jesus Christ, because Jesus Christ is the entity who has incorporated both the being, Jesus (wholly a man), and the being, Son of God (thus opening a new reality for human beings in the *D* perspective). Paul could not ascribe any action to such person who is constitutive of two types of agents *both* man *and* God. Since Jesus Christ is such unique entity, Paul employed locutions such as the prepositions 'in', and 'through' before the proper name 'Jesus Christ', so that the being, Jesus Christ, could be understood as the medium *in* whom and *through* whom God reveals His judgment and His intention towards human beings (see 2:16, 3:24, 5:1, 6:3, and 8:1). It was necessary for Paul to write this sentence not by putting 'Jesus' faithfulness' (3:26) but in this way in the sense that the faithfulness which has belonged to Jesus Christ.

It is certain that the linguistic behaviors between 'Jesus' and 'Jesus Christ' are different. God's intention of delivering his own son to the world in the flesh is fulfilled by the life of Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus carried out God's intention, which was bestowed on him in his own flesh, through his own responsible freedom in the *C* perspective. Jesus was also (falsely) punished by a wrong application of Jewish and Roman laws

in his own flesh in the *C* perspective, although God did not punish him but sin: ‘Concerning sin, God has punished the sin in the flesh [of Jesus]’ (8: 3). This, however, is the sacrificial act of his faithfulness not based on the Mosaic law. In fact, while the sin is punished through his own flesh, no one is punished on the cross of Jesus. Since Jesus carried out his faithful life, God could set forth him as a locus of His own presence. That is why Jesus was ‘appointed the Son of God in power, according to the Spirit of holiness, based on the resurrection of the dead’ (1:5).

Therefore, the genitive ‘*Iesū Christū*’ must be taken not as either the objective genitive nor subjective genitive but as ‘the genitive of belonging’⁽¹⁷⁾ (See note (31)).

The reading of subjective genitive, according to which some commentators read the relevant clause as the faith which Jesus Christ holds, should be rejected⁽¹⁸⁾. This is because, ‘Jesus Christ’ is never taken to be the agent. This is one example of constraint for theological interpretation from the linguistic fact.

A traditional reading of the verse 22 as the objective genitive should be rejected either (e.g., T. Aquinas, M. Luther)⁽¹⁹⁾. This is because man’s having faith in Jesus Christ cannot be a medium of God’s revelation. It treats ‘faith’ as man’s free and responsible act in believing Jesus Christ and staying at the *C*-type dimension. This treatment of the traditional reading might be objected by people such as Luther who takes that having faith on our part itself is God’s act in such a way that to believe in God is to be made to believe by God. Thus, our mental act of having faith can be taken to be the mediation of the revelation of God’s righteousness. This is the reading not to sever *A* horizon from *C* horizon by demanding the intercession of Spirit to unite them as $Er(AviaC)=ErgonD$. Paul, however, writes this paragraph so as to be able to understand it without appealing to the intercession of Spirit, although nothing hinders from

Spirit's working simultaneously in any human faithful act. In this sense, Luther's reading is a pious one. When Paul employs a conditional sentence 'if Christ dwells in you' (8:10), this implies that he takes it that Christ as the Spirit may not dwell in us in some situations. His employment of the imperative mood presupposes the either side of the possibility as well. We cannot take it for granted that the Holy Spirit intercedes between an act of God and an act of man all the time.

6.3 Asymmetry in the meanings of the term '*pistis*' and its two phases

We should grasp the meaning of the term according to the difference of God's act and man's act. It is evident that when the same word is applied to both God and man, there are asymmetries in the meaning of the term. Paul is, no doubt, aware of this asymmetry. The following fact shows his awareness that when he ascribes '*pistis*' to God and man, while he employs its noun case only for God (3:3, 22), he employs its verb too in man's case (eg. 4:3, 15.13).

Romans 3:21-26 is in the language of the *A* group, that is, the 'before God' language, through which God's understanding, judgment, and action concerning human beings are all reported. In other words, God is the agent of this paragraph and the meanings of the terms in dimension *A* are not same as in the dimension which Paul used in his understanding of man as an agent in *C* horizon because of the weakness of flesh. Paul distinguished according to the different dimensions of language the (f1) 'faithfulness of Jesus Christ' (3:22), which I will term (f1), from (f2) 'faith', which is the mental disposition or state of all human beings. When Paul gazed at our flesh and uttered 'faith,' it refers to a state emerged in our soul. This (f2)-type of our own flesh varies from person to person, and it also varies from time to time within one person. Paul described this type of faith by associating this faith, as well as the believer, with the ideas of

‘weak’, ‘progress’, ‘lack’, and ‘growth’ (14:1, Phil. 1:25, 1Th. 3:10, 2 Cor. 10:15). This pronouncement came from Paul’s human manner of speaking, due to the infirmity of flesh. The criteria, by means of which Paul distinguishes these states of people with respect to their having faith, belong to his understanding of the phenomena that can be observed in the human dimension. That is, this worldly dimension is man’s responsibility, although this dimension itself is ultimately under the control of God existing with His permission (cf. 2 Cor. 10:13).

Paul described (f1) ‘faithfulness of Jesus Christ’ as the medium for the revelation of God’s righteousness in the language of revelation from God’s side (that is, he used *A*-type language and concepts). Because of this mediation, God can see and assess man’s faith in (f2) as the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (f1). God regards the faith of Jesus of Nazareth is sufficient enough to convey His faithfulness and thus of His righteousness towards mankind. In general, for any entity to become *a medium* of two entities of different genera, this entity must embody (at least potentially and preferably actually) characteristics of both original genera.

God’s righteousness is revealed through His faithfulness to all men who believe. People who believe (so understood by God) know that God is righteous through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ the mediator⁽²⁰⁾. In the *A* passage, Paul reports what God understood in terms of ‘*pistis*’ that is, ‘faithfulness’. In this paragraph, ‘faithfulness of Jesus Christ’ is placed as the center of the language network. The word ‘*pistis*’ which is ascribed to both God and man contains cognitive and ethical aspects, as the ordinary Greek as well as other languages implies. In terms of the cognitive virtue (*dianoētikē aretē*) and the character or moral virtue (*ēthikē aretē*), while God does not lack anything by being Himself sufficient in these respects, man is insufficient at least in cognition with respect to his relationship with God (cf. Aristotle, *Nic. Eth.*, I.13, 1103a5).

Insofar as God is concerned, given that the cognitive aspect is not considered in Him in showing His faithfulness towards man, we cannot render its translation as 'faith.' The 'faith' inevitably involves man's insufficient cognitive state in which one believes God without fully knowing it. When God is faithful toward man through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, man's ethical aspect (not cognitive aspect any more) is at stake whether man is faithful so as to correspond to 'God's faithfulness' (3:3, cf. Mark, 1:11). God's righteousness based on His faithfulness is realized in the one of Jesus of Nazareth to the effect that God has kept His promise to Abraham in the Christ event and not told a lie. Keeping a promise and not telling a lie are reported to characterize God's faithfulness as 'truth' (3:4). Any faithful relationship is realized by overcoming any cognitive insufficiency, just as it is confirmed in a story of Jesus that a man in crisis cried out and said 'I believe, help thou mine unbelief' (Mark, 9:24). In such a situation, while the cognitive element does not have any impact, the faithful relationship between God and man alone is what mattered.

When God's initiative act is concerned with, the words and sentences must be understood from the perspective of what God understands by the relevant words. In the passage *A*, God's righteousness based on His faithfulness is revealed through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ to all those who believe. Here the word '*pistis*' in 'all those who believe' (3:22: group *A*) as well as 'the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faithfulness' (3:26) is not directly describing anyone's state of mind, except the one of Jesus. This phrase, first of all, signifies those people who are regarded by God to be the people who believe. Insofar as God regards anyone to be the one whose faith is on the basis of the faithfulness of Jesus, He justifies him/her. It becomes the proper vehicle for the revelation of His righteousness so as to bestow it to the people who believe. This shows

that His righteousness based on His faithfulness is not separated from the one of Jesus Christ. Thus this *A* dimension is focally constituted by the faithfulness of Jesus Christ so that any constituent of this sphere should be construed by locating itself with respect to the relation to the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. We cannot get out of this gravitation.

Thus, when man is taking initiative in his having *pistis*, it should be translated into ‘faith’ which is supposed to correspond to God’s initiative faithfulness. On the other hand, when God’s ‘*pistis*’ is at issue, we have to pick up God’s ethical or character aspect alone so that it should be translated into ‘faithfulness’⁽²¹⁾.

6.4 Redemption based on the faithfulness

Now that we have understood the first sentence of [A] passage in which God revealed His righteousness based on His faithfulness, we are now engaged in its explanation. The succeeding sentence of verse 22 has been, insofar as I know, unanimously translated into ‘For there is no distinction (*ū gar diastolē*) [among all people who believe]’. This is supposed to explain why the addressee of the revelation is ‘all those who believe’. This reading explains at most ‘all’ by appealing to a negative reason as being lack of distinction, due to the fact that all have sinned. It is unlikely that God does not see any distinction between the faith of, say, Mother Teresa and the one of mine or Hitler (cf. 5:14). I construe it that v.22 should be translated from the perspective of God’s self cognition such that ‘For there is no separation (*ū gar diastolē*) [between God’s righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ]’⁽²²⁾. This is because this sentence must describe God’s state, cognition and act based on the faithfulness rather than man’s state of mind, provided that [A] passage is focally constituted by God’s initiative act through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. ‘But now apart from a law [of works]’, God’s righteousness based on His

faithfulness is at issue. Thus this sentence is supposed to give a reason why God's righteousness is revealed to 'all those who believe' rather than all people who keep the law of works. Since there is no separation between God's righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, the addressee of God's righteousness is 'all those who believe'. God was and is faithful in the one of Jesus Christ by having kept His promise to His people.

If we appeal to more basic relations among the words as 'righteousness', 'faithfulness', 'to all those who believe', and 'reveal', it is required at the formal level of this analysis to grasp the meaning of such words. As the addressee of God's revelation, it is necessary to write 'all those who believe' due to a formal constraint at the level of language and epistemology which are the basic ingredients of any theological language so as to know God's righteousness. Insofar as the theological language can be understood at all, it must presuppose a current use of language and a cognitive structure. These are the most basic elements, so that any theological interpretation must be constrained by these analyses ultimately based on the principle of non-contradiction. It is evident for anyone to be impossible to believe that someone is 'faithful', as he is 'doubtful' about the opponent. Just as one cannot swim without presupposing water and thus one cannot grasp the meaning of 'swimming' without grasping the meaning of 'water', it is necessary for anyone who 'knows' God's righteousness to have 'faith' on his part. On this point, Paul does not consider how much faith one must have in order to be regarded by God as a man having faith.

Then the verses 23-26 which are, in fact, one long sentence with the explanatory particle '*gar* (for)' explains as the whole sentence why there is no *separation* between the relevant righteousness and the faithfulness. Paul reports God's self cognition of the inseparability. His righteousness

is now severed from His law of works but bound with the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. We do now understand why Paul employs three similar phrases to emphasize the indication of God's righteousness in the subordinate clause of one long sentence vv.23-26 as follows: 'resulting in the indication of His righteousness', 'towards the indication of His righteousness' and 'Himself to be righteous'. All these are connected with the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. From God's perspective, it is indeed a good opportunity for God to take the faithfulness of Jesus Christ so as to indicate His righteousness. Paul reports their non-separateness by mentioning 'through [Jesus'] faithfulness in his blood resulting in the indication of His righteousness' and 'He might Himself be righteous... in justifying anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faithfulness'.

Now God's righteousness is separated from the law because Jesus of Nazareth carried out his faithful obedience to the cross. God is well pleased with his faithful life as the one which corresponds to His righteousness based on His faithfulness. This is made possible for Him by revealing His righteousness apart from the law but through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. Therefore God could reveal it not to the people who keep the Mosaic law, but to all those who believe. God set forth Jesus Christ as a locus of His presence through the faithfulness in his blood resulting in the indication of His righteousness because of the passing over of sins committed beforehand in God's forbearance⁽²³⁾. God regards the faithful obedience of Jesus as a good opportunity to compensate the lack of His showing righteousness due to His forbearance in abstinence of applying the Mosaic law to the sins previously committed. God took this chance as making Him possible to redeem all sinners freely without any cost on man's part. All men are now to be justified freely by His grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus. In this sense, the Christ event is a good chance for man too. God has shown His righteousness by justify-

ing anyone at all whoever is based on the faithfulness of Jesus. This shows God's cognition that the righteousness based on the faithfulness is more basic for God Himself than the righteousness based on the law of works.

In this way the *A* language network and the *B* language network are mutually independent. In this semantic analysis, I shall offer a minimum and confirmable reading of 'the atonement' by just confining the matter in God's initiative act. Paul is indeed ascetic in reporting what God did, by sticking to the revelation of the faithfulness throughout. If my reading thus far is right, this has some theological implications too. Theologians have been debating the nature of the death of Jesus and offered interpretations such as the theory of the penal substitution (vicarious punishment) and the Devil-ransom theory and so on⁽²⁴⁾. It is not reported by Paul that God punished Jesus nor anyone on the cross of Jesus, but instead He has revealed His righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ to all those who believe. God compensated His lack of showing righteousness to them by setting forth Jesus Christ as a locus of His presence. It is true that while He put him as a substitute for sinners to redeem, Jesus spontaneously died for it. God emphasized that the righteousness based on the faithfulness made possible for God to redeem sinners without any cost on man's part.

One may be able to say from Jesus' perspective, he is determined to be a sacrificial offering for the sake of sinful men's atonement. In this substitution God did not regard Jesus as a sinner. When Paul says in 2 Corinthians 5:19-21 that 'Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf; that we might become the righteousness of God in him', God's cognition of 'him who knew no sin' is kept throughout in the act of redemption (cf. Mat. 26:39). Sinless Jesus died for the redemption as the spontaneous substitute for sinners. The expression 'Him..He made to be

sin' means merely the substitution as the change of place between the sinner and the sinless. In fact, the original meaning of 'reconciliation (*katallassē*)' is the exchange of, say money (5:10, 11:15, 2Cor. 5:18-19). In other words, Jesus was wrongly punished by the wrong application of Jewish and Roman laws. If we are allowed to employ the anthropomorphism, God made use of this wrong application for the human salvation. God did not punish Jesus on the cross vicariously for the sake of sinners under the Mosaic law. If this were the case, it would have resulted in that God has revealed the gospel *A* within the framework of the Mosaic law *B*. Anyone whose faith is based on Jesus' faithfulness in his blood is now justified by God in the sense of his/her sin being redeemed. The Christ event confirmed a space for God not to create a sinner according to *B* perspective. In comparison with biblical and theological studies thus far, we can tell this much as the necessary and minimum extraction of the relevant passage, insofar as we only stick to God's initiative act.

God's cognition of righteous man is dictated and delivered by Paul in such a general way that anyone who knows Greek grammar and the current language can understand what God conceived and revealed about these matters. This kind of argument should be taken as 'persuasion of wisdom' which is contrasted with 'demonstration of Spirit and of power' in his 'my argument and my proclamation' (1Cor. 2:4). In fact, I construe that while he delivers an argument of persuasion of wisdom, for instance, in Romans, 1:16-4:25 and chapter 9-11, Paul argues chapter 5-8 as a whole according to the demonstration of Spirit and of power, although nothing hinders that his every word may be spirited, insofar as we can detect the dimension of rational persuasive argument in it. The distinguishing mark between these two ways of argument consists in whether Paul directly mentions Spirit in his argument or not.

6.5 Rejection of any human condition for the justification

As a consequence of independent language of revelation, there is no room for setting any human initiative in it. In his attractive short commentary of Romans, W. Barclay limits the area of God's initiative act due to His respect for the free-will on man's side. He says: 'God gave man free-will, and God respects that free-will. In the last analysis not even God can interfere with that free-will...Before man there stands an open choice. It has to be so. Without choice there can be no goodness, and without choice there can be no love....If men deliberately choose to turn their backs on God, then, after God has sent His Son Jesus Christ into the world, not even He can do anything about it'⁽²⁵⁾. Barclay here delivers a theological language on the basis of and in the analogy of *C* language. In the subsequent passage, Barclay guesses God's state of mind by an analogy of a father whose son turned his back within the comprehensible language network of 'free-will'.

If our having faith as a mental state is the qualification for and the condition of being justified, it is contradicted by the statement that 'since all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, being now justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus' (3:24). I think that 'free grace' i.e. *A* cannot be accommodated with any human condition i.e. *C*. All people are, on the one hand, men whose justification cannot be dependent on their moral character at all and, on the other hand, men to whom the faithfulness of Jesus Christ is bestowed as their own faith being sufficient for as the receiver of God's righteousness, because God's righteousness is not separated from its mediating faithfulness. Anyone who believes in God's sight knows that God is righteous through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ and receives righteousness through it.

Before God, all people are men who receive righteousness freely by

his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. God justifies ‘the ungodly’ ‘freely by God’s grace’ (3:24, 4:5). God’s free grace rejects any involvement of the human condition, insofar as we stick to the meaning of the term. We should not call having faith on our part as ‘a qualification’ of receiving grace. This is merely a formal constraint of the linguistic and epistemological levels in order to understand God’s revelation of justification, insofar as God’s revelation can be understood by us at all and we stick to the perspective *A* in which any human condition is not considered. If God’s righteousness was not separated from the law of works, there is no room for faith coming in (Gal. 3:25). Only the doer of the law of works may know God’s righteousness and receives righteousness as due reward. Since this faith is a mediator of God’s righteousness, Paul could say ‘all’ people who believe know that God is righteous and receive it.

Given that God’s revelation is generally stated, God’s cognition and will are not so much clearly revealed to each particular individual as was revealed in Jesus Christ. We should say that God’s cognition of and will to human beings is revealed in the most evident way in Jesus of Nazareth. Paul who is cognitively limited in terms of his own salvation says, ‘I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected’ (1Cor. 9:27). He does not know sufficiently enough about his future, although he knows well himself to be righteous insofar as he takes himself to be in Jesus Christ which is revealed by God as faithful and righteous. Man’s faith is not sufficient for the perfect cognition of God, insofar as he is in flesh. ‘O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past tracing out!’ (11:33). That is why it is substantial to have faith on man’s part of what was revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul orders the people of Rome as follows: ‘The

faith which you have according to yourself (*kata seauton*), have you before God' (14:22).

6.6 Human-centric perspective

In passage [C] vv.27–31, Paul deduces some consequences of this revelation reported in [B] and [A]. Firstly, Paul gazes at the human mind and confirms in 3:27 that any boast on one's own part (such as regarding oneself as righteous and virtuous) is excluded. There is no room for man to boast about oneself due to the free grace given to all men through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. Boasting is not permitted not through the law 'of works' but 'through a law of faithfulness'. God's will being manifested in the Christ event is 'a law of faithfulness'. God's will based on His revelation conveys that the faithfulness is more basic than works with respect to the righteousness of both God and man.

Then Paul asserts a recognition of the content of revelation *A* from a human perspective by taking the subject 'we' in verse 28 which is later known to be the locus of 'justification by faith'. But there are three textual problems (i) (ii) (iii) in this verse: '*logizometha* [(i) *gar* or *ūn*] *dikaiūsthai* (ii) *pistei anthrōpon* (iii) *chōris ergōn nomū*'. My reading is this: '(i) Therefore, we recognize that man is justified (ii) by faith (iii) apart from a law of works'. Firstly, there are almost equally two strong readings in the tradition of manuscripts concerning (i) whether we should take either the explanatory particle '*gar* (because)' or the consequential particle '*ūn* (therefore)'. In the 27th edition of the Nestle-Aland, the '*gar*' reading was adopted in 12 manuscripts such as Alef, A, D*, F and the '*ūn*' reading was adopted in 5 such as B, C, D. Interestingly, however, in the 28th version, the '*gar*' reading is 12 and the '*ūn*' reading is 13. While Nestle-Aland has been adopting the '*gar*' reading in 28th edition too, it looks as if the '*ūn*' reading increases its plausibility in the recent ver-

sion⁽²⁶⁾. Secondly, there is another problem which is closely connected with (i) the reading of the particle: that is, how we should read (ii) '*pistei*' which is delivered by the dative of agent. Is this God's or Christ's faithful commitment toward man or man's faith toward God? Thirdly, concerning (iii) '*chōris ergōn nomū*', two ways of reading are possible either as 'apart from a law of works' or 'apart from works of a law'.

Since the semantic analysis managed to discern type *A* language from type *B* language in the previous passage, it may be able to contribute in solving these problems based on the analyses thus far. Everyone can agree that in [C] passage vv.27-31 Paul now moves his sight to his fellow man and the human mind and sets the new situation of human beings in place from a man centric *C* perspective. This can be confirmed by his reference to man-made division of groups of people and man's cognitive and character states such as 'boasting', 'we recognize', 'man', 'Jews', 'Gentiles', 'circumcised' and 'uncircumcised', 'we nullify' and 'we confirm'.

Concerning the particle (i), if we read the '*gar*', it explains why man's new due state of mind is established through God's will revealed in the Christ event. If we read the '*ūn*', it states a consequence of the revelation of God's will in Christ event. Everyone can agree that given the revelation of the Christ event, the faithfulness is more basic than works with respect to man's relation with God. If the '*gar*' reading is right, in order to explain man's new state, we have to put God's initiative reading again in this context such that God justifies man by God's faithfulness apart from His law of works. This is because mere human judgment of justification by faith cannot explain God's will. This reading obviously repeats what Paul reported in [A] passage. In this reading, man cannot explain man's new state of mind by his recognition of the significance of revelation from human perspective *C*. Even if our recognition of the

revelation manages to offer a reason for God's will of banning a boast, it will be in such minimum sense that man acknowledges or confirms his new state by accepting God's will. Thus the '*gar*' reading is very weak indeed.

We have to be aware, on the contrary, that the verse 28 is delivered by a passive mood in which God's initiative is involved in the minimum way. Since the main close of verse 28 consists of Paul's cognition that 'we recognize', the whole sentence is carried out by man's initiative, even if the subordinate clause admits God's initiative. This implies that the whole sentence is delivered in *C* dimension. In this dimension, God's initiative may be symbolized as *Er* (*a*- in *C*), where the small letter '*a*' signifies the fact before God *A* *within* the dimension *C*. If we take '*ūn*' reading, the argument flows smoothly with man's initiative reading that since God's will through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ is more basic than His will of works, we recognize, 'therefore', that man is justified by faith apart from a law of works.

This man's initiative reading is natural in this paragraph, because Paul is concerned with man's new state of mind. The 'justification by faith' is Paul's deduction from Christ's faithful event. His claim will be endorsed by the descriptions of justification by faith in Abraham and David cited from the Old Testament in Romans chapter 4.

If (i) is settled in reading 'therefore', we can rather easily settle (ii). We should not sneak in God's initiative in interpreting the dative of agent '*pistei*' too. Given that as we have made clear so far, the faithfulness is a bi-lateral relation between God and man, either of both beings can be taken as the agent of *pistis* (See note (11)). Since the faithfulness of God has been already made manifest in passage [A], it is natural in this sentence as a consequence of the previous discussion to take man as the agent of *pistis*. Insofar as the grammatical subject is concerned, the

subject of the indirect sentence: ‘man is justified *‘pistei’*’ is obviously ‘man’ in general. The whole sentence is governed by man’s initiative by stating ‘we recognize’ as well.

The subject of subordinate clause ‘man’ suggests that man, whoever he is, is justified by faith. This simple fact is confirmed by ‘we’. Paul did not repeat here the *A* language in that God justifies anyone who is based on Jesus’ faithfulness. He employed ‘*pistei*’ which is the dative of agent to the effect that man is justified by his having faith. As we have confirmed the reciprocity of *pistis*, this faith must be pleased by God as somehow being correspondent to God’s faithfulness, if it is to be justified. Granted the reciprocity of faithfulness and the passive state of being justified, Paul conveys his own cognition of a consequence of the Christ event. As a consequence of [A] passage together with the exclusion of boasting by the law of faithfulness, Paul concludes that ‘Therefore, we recognize that man is justified by faith’ of which God is pleased well.

Concerning (iii) ‘*chōris ergōn nomū*’, although it is possible to translate it either as ‘apart from a law of works’ or ‘apart from works of a law’, I take the first option for some reasons. Firstly, when Paul put the preposition ‘apart from’ in 3:21, it is followed by ‘law’. Secondly, in the preceding verse 27: ‘By what manner of law? Of the works (*tōn ergōn*)?’, the phrase ‘of the works’ is undoubtedly supplied by ‘law’ in the order of ‘law of the works’. It is natural to read the following verse in the same way as the previous one. Thus, those textual problems (i)(ii)(iii) are now solved. Paul meant that ‘Therefore, we recognize that man is justified by faith apart from a law of works’.

In order to confirm this reading, it is useful to consider the verse 29. The sentence begins with a disjunctive particle ‘Or (*ē*)’ such that ‘Or is God the God of Jews only?’ What is contrasted between the verses 28 and 29? Since the law of faithfulness is more basic than the law of works

as to God's will, Paul recognizes in v.28 that the so called justification by faith is endorsed. Then in v.29, Paul offers an alternative to the effect that if God's will of faithfulness is not basic, it follows that God is the God of Jews only. By introducing a disjunction, Paul raises this question to people of Rome so as to confirm that God is God of both Jews and Gentiles. If so, I think again that the '*ūn* (therefore)' reading is better in terms of the flow of argument. First, he deduces a consequence of the language of revelation *A* as a new situation of the human mind i.e. the exclusion of boasting. Then, Paul confirms that the law of faithfulness can endorse this new situation. From these sentences, Paul draws a claim by introducing with 'therefore' that Paul and his fellow Romans recognize that a man is justified by faith.

Thus we can say from the view point of semantic analysis that Paul, as a representative of humanity indicated by the subject 'we', understands a significance of God's revelation in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ as the justification by faith on our part from the perspective *C*.

Then Paul claims in verse 30 that 'there is one God' who justifies Jews, i.e. the circumcised on the basis of relevant Jew's faith (fulness), or perhaps their father Abraham's faith (fulness) and Gentiles, i.e. the uncircumcised through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. All human beings are justified by faith. The last question addressed to Romans is verse 31 such that 'Do we then nullify the law through faithfulness? May it never be! No, we confirm a law [of works]'. Paul confirms that the law of works will never be nullified, because it is God's will which constitutes *B* horizon.

7. A Solution for a Theological Aporia on the Justification

When we carry out a semantic analysis of the text, which results in

at least three mutually independent perspectives on the reality of human beings, we no longer find any alleged contradiction in Paul himself. However, commentators are puzzled by the following apparently contradictory (or at least conflicting) sentences between types *A* and *B*. While Paul says in one passage about group *B*: ‘God will recompense every man according to his works’ (2:6), in another passage, he says about group *A*: ‘Now if a man does have works to his credit, his wages are not reckoned as a matter of grace but as a debt; but to the man who has no work to his credit but believes in Him who justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness’ (4:4). Some commentators take the *B* claim as ‘a warning’ or ‘discipline’⁽²⁷⁾. These two passages are not contradictory, however, because passage 1:18–3:20 points to the language network of *B*, that is, to the Mosaic law of work. This should not be understood as ‘the work of the law’ as is usually understood. While ‘a law of works’ is written as ‘*eks ergōn nomū*’ (3:20, 28) and ‘*dia poiou nomū; tōn ergōn*’ (3: 27), ‘the work of the law’ is written as ‘*to ergon tū nomū*’ (2:15). He makes it specific in the latter meaning by putting the definite articles in each word. This is because man’s each work or deed is determined under a particular law specified each time.

As a matter of fact, God’s will as a law must be distinguished from man’s deed of law. Anyone who lives under the law must fulfill the law of works in every respect, because on the final day God will deliver a judgment on the relevant person according to his/her works. The person who lives under the law of works must satisfy all applicable laws or precepts. Paul said, ‘as many as have sinned under a law shall be judged by a law; for not the hearers of a law are righteous before God (*para theō*), but the doers of a law shall be justified’ (2:12–13, cf. Gal. 5:3). It will be revealed ‘in the day of wrath’, however, that such a man would be condemned by God through His cognition of sin according to a law of

works (*dia gar nomū epignōsis hamartias*) (2:5-6, 3:20). On the other hand, the wrath of God is revealed in each present time 'against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men' in such a way that God gives them up by letting them do as they wish (1:18, see note (9)). It does not matter whether or not they know or feel God's wrath in each corresponding present time as their mental states. The present revelation of God's wrath leaves a room for them to repent. Anyone who lives under the law is the addressee of His wrath (4:15, cf. Gal. 3:13).

Although there are two types of man before God, Paul conceded that there could possibly be men who being autonomous (group *C*) could live either in Jesus Christ or under the law of works. This kind of man, and the corresponding language network that describes him, is the result of Paul's concession to the weakness of flesh (6:19). Paul regards this man as a possible being who is a 'slave of righteousness' or a 'slave of sin'. This possible being is the man who lives before mankind, not before God. In front of God, any man must be either righteous or sinful, although God may patiently wait for the sinner to the repent.

When a person says that 'For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwells no good thing' (7:18), Paul specifies 'me' by identifying oneself as its fleshy part which is contrasted with its 'comprehension' part which grasps 'God's will' 'in accordance with Spirit' (7:25, 8:4, cf. 12:1-2). Man is constituted by these two apparently conflicting parts. Paul says that 'You are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwells in you. But if any man has not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his. And if Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwells in you, He that raised up Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken also your mortal bodies through His Spirit that dwells in you' (8:9-11). If one is spirited, he is not any more 'in the flesh', that

is, in the *C* dimension. Because, somehow through the mediation of Spirit, he is in (AviaC) at the *ergon* level and in (A+C) at the *logos* level, which is not anymore merely in *C* only.

When Paul observed the different states of human beings, and addressed the people of Rome in the imperative mood, this dimension of his language is different from the language of the revelation ‘before God’ for groups *A* or *B*. When Paul spoke to the Romans, he ordered, ‘Even so reckon you also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus’ (6:11), and he presupposed that the people of Rome might or might not obey the order. For if Paul did not presuppose the possible disobedience of the Romans, he would not have delivered his statement in an imperative mood. The persons whom Paul addressed in the imperative mood were capable of being either righteous or sinful.

The conditional clause ‘if Christ dwells in you’ (8:10) presupposes a similar situation. In this clause, Paul considers the possibility of Christ’s not dwelling in believers. The possibility is that the person addressed by an imperative is one who lives, not in front of God, but in front of man. It is not as clearly revealed to each person as it is in Jesus Christ, who is righteous and who is not. That is why having faith on one’s part is always substantial for every man. Thus, Paul orders, ‘The faith [*C*] which you have according to yourself (*kata seauton*), have you [*A*] before God’ (14:22). This order is addressed to the person in group *C* so as not to sever his faith which is held according to his own free responsibility from the faithfulness revealed in Jesus Christ as constituting the faith of people in group *A*.

Jesus of Nazareth who led his life in the flesh on the basis of faith alone is regarded by God as the reality of a righteous man in front of God (group *A*). By his faith, Jesus overcame the weakness of the flesh. Jesus’ faithfulness, while he was in the flesh, was thought well of by God,

as something which corresponds to 'God's faithfulness' (3:3). Thus God's recognition of the righteous man is revealed to all people who believe in Him through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.

Each of these realities (*A*, *B* and *C*) has its own consistent or coherent language network. Besides these language networks (or rather, as the basis for these articulations) Paul captured the reality of Jesus Christ who is both the son of God and a man. In this, Paul offered a language network that is not concessive but authentic. This language is based on the connection between the groups *A* and *C* through the Spirit. The Spirit is the glue (*via*) which makes the realities *A* and *C* as the reality *D*, that is $ErD = Er(A \text{ via } C)$. I shall call this reality the 'theological entity' (or *D*). In this analysis, *D* which integrates *A* and *C* through the Spirit and the corresponding language network (that is, the 'theological language', or the 'language of Jesus Christ' (Log *D*)) contains reference to the Spirit.

If Paul had not conceded that the flesh is weak, he would have only used the language of *D*, in other words, the one of Jesus Christ as a theological entity. Talking about Jesus Christ would be the same linguistic act as talking about each of us. Paul would have claimed that everything is clear in front of God, because God created all creatures in front of Him. Man is a relatively autonomous creature of God, insofar as he/she is free and responsible (cf. Ps. 8:5).

Luther is committed to the theological language of *D*, for he did not sever the concept 'before God' *A* from the concept 'before man' *C* in his consideration of Jesus Christ, the being who is located in both dimensions in full. Calvin also claimed that 'this [severing] would be, as it were, to rend Christ asunder'⁽²⁸⁾. This adherence to the language of *D* is adhering to the complexity of *erga* in any man of faith. This is the gist of Protestantism. We can understand the meaning of this sentence at the

formal level at least by articulating three realities without appealing to the Spirit. Although the language of group *A* can be understood without appealing to the Spirit, the language channel which was opened up by Jesus of Nazareth was *D*-type language. For example, Jesus of age 12 utters a *D* language in his reply to Joseph and Mary who sought him for three days in that he says ‘How is it that you sought me? Haven’t you known that I must be in my *father’s* house’ (Luk. 2:49). On the other hand, Jesus concedes to the weakness of flesh, when he preaches the gospel by parables (cf. Luk. 8:9). Insofar as we are obedient to Christ (in front of God), we may be able to claim that our own language belongs to the *D* category.

8. The Problem of the Past Tense concerning Ergon

In Romans, there are some passages which cannot be understood without presupposing the work of the Holy Spirit. I construe that Romans chapters 5-8 are basically constituted by Ergon D and Ergon E languages (Concerning Ergon E, I discuss in section 10). In these chapters, in my view, Paul develops the demonstration of Spirit and power by uttering his words inside *ergon* of the Spirit here and now. It is characterized that insofar as the Spirit is at-work (*energein*), Paul’s particular such utterances are true. The characteristic of Ergon D language is not to sever between the language before God and the one before man.

There are distinctive characteristics in terms of the style of writing in these chapters 5-8: Firstly, he mainly employs the first person plural ‘we’ as the basic agent in contrast with the third person subject being dominant in previous chapters 1-4. Secondly, he employs the past tense several times in expressing the death of ‘our’ old man and the justification of ‘our’ new man both of which are related with the Christ event in past

(5:1, 9, 11, 6:2-10, 18, 7:4-6, 8:2, 30). Thirdly, Paul refers to the works of the Holy Spirit for the first time in the *ergon* context of here and now apart from the context of his general introduction of the gospel (5:5, cf. 1:4). While these three elements are internally connected, I shall investigate these chapters by focusing mainly on the second issue and offer some grounds for the reading of these chapters as Ergon D language. When Paul connects his cognition of human beings with the two reports of God's revelation on the gospel and the law developed in chapters 1-8, he employed the past tense so as to indicate the Christ event.

Romans 6:6-11 offers a good example which shows why he employed the past tense in a particular context. His employment of the past tense with respect to the Christ event in this passage offers a clue to understand all other passages involving the past tense consistently. Paul says:

Knowing this (*ginōskontes*), that our old man was crucified with him (*sunestaurhōthē* [aor.2, pass]), that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that has died is justified from sin. But if we died (*apethanomen* [aor.2]) with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him (*suzēsomen* [fut.]); knowing (*eidotes*) that Christ being raised from the dead dies no more; death no more had dominion over him. For the death that he died, he died unto sin once: but the life that he lives, he lives unto God. Even so reckon you also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus (Rom. 6:6-11).

This passage clearly indicates a layer of reality. Paul's utterance gives rise in gazing at an actual place where God recognizes that all people who believe died as '[our] old man' together with Christ in his actual death on the cross. According to Paul's report by employing the past tense, the death of Christ involved the death of an old man at that time in the event of Golgotha. The whole sentence is presented as a

content of knowledge within the scope of Paul's knowledge claim indicated by '*ginōskontes*'. This knowledge claim is grounded by God's revelation of His cognition of human beings through the Christ event based on man's comprehensibility of God's cognition through His revelation. What is known in Paul is that the death of an old man brought the liberation from his/her sin. This is because Paul regards the death of Jesus which was prophesized as the one of atonement in the Old Testament as the accomplishment of God's promise (e.g. Is. 53).

On the other hand, his employment of future tense in a belief sentence 'we believe that we shall also live with him (*suzēsomen*)' shows this to be an objective of faith so that it cannot be uttered as a piece of knowledge. This remains to be an article of faith, because it is stated from the reality of the last judgment at the final day. But, his knowledge (*eidotes*) of Christ's resurrection offers a ground for this belief here too.

It is only possible to understand this passage delivered in the past tense by appealing to the bridge by the Holy Spirit's intercession (*via*) between the Christ event *A* and *the old man* of people represented by Paul himself whose body still lives in horizon *C*. I take it that this is in Paul's awareness an Ergon D language. If we concede to the weakness of flesh, it is described as ErC (a-in C), although nothing prevents it from being simultaneously interceded by Spirit.

In chapter 5-8, Paul left the persuasion of wisdom and engaged in the demonstration of Spirit and power. His introduction of Ergon D language consists of reflecting on both the Christ event as 'our' own event and at the same time reflecting on 'our' own positive passions such as peace and joy. In the beginning of chapter 5, Paul introduces and develops an *ergon* language as follows:

Having had been justified (*dikaiōthentes* [aor.2. pass. *dikaioō*]) on the basis of [Jesus'] faithfulness, we hold peace with God through our

Lord Jesus Christ; through whom we have also obtained our access (*tēn prosagōgēn eschēkamen* [pf. *echo*]) by faith (*tēi pistei*) into this grace wherein we have stood (*hestēkamen* [pf. *histēmi*]) and have rejoiced (*kauchōmetha* [pf. *kauchaomai*]) in hope of the glory of God. And not only this, but we have rejoiced in our tribulations: knowing that tribulation works patience; and patience, probation; and probation, hope: and hope puts not to shame; because the love of God has been poured in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given to us (Rom. 5:1-5).

This passage is important for my project of semantic analysis to the effect that Paul elucidates, in my view, two layers of reality *A* and *C* in his explicit awareness of methodological perspectives, which are respectively the grace bestowed in the Christ event and (f2) the faith which man holds so as to make an access to that grace. But these two realities are at the same time combined as an *ergon* by employing the perfect tense which indicates ErD. Grace has been poured in our hearts so that man has already stood on the grace and rejoiced the grace in hope of the glory of God. Paul, by gazing at and spinning words on both the Christ event and man's states of mind such as 'peace' and 'joy', combines both events by appealing to the work of Spirit. In other words, Paul declares the newness of human beings as a consequence of his previous discussions which is traditionally inherited under the name of 'justification by faith'. In a word, Paul has recognized the 'love of God' toward him and his fellow human beings through the mediation of the Holy Spirit. Here we find three agents and their complex works: 'God', the Mediator who is characterized in two ways as 'through our Lord Jesus Christ' and 'through the Holy Spirit' and 'we'.

In this passage, '*pistis*' appears twice (5:1, 2). I construe that Paul refers to (f1) the faithfulness of Jesus in v.1 and (f2) the faith which we

hold according to ourselves in v.2. There are several reasons why we should take (f1) in v.1: ‘Having had been justified on the basis of [Jesus’] faithfulness, we hold peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ’ (29).

Firstly, the phrase ‘on the basis of faithfulness (*ek pisteōs*)’ (5:1) reminds us of ‘on the basis of Jesus’ faithfulness (*ek pisteōs Iesū*)’ (3:26) in the [A] passage, where God justifies the people whose faith is based on Jesus’ faithfulness. When Paul intends to mention our human faith, as I have argued, he used ‘*pistei*’ which is delivered by the dative of agent as in [C] passage 3:28 and in our passage ‘*tēi pistei*’ (5:2). Since he offers a ground for our positive peaceful communion with God in v.1, our own state of having faith cannot endorse our positive relation with God except only in a subjective sense.

Secondly, the same aorist verb ‘*dikaiōthentes*’ is employed in 5:9 in which Paul referred to the Christ event in blood: ‘Much more then, having had been justified by his blood (*dikaiōthentes nun en tōi haimati autū*), shall we be saved from the wrath of God through him’. Christ’s suffering on the cross was taken by God to justify people whose faith God is pleased well.

Thirdly, when Paul says in the past tense that ‘Having had been justified based on faithfulness’, it is reasonable to suppose that he utters in being at-work of the Holy Spirit here and now, given that the Holy Spirit connects between God’s past action of justification on the cross and people’s present peaceful communion with Him, whose area of reference is designated by ‘we’.

Fourthly, the differentiation of two senses of ‘*pistis*’ ((f1) and (f2)) which matches well with my analysis of the layers of realities and their corresponding language networks contributes to understanding the passage well. The verse 1 will be analyzed and symbolized as ErD=ErCvia ErA (IX), where ‘ErC’ stands for the occurrence of man’s state of mind

such as peace or rejoice and 'via' stands for the mediation of the Holy Spirit and 'ErA (IX)' stands for God's revelatory acts of justifying through Jesus Christ (IX). In fact, God's revelatory act called 'A' is based on Jesus Christ so that 'A' simply means God's revelation through Jesus Christ. In this sense, this symbolization appears to be superfluous, but here expressed for the clarification. This can be again conceded to reduce it into Ergon C such as ErC (a-in C), although this does not reject to be mediated by the Holy Spirit. A characteristic of *ergon* language is describing one's mental states such as peace and joy on the basis of the Christ event. Both are supposed not to be severed, symbolized as $ErD = Er(AviaC)$ and its general statement to be $Log D = Log(A + C)$.

The reason why Paul can talk about the Christ event around CE 30 as his and his fellows' own event in about CE57 is that he can suppose the assimilation of these two things by the intercession of the Holy Spirit, in spite of the limit of the weakness of the flesh. Paul utters in inspiration such that 'we' are in joy and peace because of that past event. He says in the present and perfect tenses that 'we hold peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ; through whom we have also obtained our access by faith (*tēi pistei*) into this grace wherein we have stood and have rejoiced in hope of the glory of God'. 'By faith' 'we' can make access and in fact have obtained the access from our flesh part *C* to the grace *A* established by the Christ event. On this (f2) 'faith', Paul orders that 'The faith [C] which you have according to yourself, have you before God [A]' (14:22).

The claim that one man's event is also the event of another man who was not born yet at that time suggests that the language space before God and the one before man behave differently. Insofar as they are expressed by the same language Greek, however, some understanding must be possible. One such attempt is to understand it by supposing that the Holy Spirit gets over such an obstacle of the temporal interval between

two events. This implies that a superior theory of time and space than the one of a creature is at work. Although it is superior, it is described within the time sequence in this created world. The act of the Holy Spirit implies that the superior theory of time and space is the one of God and keeps always the present time. In other words, the intercession of the Holy Spirit is always at work here and now such that our present event is assimilated with the past Christ event.

We can present this *ergon* passage as a general account Logos A at the *logos* dimension such that God sets forth Jesus Christ as a redemption for the sin of all people around CE 30 and justifies anyone who is based on Jesus' faithfulness. On the other hand, we can also reduce it into a Logos C and symbolize it as Log C (Er (a- in C)) to the effect that anyone who holds such passions as peace and joy in his/her having faith is entitled to have made access to the grace. This is an articulation of the following Er D or by concession Er (a-in C) languages: 'we have also obtained our access by faith into this grace wherein we have *stood* and have *rejoiced* in *hope* of the glory of God'. Thus, this claim can be symbolized as Log D=Log C (Er (a- in C)) + Log Via+Log A (Er A (IX)). Chapter 5:1-5 is formed by the composition of these elements. One may reply that he can understand this but does not agree with it.

On the other hand, it is not the case that Paul merely appeals to this kind of interpretation. Paul offers a proof or an endorsement in the *ergon* language itself in such a way that one can understand the utterances in Spirit's being at work at the commensurate level. Ergon D language allows Ergon C language to make an access to itself so that one can understand Paul's writing in general and man-centric language. Or rather, since Ergon D language itself is stated in the Greek language under the same grammatical structure, it must be the case that the *ergon* of the Holy Spirit can be somehow understood.

Paul construes it in his love to the weak people that the *ergon* (at-work-ness) of the Holy Spirit can be made accessible and can be grasped to some extent in Ergon C without referring to the Holy Spirit. Paul's authentic claim is that the Christ event (circa CE 30, Jerusalem) can be recognized as our (circa CE57, Chenchreai) own event through the work of the Holy Spirit. In this sense, the past tense is an *ergon* language here and now. Concerning the reason why Paul could say with confidence as 'our' event that 'Having had been justified', a commensurable access can be made. By making access by Ergon C, this sentence is not only possible to be understood, but also increases the persuasiveness of the truth of this utterance at the commensurate dimension.

While he presents his cognition of people's actuality by stating in the past tense that 'we..having had been justified on the basis of [Jesus'] faithfulness', some occurrences of *pathos* such as 'peace', 'rejoice', 'hope' and 'not being ashamed' are offered as an evidence of the reason why he can talk and indicate the fact before God as his own fact. Or Paul seems to understand that these passions are the sign of the Holy Spirit's being poured into the heart. It seems to Paul that having received the Holy Spirit, soul is in good state in that these positive passions come about. Present *pathos* such as peace and joy which come about in one's soul endorses the truthfulness of this thought. By enumerating these positive passions, Paul expresses from man's perspective designated by 'we' the soul's state in which there is no split between the fact before God and the fact of one's own self cognition. In fact, its reason as the infusion of the Holy Spirit is stated in 5:5: 'because the love of God has been poured in our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given to us'.

9. Aristotelian Endorsement of the Relation between States of Mind and its Passions

This Pauline utterance is commensurate with Aristotle's thought on the relation between the soul's virtues and passions such as joy, anger and envy which are in general accompanied by pleasure and pain. Aristotle thinks that passions themselves which cannot be chosen but come about become 'the signs (*sēmeion*)' of the states or habits (*hexeis*) of the soul (*Nic. Eth.* II3). Aristotle describes the relation between a state of mind and its passion as follows; 'by states of character the things in virtue of which we stand well or badly with reference to the passions, e.g. with reference to anger we stand badly if we feel it violently or too weakly, and well if we feel it moderately' (II5.1105b25-27). It is not that a person who is just does not ever get angry. A just person gets angry at the appropriate occasion with the appropriate amount of passion of being angry and also he/she chooses the right action to be taken without any hesitation. Just action is taken by him/her for itself, i.e. to be just itself. A virtuous person chooses virtuous actions such as courage, temperance and justice for their own sakes with the right amount of passions with respect to fear, pleasure and anger. That is why, *pathos* is said to be 'the sign' of character power-ability or habit of the relevant person. In one passage, Aristotle explains how morally virtuous persons are nurtured. They must be habituated with performing continuously good actions on their own behalf, just as a virtuous person does. In this passage, Aristotle describes this in contrast with Socratic intellectualism as follows;

If the acts that are in accordance with the excellences have themselves a certain character it does not follow that they are done justly or temperately. The agent also must be in a certain condition when

he does them; in the first place he must have knowledge, secondly he must choose the acts, and choose them for their own sakes, and thirdly his action must proceed from a firm and unchangeable character. ...It is well said, then, that it is by doing just acts that the just man is produced, and by doing temperate acts the temperate man; without doing these no one would have even a prospect of becoming good.

But most people do not do these, but take refuge in theory and think they are being philosophers and will become good in this way, behaving somewhat like patients who listen attentively to their doctors, but do none of the things they are ordered to do. As the latter will not be made well in body by such a course of treatment, the former will not be made well in soul by such a course of philosophy (*Nic. Eth.* II4.1105a28-b18, cf. X.9 tr. by D. Ross).

I think that Paul agrees with Aristotle at least partially on how man becomes virtuous, although he is interested in this epistle how man is justified by God. He exhorts the people of Rome to be diligent to do good things for others (Rom. 12). It is evident thus that Aristotelian analyses of soul can be applied to Paul's conception of the relation between soul's state as habit and soul's passions. We can say that Pauline *Ergon* D language itself also follows the grammar of *ergon* language in general. In other words, it is not the case that Pauline *ergon* language is so peculiar that it refuses any access to understanding it without referring to the Holy Spirit. It is generally perceived in any flesh that a certain *pathos* comes about as the result of one event having taken place.

Paul proceeds one step further than Aristotle so that whether one receives the Holy Spirit or not is judged not only by an occurrence of positive passions but also by the soul's virtuous states and right actions

which surpass soul's *pathos* as follows: 'the kingdom of God is..righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit' (14:17), 'the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit' (15:13), and 'the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance' (Gal. 5:22). Jesus also thinks about a woman that her action indicates her sins' being forgiven, when he says that 'Her sins which are many are forgiven; for she loved much' (Luk. 7:47). In other passages too, Paul argues that the soul's *pathos* and acts as its expressions discriminate whether the relevant soul's state is 'spiritual (*pneumatikos*)' or 'carnal (*sarkikos*)'. He raises 'jealousy and strife' as the evidence of being carnal (1Cor. 3:1-3). In this way, Paul takes the position of consequentialism to the effect that one can discriminate whether the relevant soul receives the Holy Spirit or not by examining one's own soul. Jesus also takes the consequentialism by saying that 'each tree is known by its own fruit' (Luk. 6:44). Thus this kind of consequentialism offers a criterion of examining whether Divine folly and weakness are wiser and stronger than man confined in C dimension.

The consequentialism can be commensurably confirmed at the Ergon C level in human criteria and human judgments. Thus we can say that whether we are regarded by God in Christ's past event to be righteous can be either known or convinced in such a fact as our *pathos* and its fruits. This fact shows that Ergon D and Ergon C are connected or some part of Ergon D is constituted by Ergon C such that Paul understands that the infusion of the Holy Spirit is nothing but one stimulus from the external world. In our ordinary experience, it is reasonably supposed that one event or one word sustains the peace of someone for a long period and the existence of such a person can be to certain extent confirmed.

The attempt of distinguishing the time and space of creature from the

one of its creator owes itself to the weakness of flesh⁽³⁰⁾. The cognitive terms which Paul often mentions such as 'to know' and 'being convinced' are employed under the same grammar as these words are applied to the objects with which science ordinarily deals. Paul claims that 'we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to His purpose' (8:28). A person, knowing that all his past events were indispensable for him who is bound to the eternal life, can be said of having received the Holy Spirit. When a person acknowledges his whole life to be good, he can make a knowledge claim about his whole life. The infusion of Holy Spirit is understood by him as an *ergon* which is in principle not different from any other *ergon*.

Paul dictates his epistle inside of being convinced of receiving the Holy Spirit. Therefore in this passage 8:28 too, the symbol ErD t1p1 indicates that Paul's conviction is uttered in a such particular time and place as 't1p1' under the Holy Spirit's being at-work. But it can be thought that this *ergon* may remain to be Paul's own conviction so that we can also write ErCt1p1 (a- in C) by conceding to the weakness of flesh. Because the intercession of the Holy Spirit may be at work to the best - whatever it is—Ergon C. By the same reason, we can write this *ergon* in a general level as both Log D and Log C (ErCt1p1 (a-in C)) as a possible equivalent.

In other passages as well, Paul argues by employing the past tense in similar contexts: 'we also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we received (*elabomen* [aor.2]) the reconciliation' (5:11), 'we were discharged (*katērgēthēmen* [aor.1]) from the law, having had died (*apothanontes* [aor.2]) to that wherein we were held (*kateichometha* [impf]); so that we serve in newness of the Spirit' (7:6) and 'by hope we were saved (*esōthēmen* [aor.1])' (8:24). In these passages, Paul states that the Christ event before God which is expressed by the past tenses is the

event of the people who are referred by ‘we’ including Paul himself⁽³¹⁾. This can be explained by the same way as the one about Romans 6:6-11 and 5:1-5 above examined.

10. The Language of Agony of Sin

Now we look at Ergon E in Romans 7. It has the same characteristic as Ergon D in terms of involving the intercession of the Holy Spirit, although it unites God’s law of works *B* and man *C* in this case. Ergon E can be symbolized as $ErE = Er(B \text{ via } C)$ and it can be taken at the *logos* level as $\text{Log } E = \text{Log}(B + C)$. In this chapter which is developed by both *Er E* and *Log E* in a peculiar way, Paul presents a fictional first person ‘I’ as the agent of reply to God’s one precept of the ten commandments addressed by ‘You’: ‘*You* shall not covet’ (7:7). Paul develops a new function of the law of works, after having proved the function of gospel which supersedes the law of works in chapter 3:21-6:23. Anyone who is regarded by God ‘to be under the law’ is placed by Paul to be a man who is supposed to be filled with remorse and shame for his/her own sin. ‘I’ is supposed to cry as follows; ‘For that which I do I know not: for not what I would, that do I practice; but what I hate, that I do. But if what I would not, that I do, I consent unto the law that it is good...O wretched, I, man (*Talaipōros egō anthrōpos*)! Who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then I myself with the comprehension serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin’ (7:15-25).

In this cry of agony, I construe that ‘I’ is identified with ‘man’. The usual translation: ‘O wretched man I am’ fails to grasp the generality of ‘I’ which indicates anyone who is under the law. This agony can be said to be delivered in the safest way as a language of Ergon C (b-in C), that

is a man-centric cry. But Paul also let 'I' say that 'I know that the law is spiritual' (7:14, I read not *oidamen* (we know) but *oida + men*). In my analysis, 'I' makes a knowledge claim by grasping the law as an Ergon $E=Er(BviaC)$. In this sense, the traditional title of 'the conflict of Spirit and flesh' is appropriate. Thus, if we make an access to this chapter from God's perspective, a function of the law via the Holy Spirit is to make manifest the sin of 'man' who is under the law, as it is said that 'in order that sin might be manifest to be sin (*hina phanē hamartia*)' (7:13). A man under the law is demanded by God to perform a conflict like this.

Paul argues a function of Spirit in this case such as that anyone who is under the law before God must cry as 'I' being in agony of sin. He characterizes this situation that 'through the commandment sin might become exceedingly sinful' (7:13). The law which is taken not as 'a letter' but as being spiritual forces the man under the law being split in his soul between the law of sin and the law of comprehension (7:23 cf. 2 Cor. 3:6). While we can talk about this chapter both at the *ergon* level and the *logos* level, my explanation above is stated at the general and *logos* level as Log E which implies that while nothing prevents from taking 'I' to be referring to, for example, Paul himself, it generally signifies anyone under the law interceded by the Holy Spirit.

In this way, Ergon D and Ergon E are the languages of *ergon* by referring to the mediation of the Holy Spirit. While these *erga* can be made accessible by both God and man, it is certain that Paul speaks about the Spirit so as to be analyzed in general way. What makes this possible is that the language of revelation is reported by Paul in such a way that one can develop mutually independent language networks.

11. A Comparison with Justification by Faith in Galatians

Now, I shall confirm that what I have argued on the justification by faith in Romans is compatible with other relevant passages. In the parallel passage in Galatians, it is a peculiar characteristic of this epistle that Paul personifies both ‘law’ and ‘faithfulness (*pistis*)’. He says: ‘Before the faithfulness was to come, we were guarded being held in custody under a law with a view to the faithfulness about to be revealed, so that the law was a kind of tutor in charge of us till Christ, in order that (*hina*) we may be justified on the basis of faithfulness’ (Gal. 3:22-23). While he characterizes the Mosaic law as a tutor, Paul identifies (f1) the faithfulness as Christ being something to come and to be revealed. H. W. Meyer regards the personification of the law as God’s act as the self-revelation. He wrote that ‘What sort of position is assigned under these circumstances to *the law*, is then stated in ver.23 — [*sunekleisen hē graphē k.t.l* (Scripture confined all under sin)]. *Scripture* is personified, as in verse 8. That which *God* has done, because it is divinely revealed and attested in Scripture (see Rom. 3:9-19) and thereby appears an infallible *certainty*, is represented as the *act* of *Scripture*, which the latter, as in its utterances the professed *self-revelation of God*, has accomplished’⁽³²⁾.

This usage of ‘*pistis*’ is different from (f2) the faith which we hold or have according to ourselves (Rom. 14:22). The ‘*pistis*’ also expresses something having to do with God’s self-revelation, although Meyer himself takes ‘*pistis*’ in this passage as man’s mental state of having a faith. We can say at least that the basic use of (f1) ‘*pistis*’ is grounded by the Christ event in the sense that God’s faithfulness and the faithfulness of Jesus of Nazareth are found in it. While the law is here contrasted with the faithfulness, it is placed by the manner of teleology as something

providing a passage for the faithfulness. It is noteworthy that the '*pistis*' is characterized to be something 'to come (*elthein tēn pistin*)' and 'to be revealed (*tēn mellūsan pistin apokaluphthēnai*)'. The historical consequence of '*pistis*' being revealed after the law does not differ from the placement of both the law and the faithfulness in terms of historical order and functions in *Romans* in which 'the present opportunity' (3:25) offers a dividing point.

In Galatians, however, Paul writes basically the justification by faith from the human perspective *C* not merely as a report of revelation by *A* language. The human perspective can be confirmed in his teleological and sequential manners of describing the relation between the revelation of the Christ event and the human state of mind as its consequence. He employs the '*hina* (in order that)' clause: '*in order that* the promise based on faithfulness of Jesus Christ may be given to the believers' (Gal. 3:22) and '*in order that* we may be justified on the basis of faithfulness' (Gal. 3:24, cf. 2:16, 19). These *hina* passages convey God's providence of the historical precedence of the law with respect to the faithfulness. Paul says; 'Since we know (*eidotes*) that man is not justified on the basis of a law of works (*anthrōpos ex ergōn nomū*), but through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, we too have believed in Jesus Christ (*hēmeis eis Christon Iesūn episteusamen*), in order that we may be justified on the basis of faithfulness of Christ and not on the basis of a law of works (*hina dikaiōthōmen ek pisteōs Christū kai ūk ex ergōn nomū*). Every flesh will not be justified on the basis of a law of works (*ex ergōn nomū*)' (Gal. 2: 16).

What Paul's knowledge claim (*eidotes*) here consists in is the knowledge of actuality before God which is revealed as both *A* righteousness in the gospel and *B* sinfulness in the law. Based on this knowledge claim, Paul conveys his conviction of being justified by faith by employing the

subject of ‘we’ which signifies both the Galatians and Paul. Paul claims that based on our knowledge of these revelations, ‘our’ faith is carried out in the teleological framework of justification. In this epistle, the first pronoun plural ‘we’ is taken to be a subject and thus the justification is discussed from this human perspective in his awareness of Er C (a- in C), that is, having his own faith in his own responsibility.

Paul advances one step further and takes ‘I’ the first pronoun singular as the subject. This is because Paul delivers an *ergon* language as his confession of non-separateness in his awareness of the complexity of *erga* (works) in himself. By *ergon* language here, I mean that what Paul utters by supposing that God’s act and man’s act are mediated by the act i.e intercession of the Holy Spirit. Paul delivers an *ergon* language such that ‘For through the law [of faithfulness: ‘the law of Christ’ (6:2)] I died to a law [of works] to live for God. I have been crucified with Christ: the life I now live is not my life, but the life which Christ lives in me’ (Gal. 2:19). In the parallel passage in *Romans*, Paul states the exchange of two laws in such a way that ‘the life giving law of the Spirit in Jesus Christ has set you free from the law of sin and death’ (8:2). This Galatian passage makes ‘I’ speak with an inspired soul in that since Christ’s faithfulness has come, Christ is at-work in me in such a way of not separating me from him. Therefore we should construe Paul’s following claim as an *ergon* language in which Paul confesses that he is living in assimilation of ‘faithfulness of the son of God’ with his own faith. He says that ‘my present bodily life is lived in the faithfulness of the son of God, who loved me and gave himself up for me’ (Gal. 2:20).

These arguments are basically carried out on the same dimension with the discussion of ‘our’ justification by faith in the relevant passages of *Romans* (3:27–31). I construed *Romans* 3:27–31 as ErC (a- in C) and LogC (a- in C). In *Romans* 3:27–31 in which he develops *C* language, Paul

gave an agreement to the justification by faith by saying that 'We recognize~(*logizometha*)'. But we can say that Paul is more audacious in Galatians by taking 'I' as the subject and stepping into the *ergon* of the Holy Spirit further more than in Romans. Both passages convey the description of justification at the level of ErC (a- in C), if we concede the weakness of flesh. But Paul is entitled to claim that he is himself spirited so that he delivers *D* language, because nothing hinders from the Holy Spirit's interceding in it, i.e. $ErD = Er(AviaC)$. Paul's execution of *ergon* language in Galatians is different in terms of the context from the presentation of justification by faith within the systematic development of his theology in Romans. In Galatians, Paul carries out the confirmation of what he taught to the church which he himself has built. Thus he is more direct in word and deed.

12. Pauline Compatibility between God's Predestination and Human Freedom

Finally, I will offer a linguistic analysis of a relation between determinism and human freedom, the one theologically called 'the doctrine of predestination'. My analysis of articulating Pauline layers of language may shed a light for a new framework within which this problem should be solved. My suggestion of Paul's argument for the compatibility between God's election and man's freedom has two stages, one of which can be called (CC) 'the concessive compatibility based on God's love to the weak flesh and human ignorance' and the other (CS) 'the compatibility of the unique (necessary) way of justification and the spontaneity'.

Paul argued, as we have confirmed, that God's righteousness and love have been manifested through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ without involving any condition on the human part. Human beings are all in

principle freely justified by grace alone. 'For all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, and are now being justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus' (3:23). It is a free gift from God. What is revealed through His faithfulness constitutes the language network A. In order to know God's revelatory act in this perspective, it is epistemologically required to have a corresponding faith on human's part. The addressee of the revelation is described as 'to all those who believe' (3:22). This is merely an epistemological constraint imposed on any language user. One's faithfulness cannot be known, if the counterpart is in doubt without having faith toward him/her. In the revelatory horizon, such human state of mind has not been considered at all as how much faithful one has to be in order to be pleased well by God. Paul articulates the dimension in which God's revelatory act is solo performance without involving any human mental state except of Jesus of Nazareth.

In parallel with God's solo performance, Paul concedes to the flesh by taking a man to be autonomous agent. In this concession, he delivers the human-centric manner of speaking by saying that 'I speak after the manner of man due to the weakness of your flesh' (6:19). In this horizon C, a man is responsible of his/her action either of accepting the gospel or rejecting it. This freedom can be described as Log C in its general account. When Paul orders people of Rome that 'reckon you also yourselves to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus' (6:11), he presupposes that they may not obey this order by choosing their action otherwise. This is the ordinary and most commensurable understanding of the imperative. He admits the possibility of anyone accepting either of the contrary states, when he equally ascribes the word 'slave' into both 'the slave of sin' and 'the slave of righteousness' (6:17-18). When Paul says that 'when you were slave of sin, you were free (*eleutheroi*) in regard of righteousness' (6:20), the word 'free' is ascribed to either of these

contrary states as the antonym of 'slave'. In this human centric context, the word 'free' is neutrally employed in either of contrary choices (7:3). In this way, the human freedom in the sense of *libertas indifferentiae* (the freedom of indifference or doing otherwise) is secured.

If God's will and cognition were clear to everyone who is not subjected to the weakness of his/her flesh, he/she directly would know God's judgment and election on him/her. There is no room for human freedom before God with respect to either by being righteous in *A* or being sinful in *B*. The fate were already laid upon any man. This implies that the compatibility between the determinism in God's election and the human freedom gives rise because of Paul's concession to the weakness of human flesh. But Paul's concession is endorsed by the incarnation and the atonement of Christ who bridged between *A* and *C*. As Christ's becoming a flesh shows, there is a relative ontological and natural independency in flesh of the reality before God in the sense that there is a sphere based on a natural law according to which man carries out independent life. Thus, Christ's mediation shows mercy of God to all human beings who are weak due to their flesh.

It is indeed reported by Paul that God has revealed His love through Christ event. But God's cognition and judgment on man's salvation has not been revealed to each of individuals as clearly as revealed in and through Jesus Christ. Human beings are ignorant of their own final judgment. Even Paul says, 'I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage: lest by any means, after that I have preached to others, I myself should be rejected' (1 Cor. 9:27). He does not know sufficiently enough about his future, although he knows well himself to be righteous insofar as he takes himself to be in Jesus Christ. One's necessary ignorance of future implies his/her discretion in determining the direction of life with one's own responsibility. Paul leaves human discretion to receive the grace or

reject it in the dimension *C*. We were informed by Paul about our fortune in a disjunction ‘either A or B’ but not either of the disjuncts. If we knew God’s election, we would have known that our discretion was merely nominal in its eventual vainness.

In this way, insofar as *A* and *C* dimensions are concerned, both explanations are compatible without involving any inconsistency. One is entitled to commit in faith in hope. But there is no guarantee in this explanation that human commitment to God’s grace matches with God’s election beforehand. This kind of compatibility pays a cost in that the human freedom has no relevance with the determinism or God’s election. Man’s having faith does not satisfy a necessary condition nor a sufficient condition for his/her being justified by God. This is a necessary consequence of taking two agents being mutually independent. This is a kind of easy solution by dividing the regions of no mutual interference between Log A and Log C. We can call this compatibility as (CC) ‘the concessive compatibility based on both God’s love to the weak flesh and human ignorance’.

But Paul also seems to make a stronger claim and argues for human freedom on the basis of Christ event which constitutes Ergon D=Er (A via C). In this dimension, he employs the freedom in different sense from the one in the dimension *C*. In some passages, Paul characterizes a type of human freedom in *D* language: ‘[Log A] There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. [Er D] For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus made you free (*ēleutērōsen*) from the law of sin and death’ (8:1-2, cf. 8:21) and ‘Now the Lord is the Spirit: and [Log D] where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is freedom (*eleutheria*)’ (2 Cor. 3: 17). I think that Paul means *libertas spontaneitatis* (freedom of spontaneity) as Er D in his awareness (or by concession Er C (a-in C)). This freedom of spontaneity is compatible with the necessity (e.g. God’s grace

being poured through the Holy Spirit), although the compulsion and the spontaneity are still incompatible. Theologians have tendency to treat the theological freedom in terms of this sense so that the Pauline imperative is interpreted as the one expressing the responsibility on human side on the basis of the bestowed grace say, x rather than impartial human freedom of doing otherwise between x and not- x . According to a German pan, the imperative is characterized as Aufgabe (office, responsibility) on the basis of Gabe (grace) (See note (29)).

The locus for Paul's doctrine of predestination is developed in the dimension D in Romans chapter 8 as follows;

Those whom He predestined He also called; and those whom He called He also justified; and those whom He justified He also glorified...He who did not withhold His own Son, but gave him up for all of us, will He not with him also give us everything else? Who will bring any charge against God's elect? It is God who justifies. Who is to condemn? It is Christ who died, yes, who was raised, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us. Who will separate us from the love of Christ? (8:30-35).

In my analysis, Romans chapter 8 as a whole is developed by Ergon D language in Paul's awareness and also by Log D in general level. God's initiative act is interceded by Christ being at the right hand of God and mediated by Holy Spirit so that anyone can make access and 'we' have already made access to God's mercy and love. Insofar as human beings stick to the Christ event, God's election can be understood in His love and mercy rather than so called Calvinistic 'double predestination' according to which some are predestined to be saved and some other to be perished. In this passage Paul urges us to accept the predestination by focusing on the Christ event in which he claims that nothing separate us from 'love of Christ'.

Insofar as we stick to the Christ event, we are entitled to expect God's mercy at the final judgment. This is because God's love to human beings has been most clearly revealed in and through that event. Paul develops this thought by quoting the relevant passages in the Old Testament in Romans chapters 9-11. Paul's justification by faith based on God's free election was accused by his opponents. Paul reflects it in the style of *diatribē* and appeals to the Christ event for the endorsement of his argument as follows;

As it is written, 'Jacob I have loved, but Esau I have hated'. What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God? My it never be!... He has mercy on whom He wills, and whom He wills He hardens. You will say to me then, 'Why does He still find fault? For who has resisted His will? But indeed, O man, who are you to reply against God? Will not the thing formed say to him who formed it, 'Why have you made me like this?' Or, does not the potter have power over the clay, from the same lump to make one vessel for honor and another for dishonor? What if God, wanting to show His wrath and to make His wrath and to make His power known, endured with much longsuffering the vessel of wrath prepared for destruction, and that He might make know the riches of His glory on the vessel of mercy, which He had prepared beforehand for glory, even us whom He called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles? ...That Gentiles, who did not pursue righteousness, have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness on the basis of faithfulness (9:13-30).

Paul's critics argue against Paul's doctrine of predestination as the basis of his doctrine of justification by faith to the effect that such theories do not leave any room for human efforts for man's salvation. They claim that a man is supposed to be justified by his/her works of the

Mosaic law. In this *diatribē* style of argument which is developed as Log C (a-in C) and Log C (b-in C) (where 'b' stands for B, insofar as it is made use for Paul's argument), he appeals to God's mercy in the Christ event. Paul regards himself and his fellow Romans addressed 'us' as being called by God in his awareness. Because of Christ's and Spirit's mediation, human beings are entitled to expect God's positive judgment on the final day. Does it mean that God changes his mind on the treatment of some people at some points of their life courses after his predestination? Certainly, Paul reports that God has endured man's evil act. He reports that 'He [God] passes over sins committed beforehand in God's forbearance toward an indication of His righteousness in this present opportunity' (3:26). There is a reason for God's forbearance. He was waiting for the opportunity of indicating His righteousness based on His faithfulness rather than the one based on the Mosaic law. This forbearance does not necessarily imply that He has changed His determination of elected people. At least, it was not revealed as clearly as in the revelation of righteousness based on His faithfulness through Jesus Christ.

What we can be sure based on Paul's proclamation is that God is waiting for our repentance in order that anyone can be made righteous by his/her faith. This message which was most clearly revealed through Jesus Christ undermines such a question as whether God sometimes changes His mind concerning with His election. At least God's change of mind is not as clearly revealed as His love being shown in Christ event. This love is in principle directed to 'all' human beings (3:23). Thus this kind of question is blocked insofar as we stick to the Christ event. Therefore, we can conclude that insofar as we stick to *D* dimension, God's love for all human beings has never been and will never be changed (8:39).

Anyone who is at-work as Er D would never reject this grace but

spontaneously accept it with gratitude, even if he admits at the level of reflection in Log C that any man is in principle disposed to do otherwise. But taking other option say not-x than grace say x, we must call it that one takes it ‘reluctantly’. In this reluctance too, we can spot some kind of freedom of indifference by taking it as ‘less spontaneously’ but not neutral way any more. In this sense, the human freedom being at-work as Er D is properly characterized by the freedom of spontaneity (*libertas spontaneitatis*). This kind of compatibility can be called (CS) ‘the compatibility of the unique (necessary) way of justification and the spontaneity’.

What is made clear thus far is that Pauline human freedom is introduced and secured by God’s love in either way [(CC), (CS)]. Thus, we can detect two kinds of freedom as ErD (CS) and Log C (CC) in Pauline argument on the compatibility between God’s election and human freedom. Pauline second solution (CS) is his authentic and non-concessive one. Given that the Christ event brought the non separateness of the reality of man being at-work Er D between the righteous man in A and the autonomous and possible agent in C, anyone in Er D do not have anything but his/her spontaneity to be in Christ. There is no virtual possibility of rejecting Christ event by choosing oneself otherwise.

In this dimension too, the human being is regarded to be free in the sense of his/her being spontaneous to be in Christ. The spontaneity is not incommensurable understanding of freedom. For instances, Confucious once says at his age of 70 that his spontaneous action whatever it is does not trespass any human due precept. Aristotle also says that ‘Now even this [something beside reason] seems to have a share in reason (*tōi logōi*), as we said; at any rate in the continent man it obeys reason - and presumably in the temperate and brave man it is still more obedient; for in them it speaks, on all matters, with the same voice as reason’ (*Nic*

Eth. I13, 1102b 26-28). These descriptions may imply that more people become virtuous, more they understand 'the freedom of spontaneity' in terms of 'freedom'.

I think that the philosophy of faithfulness which seeks for *intellectus ante fidem* should be satisfied with this result by discerning two senses of 'freedom'. Just as we articulated two different senses of the word '*pistis*', we should articulate two different senses of the term 'freedom' either as ErD or Log C. In general, Catholicism seeks for the compatibility between the grace (*gratia*, *donum*, e.g. the infusion of Spirit) and the merit (*meritum*) as man's virtuousness on the basis of Log C (Cf. T. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II-1. Q113. art. 3, art. 6, Q114. art. 5 ad1, ad2). On the other hand, Protestantism sticks to Er D throughout. Anyone can now understand at least in general way how *D* language behaves differently from *C* language. According to Pauline philosophy of language, just as individual's having faith is focally structured in order by the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, individual's having freedom as *libertas indifferentiae* is focally structured in order by *libertas spontaneitatis* of Jesus of Nazareth who spontaneously obeyed the Heavenly Father throughout his life.

The philosophy of faithfulness is based on Paul's concession on such basic notions as '*pistis*' and '*eleutheria*' so that it seeks for expanding the commensurability on the basis of Log C in order to grasp the authentic man as a whole. While we have argued that the consequentialism of knowing the nature of tree by its fruits offers a commensurable criterion, we may be able to take Jesus of Nazareth as another criterion so that we may be able to understand ourselves as a whole. Every one can agree the reason why Paul develops Ergon D language as the authentic one. Jesus of Nazareth can be taken as an exemplar of the human possibility in terms of both cognitive and character faculties. Insofar as Log C language (including Log (a-in C) language) is founded and conceded by Er D

and Log D language, there is a reason why it is reasonable to say that Divine folly and weakness which is indicated by the Christ event are ‘stronger (*ischuroteron*)’ and ‘wiser (*sophōteron*)’ than any human strength and wisdom. This statement can be construed as an utterance according to a commensurable criterion i.e. Jesus of Nazareth who is wholly a man in his obedience and faith. He is reported to be incarnated in flesh. He lived as a wholly man in flesh and overcame its weakness by his faithfulness up to his death (cf. Phil.2:8). Setting him as a criterion is nothing against reason, just as the sages or the practically wise (*phronimos*) is set as a criterion in Aristotelian ethics. Whether Jesus of Nazareth is wholly son of God as well may be examined and shared by people, if each individual is convinced through his/her experiences (preferably ErD) by God’s stronger and wiser love shown in the righteousness based on the faithfulness of Jesus.

13. Conclusion

I have distilled five language networks from Paul’s epistle to the Romans. Three *A*, *B*, *C* which are uttered without appealing to the work of the Holy Spirit are mutually independent general languages. While Paul reports what is primarily understood by God as *A* and *B* language networks of revelation, the language network *C* is primarily understood by human beings. The other two *D*, *E* are formed by appealing to the *ergon* of the Holy Spirit. The former three are written in such a way as being able to be abstracted from Paul’s *ergon* languages *D* or (a- in *C*) and *E* or (b-in *C*). The descriptions (a- in *C*) and (b-in *C*) are permitted by his concession to the infirmity of flesh. But nothing hinders from some human *ergon* which is captured by the best description of human perspective being simultaneously spirited. By ‘best’, regardless

of whatever 'best' means from the human perspective, I mean the one which is pleased well by God. When Paul dictates the epistle to the Romans by daring to speak 'by word and work' alone, what he means by 'word and work' is both the persuasion of the wisdom i.e. *A, B, C* and the demonstration of Spirit and power *D, E*. These two devices are formed by his mission of proclaiming gospel for both wise and foolish people and both Greeks and Barbarians (1:14).

I have argued that Paul develops the language space of *A, B, C* so as for anyone to understand and agree with him insofar as the linguistic understanding is concerned, because they can share the commensurable criteria of the terms they employ in the same language. I have argued that Paul did not commit the fallacy of contradiction in his proclamation of gospel. Also people may agree that Paul provides a convincing solution for one of the philosophical problems such as Kant's third antinomy and the Pelagian controversy.

Paul also seeks for the expansion of commensurability with others by developing the language space of *D, E*. This is a matter of faith and a matter of experience. At least I have hopefully shown that without having faith, one cannot know the relevant thing. People now can agree that the word 'faith' is the bottom word for man's soul and that it is the most fundamental state of soul so as eventually to integrate one's cognitive faculties and character faculties. According to Aristotelian ethics, the practical knowledge (*phronēsis*) which grasps the knowledge of the value of relevant action which leads to a right choice of action gives rises only in sages (*phronimos*) who is virtuous both in terms of cognitive (concerning truth) and moral (concerning value) excellences. According to Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, however, the situation is entirely different. Anyone can obtain faith regardless of any stage of soul's power-abilities in terms of his/her cognitive and moral excellences,

only if he/she holds an infant like reliance towards the relevant object, just as an infant cannot live without relying on his/her parent. Because of this universality, the faith is the bottom state of mind by means of which one can reset his/her life and develop in combining soul's positive faculties in terms of both cognitive and moral excellences.

Notes

- (1) This implies, I am afraid, that most of rich and laborious biblical and theological studies for two millennia will be neglected in this article. But it is not the case that my idiosyncratic approach entirely lacks any justification. The following fact seems to show that the tradition has not dissolved yet the perennial problem on the schism between Catholicism and Protestantism. In 1999, 'The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification' between Roman Catholic Church and Lutheran World Federation was issued. They signed each other and put a founding stone for the reconciliation. Both 'Augustburg Confession' (1529) and 'The Council of Trent' (1549) have lost their efficacy with respect to the criticisms against each opponent contained in their articles and decrees.

But its contents are based on the pious interpretations of the Holy Scripture by depending on the power of the Holy Spirit. Thus, the joint declaration may theologically somehow hit the mark, but left the issues on the human responsible freedom obscure. It ended up with the interpretations which did not make a thorough investigation so that it refused to be rigorously understood at least by the third person. For example, it is said: ' (16) Through Christ alone are we justified, when we receive this salvation in faith. Faith is itself God's gift through the Holy Spirit who works through word and sacrament in the

community of believers and who, at the same time, leads believers into that renewal of life which God will bring to completion in eternal life... (20) When Catholics say that persons 'cooperate' in preparing for and accepting justification by consenting to God's justifying action, they see such personal consent as itself an effect of grace, not as an action arising from innate human abilities...(21) According to Lutheran teaching, human beings are incapable of cooperating in their salvation, because as sinners they actively oppose God and his saving action. Lutherans do not deny that a person can reject the working of grace. When they emphasize that a person can only receive (mere passive) justification, they mean thereby to exclude any possibility of contributing to one's own justification, but do not deny that believers are fully involved personally in their faith, which is effected by God's words'. (cf. *Justification and the Future of the Ecumenical Movement, The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, ed. W. Rush (Unitas 2003)).

While it might appear for many people to be unintelligible that the faith of man as his/her state of mind who receives salvation offers a reason for justification by God, both parties think that the faith itself is taken to be 'gift' in that having faith is itself being made to believe by God as a kind of performing solo by God. Thus they conclude that having faith on man's part can offer a reason for justification by God. Furthermore, in the Catholic cooperative theory, man's responsible freedom as 'consent' will be eventually reduced to grace alone. For anything which is characterized as 'not as an action arising from innate human abilities' will not be worthy of being called 'freedom'. Lutheran asymmetry of human responsible action between the inability of receiving justification except as 'mere passive' reception and capable of rejecting justification will not endorse the human freedom

for having the possibility of doing otherwise (See section 12).

Depending on this kind of parochial jargon is self complacent and thus will not gain much general understanding and support. This declaration which invites more questions rather than a solution seems to show that the biblical and theological studies thus far have not properly understood Paul's theology. I will argue that Paul has offered a hand of reconciliation between Catholicism and Protestantism well before the reformation in 16th century.

- (2) I shall offer an example to explain 'the commensurability'. Greek comedy and tragedy belong to different literature genres; the comedy makes people laugh and the tragedy makes people weep. They, however, share the same language, Greek, though their vocabulary may differ in terms of the frequency of employed words. They can be analyzed and contrasted from the perspectives within their shared language. The commensurability consists in sharing the same language. Likewise, Aristotle offers 'money' as the commensurate (*sumblēton*) of people's various demands (*Nic. Eth.* V5. 1133a17-24). In our case, while people who believe and people who do not differ in their opinions, they share the same language, insofar as they can communicate each other. This language offers the commensurate criterion for them to be examined. In other words, the commensurability criterion constrains the realm of interpreting the text.
- (3) H. G. Gadamer says that 'It is the task of hermeneutics to clarify this miracle of understanding, which is not a mysterious communion of souls, but a sharing of a common meaning (p.260)...The horizon of the present cannot be formed without the past. There is no more an isolated horizon of the present than there are historical horizons. Understanding, rather, is always the fusion of these horizons which we imagine to exist by themselves' (p.273). H-G. Gadamer, *Truth and*

Method, tr. G. Barden and J. Cumming (London 1970).

- (4) cf. K. Chiba, Aristotle on Essence and Defining-phrase in his Dialectic, *Definition in Greek Philosophy*, ed. D. Charles, pp.203–251 (Oxford 2010), D. Charles, *Aristotle on Meaning and Essence*, ch.4 Signification of Names, pp.78–109 (Oxford 2000).
- (5) E. Käsemann, *An Die Römer*, S.86 (Tübingen 1974).
- (6) The word '*ergon*' has an at-work-ness/result ambiguity such that it can signify either, for instance, *praxis* (action) or its result of *praxis*. Throughout this article, '*ergon*' holds this ambiguity.
- (7) According to Paul's style of writing Romans called '*diatribē*' in the Hellenistic literature technique, the number of interrogative sentences amounts to 71 times among 433 verses. If we exclude chapter 12–16 in which Paul exhorts us how to proceed in a faithful life and greets to the people of Rome, we can count 70 times among 315 verses in chapter 1–11 of his epistle. Many of the interrogatives are, however, not genuine interrogations but rhetorical in order for his argument to make lively by conversing with putative opponent views.
- (8) Apart from these cognitive faculties, Aristotle employs the word '*pneuma*' which is in a sense essential for Paul to express the soul's deepest activity and state whose faculty corresponds to the Spirit in the sense that this very part of soul receives it. It usually means 'breath' (421b15), 'wind' (110a3) and 'air' (735b25). But the Aristotelian '*pneuma*' carries at some points the principle of life, although it is combined with physical elements. He says that 'it is true that all power-abilities of soul seem to have a connection with a matter different from and more divine than the so-called elements; but as one soul differs from another in honor and dishonor, so differs also the nature of the corresponding matter. All have in their semen that which causes it to be productive; I mean what is called vital heat.

This is not fire nor any such power-ability, but it is the *pneuma* included in the semen and in the foam-like, and the natural principle in the *pneuma*, being analogous to the elements of the stars' (GA. II3. 736b29-737a1). Aristotle has to employ the word '*pneuma*' to express the principle of life included in the semen which is a different kind of heat from the natural bodies but rather being akin to the element of stars. While I cannot pursue the Aristotelian *pneuma* further, we can see at least some special life principle in its usage. In this way, Paul had to borrow Greek philosophical words to express what he has discovered in the Christ event.

- (9) T. Engberg-Pedersen characterizes this reciprocity as 'transferral of agency'. *Cosmology & Self In the Apostle Paul, The Material Spirit*, p123 (Oxford 2010)). I briefly mention here about the proportionate thesis of comprehension (*nū̄s*) in Paul. In Romans 1, Paul characterizes 'the malfunction of comprehension (*adokimēn nū̄n*)' of the disobedient people whom God gave up (Rom. 1:28). Some people among the ungodly and unrighteous men are characterized by Paul as follows; 'they know well enough the just decree of God, that those who behave like this deserve to die, and yet they do it; not only so, they consent with them that practice them' (1:32) When their malfunctioned comprehension works, it grasps only the negative sides of God such as His wrath. People whose faith are pleased well by God can know the positive sides of God. Thus, ones' faith is more appropriate, he/she can know God's more graceful and merciful sides. On the relation of 'comprehension' and 'Spirit', I will leave for another paper.
- (10) K. Barth, *Der Römer Briefe*, X (München 1929).
- (11) My analysis of two senses of '*pistis*' has some relevance with the traditional theological understanding of the notion. This analysis offers a semantic ground for grasping the nature of *pistis* in Paul and

other writings. It has been made clear in biblical studies that this notion itself contains a bi-lateral relation between God and man since the description of an equivalent Hebrew term in the Old Testament.

A. Weiser writes the reciprocity of faith (fulness) and the passivity on the part of man in the Old Testament as follows; 'Thus here too the reciprocal relationship between God and man is part of the essence of faith. Moreover it is such that—even in those cases in which faith indicates a human activity for which man can be made responsible (the demand for faith)—man is never the one to initiate this reciprocal relationship'. A. Weiser, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testamentum* (ThWb), Band VI, her. G. Kittel, G. Friedrich, S.187 (*Faith* tr. D. Barton pp.11f (London 1961)).

Lightfoot proves the passivity of faith through the linguistic analyses of the Old Testament as follows; 'The Hebrew *emth*, the Greek *pistis*, the Latin 'fides', and the English 'faith', hover between two meanings; *trustfulness*, the frame of mind which relies on another; and *trustworthiness*, the frame of mind which can be relied upon. Not only are the two connected together grammatically, as active and passive senses of the same word, and logically, as subject and object of the same act; but there is a close moral affinity between them. Fidelity, constancy, firmness, confidence, reliance, trust, belief—these are the links which connect the two extremes, the passive with the active meaning of 'faith'. The Hebrew word signifying 'to believe, to trust', is the *Hiphil he'emin*. The *Kal'mn* [*'emânâ*] would mean 'to strengthen, support, hold up' but is only found in the active participle, used as a substantive with the special sense, 'one who supports, nurses, trains a child'..and in the passive participle 'firm, trustworthy'. The *Niphal* accordingly means, 'to be firm, lasting, constant, trusty'; while the *Hiphil he'emin* with which we are

more directly concerned, is, 'to hold trustworthy, to rely upon, believe'.. and is rendered '*pisteuō*' in the LXX, e.g.Gen. 15:6. But there is in biblical Hebrew no corresponding substantive for 'faith', the active principle. Its nearest representative is '*ʿmûnâ*, 'firmness, constancy, trustworthiness'. This word is rendered in the LXX most frequently by *alêtheia*, *alêthinos* (24 times), or by *pistis*, *pistos*, *axiopistos* (20 times); ..It will thus be seen that '*ʿmûnâ* properly represents the passive sense of *pistis*, as indeed the form of the word shows. ... Thus in its biblical usage the word '*ʿmûnâ* can scarcely be said ever to have the sense 'belief, trust' though sometimes approaching towards it.... Unlike the Hebrew, the Greek word seems to have started from the active meaning. In its earliest use it is opposed to 'distrust'; (Hesiod, Op.342)..But even if it had not originally the passive sense of faith side by side with the active, it soon acquired this meaning also (Aesch. Fragm. 276); and *pistis* became a common technical term for a 'proof.' J. B. Lightfoot, *The Epistle of ST PAUL Epistle to the Galatians* pp.154-156 (London 1910).

- (12) Why God Became Man, Anselm of Canterbury, *The Major Works*, tr. J. Fairweather, ed. B. Davies & G. R. Evans (Oxford 2008).
- (13) C. E. B Cranfield introduces seven interpretations on 1:17. The one of Ambrosiaster is the same as mine. Cranfield says that 'The words *ek pisteōs eis pistin* have been understood in many different ways: 'from God's faithfulness to man's faith'. He noted that 'Ambrosiaster, col. 56 ('ex fide Dei promittentis in fidem hominis credentis')'. C. E. B Cranfield, *Romans I*, p.99 (Edinburgh 1975).
- (14) When E. Jüngel says as follows, he fails to see Paul's two attempts of demonstrating God's righteousness: 'For 'the righteousness of God' and 'the wrath of God' are used in Romans 1:17f, as opposing concepts. This antithesis is clearest in the distinction between law and

gospel. For while the righteousness of God is revealed only *in the gospel* (Rom. 1:17), according to Romans 4:15, it is the law that brings wrath. The revelation of the righteousness of God does, of course, point to the revelation of wrath from heaven. However, and this is the crucial issue, *this* way which God has of working against unrighteousness is not the way of divine righteousness, even though according to the usual human understanding of righteousness ('to each what is due!'), God's wrath as judge coming down against universal unrighteousness should be seen as a manifestation of the righteousness of God. Rather, for Paul the *wrath* of God falling on unrighteousness is the opposite concept to the *righteousness* of God. Wrath belongs to the category of the law, not to the gospel. The law imprisons the lawbreaker within his transgressions and their consequences. That is precisely how its wrath works. ..It is not a case of 'two different revelations', but of 'one and the same act of revelation', which is however accomplished in two antithetical means of revelation'. E. Jüngel, *Justification The Heart of The Christian Faith*, p66f, tr. J. Cayzer (T & T Clark 2001).

It is in a way true that both are 'antithetical' between gospel and law. But according to the semantic analysis, God's wrath is reported not as 'not the way of divine righteousness' or 'according to the usual human understanding of righteousness', but as one of two ways of revealing God's righteousness bringing about a fact as the sinner before God. Gospel and law are revealed under the category of one of God's righteousness, although the righteousness based on faith is more basic for God than the one based on works. Jüngel's interpretation seems to be an example of excessive (and, in this case wrong) theological interpretations. Jesus says, 'Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the law and prophets; I did not come to abolish, but

to complete' (Mat. 5:17-18). Paul also says 'Do we then nullify a law through the faithfulness? May it never be! No, we confirm a law [of works]' (Rom. 3:31).

- (15) This usual interpretation may not be entirely false, if we take this utterance as Ergon $E=Er(B \text{ via } C)$ language as in chapter 7 (See section 10). The reality B can be made accessible from the C which is supposed to be mediated by the Spirit, on the condition that the concession to the human weakness is permitted. But God's initiative act of making known must be secured at first, because our awareness or knowledge of the reality before God involves God's knowledge of us in advance.
- (16) According to TLG, we find ten employments of the nominative use of 'Jesus Christ' in the New Testament. In these places 'Jesus Christ' as the subject of a sentence is never dealt with as the agent of acting something. I shall raise some *prima facie* controversial occurrences of 'Jesus Christ' in Paul's other epistles. There are two places in which 'Jesus Christ' is put as the subject of sentence: 'For the son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, ...was not yea and nay, but in him is yea' (2Cor. 1:19) and 'every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord' (Phil. 2:11). What kind of entity is it that he himself does not become anything, but that something in this case 'yea' becomes in him? What kind of entity is it to whom an identity statement conveyed by 'is (being)' is ascribed but any action of 'doing' is never ascribed? What kind of entity is it who is most of the cases accompanied by the mediating terms such as 'through' and 'in' in other cases than the nominative case? Paul often puts 'our Lord' as characterizing 'Jesus Christ' (e.g. 1:4, 7:5:1, 11, 21, 6:23, 7:25, 8:39, 15:6, 30, 16:18). This word 'Lord' literally means an owner whose possession we are. Paul says, 'For whether we live, we live

unto the Lord or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's (*tū kuriū esmen*)' (14:8). In the beginning of Romans, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ' is characterized both as 'the seed of David according to the flesh' and 'the son of God' who is determined to be so by the resurrection of the dead 'according to the Holy Spirit' (1:3-4, cf. Phil. 2:6-10). Thus 'Jesus Christ' signifies both the son of God and man. Paul thought that he could not ascribe any action to this being who is both God and man.

- (17) I take it this genitive to be 'genitive of belonging' to the effect that Jesus Christ is the person to which the faithfulness belongs: Smyth explains that 'The genitive denotes ... or belonging' 1297, p.314.
- (18) For example, W. Sanday & A. Headlam introduces Hausleiter as a strong proponent of this view. W. Sanday & A. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. p. 83 (Edinburgh 1958). Cf. Cranfield, *ibid.*, p.203.
- (19) T. Aquinas interprets '*iustitia autem Dei est per fidem Iesu Christi*' by referring to Hebrew 12:2 and Romans 10:9. Then Thomas says that 'Dicitur autem iustitia Dei esse per fidem Iesu Christi, non ut quasi per fidem mereamur iustificari, quasi ipsa fides ex nobis existat et per eam mereamur Dei iustitiam, sicut Pelagiani dixerunt, sed qui in ipsa iustificatione qua iustificamur a Deo, primus motus mentis in Deum est per fidem. *Accedentem enim ad Deum oportet credere*, ut dicitur Heb. 11:6. Unde et ipsa fides quasi prima pars iustitiae est nobis a Deo'. T. Aquinas, *Super Epistolas S. Pauli Lectura I, Ad Romanos*, LectIII, p.53 (Marietti 1953), Luther writes on 3:22 that 'Die Gerechtigkeit wird nur durch den Glauben an Jesus Christus geschenkt'. M. Luther, *Vorlesung über den Römer Briefe* 1515/1516, S. 131, (Kaizer Verlag München 1957).
- (20) Anyone who cannot find his salvation anywhere else cleaves to *Fides*

Christi (M. Luther) as his own complete faith (Luther, *The Argument of St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, Lectures on Galatians 1535*, Chapter 1-4, p.7 [WA. XL. 44, 45] tr. J. Pelikan (Saint Louis 1963)). Catholicism developed its theological view on the basis of Paul's concession that the flesh is weak, and by employing Aristotelian language (that is, the *C*-type language). When Thomas Aquinas said that 'Christ did not have faith, because he had a clear vision (*visionem apertam*) of God', Aquinas understood 'faith' only in the *C* dimension, and only as a state of mind (that is, as *f2*) (T. Aquinas, *Summa Theologica II-1*, q65ad(3)). Aquinas did not consider the existence of *Fides Christi* based on 3:22, the passage to which Luther cleaved. Paul already offered a means of reconciliation between Catholicism and Protestantism by distinguishing three dimensions of mutually independent languages—that is, by ascribing the 'faithfulness of Jesus Christ' to language of *A* group, and by ascribing our mental state of having faith to the language of group *C*. If Luther had been clear on this point, he would have shown more fully the persuasiveness of the Christ-event to which he dedicated his whole life.

- (21) J. Dunn says, 'pistis can mean both 'faith' and 'faithfulness'. J. Dunn, *Romans 1-8 World Biblical Commentary* Vol.38A, p.166. I agree with Anselm's remark about the asymmetry of the meanings of the same word among the Supreme being and its creature that 'if it ever has some name in common with others, without doubt a very different signification (*diversa significatio*) must be understood' (*Monologion*, ch. 26). *Anselm of Canterbury* Vol.1, p.41 ed. J. Hopkins and H. Richardon (SCM Press LTD 1974).
- (22) While Bauer lists only 'Unterschied', Liddle & Scott offers first 'drawing asunder' 'separation' and then 'distinction'. W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch Zum Neuen Testament* (Berlin 1971). Liddle & Scott,

Oxford Greek-English Dictionary, eith edition (Oxford 1996). In Romans 10:12 we find another use of 'separation'. Paul says that 'The Scriptures says, 'Whosoever believes on Him shall not be put to shame'. For there is no separation of Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, being rich unto all that call upon Him. This is because 'Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (10:11-13). Paul argues by quoting the passages of the Scripture that the law of faithfulness does not allow any separation among people who believe. Since the issue here is the union or togetherness of people who believe on the basis of the sameness of the Lord who is rich to all people who call Him, 'separation' is preferable. This is because while the antonyms of 'separation' are such as 'union' and 'togetherness', the ones of 'distinction' are such as 'sameness' and 'accord'.

- (23) Concerning '*hilastērion*', it has been understood in two phases of the Christ event either as 'Sühnopfer' in the sense of the means of expiating sin or 'Gnadenstuhl (mercy seat)' as the place of sin offering. While Luther Bibel adopts 'Sühnopfer', he offers the following translation and comment in his commentary: 'Welchen Gott hat vorgestellt zu einem Gnadenstuhl durch den Glauben (d.h. dass er eine Sühnung sei für unsere Sünden, aber nur für die Glaubenden), weil durch den Unglauben dieser Gnadenstuhl vielmehr zu einem Tribunal und zu einer Gerichtsstätte umgewandelt wird' (*ibid.*, S.138). Meyer says that 'the view of the death of Jesus as the concrete propitiatory *offering* was deeply impressed on and vividly present to the Christian consciousness...Origen, Theophylact, Erasmus, Luther, Calvin... and others; ..and others, have rendered '*hilastērion*' in quite a special sense, namely, as referring to the canopy-shaped cover suspended over the ark of the covenant, on which, as the seat of Jehovah's

throne, the blood of the sacrifice was sprinkled by the high priest on the great day of atonement, and which therefore, regarded as the vehicle of the divine grace, typified Christ as the atoner'. H. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to The Epistle to the Romans*, vol.I, tr. J. Moore, p.172 (Edinburgh 1886).

According to my semantic analysis, the passage [A] should not be confounded with the passage [B] in which the sin is condemned by the Mosaic law. The verses 21-26 must not be understood under the Mosaic law. The sin offering sounds to be direct transaction within the judicial law. Paul says in the previous sentence that 'since all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, being now justified freely by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus' (3:24). We have to understand 'the redemption (*apolutrōsis*)' not under the Mosaic law but free grace. Thus I interpret 'the redemption' as God's free grace which simply means the transfer of sinners delivering from his sin to righteousness. '*Hilastērion*' must be understood under God's grace rather than within His Mosaic law of works. Thus it should be taken rather in a positive sense and general sense as the throne of Divine presence which is sometimes translated as 'Gnadenstuhl (the mercy seat)'. In fact, God ordained '*hilastērion*' the place to see Moses, by saying that 'it is there that I shall meet you, and from above the cover, between the two cherubim over the Ark of the Tokens, I shall deliver to you all my commands for the Israelites' (Ex. 25:21).

I agree with C. H. Talbert's reading on this word. He offers a translation of 3:22-24 as follows: 'the righteousness of God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ for all who believe (for there is no distinction, for all have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God, with the result that all are being justified freely by His grace) [the

righteousness of God] through the redemption in Christ Jesus, whom God purposed as the locus of divine presence through his faithfulness in his blood, for a proof of His righteousness'. For the reading of 'as the locus of divine presence', Talbert refers to various passages in the Old Testament and offers the following translations and understandings. He says that 'LXX Exodus 25:17 is most likely to be translated: 'You shall make an *hilastērion* (=cover), a lid of pure gold'; LXX Exodus 31:7 speaks about the *hilastērion* that is on the ark of the covenant; LXX Exodus 38:5-8 mentions the *hilastērion*, the lid of the ark, made of pure gold, with cherubs at either end; LXX Leviticus 16:13-15 refers to the *hilastērion* as the lid of the ark. In all of these passages the *hilastērion* is the lid or cover of the ark. This fits the Hebrew word it translates, *kaporeth* (=cover). It is an object that is distinct from both the altar of incense (Exod 30:1-10) and the altar of sacrifice (Exod 27:1). The ark's lid served as the locus of the divine presence and revelation. The LXX Exodus 25:22 says God speaks above the *hilastērion* from between the two cherubim; LXX Leviticus 16:2 refers to the *hilastērion* on the ark where God appears in a cloud; LXX Numbers 7:89 says Moses heard the voice of the Lord speaking from the *hilastērion*. Thus, the verb (*hilaskesthai*) and the adjective (*hilastērion*) are related to the function of atonement while the noun (*hilastērion*) is associated with the function of divine presence and revelation'. E C. H. Talbert, *Romans*, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary, p.107, 113 (Smyth & Helwys 2002). From my standpoint, it is certain that *hilastērion* should not be read within the framework of Mosaic law. If so, the gospel *A* would be delivered from within the law *B*. Paul only borrows the traditional wording to express the locus of Divine presence.

(24) Anselm justly rejects both the Devil-ransom theory and the theory of

vicarious punishment. Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo*, I6, I8.

(25) W. Barclay, *The Epistle to The Romans*, p.21 (Edinburgh 1963).

(26) Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28 revidierte Auflage, (Stuttgart 2012), Cranfield, *ibid*, p.220.

(27) E. Jüngel, *Paulus und Jesus*, S.70 (Tübingen 1962). Similarly E. Käsemann construed such that the doctrine of justification is superior to the doctrine of judgment according to the work by presupposing both doctrines as being comparable at the same level. In his commentary on Romans 2:11, Käsemann wrote: ‘One cannot simply establish the contradiction and demand that it be upheld. Otherwise Paul becomes schizophrenic. Christ as the fulfillment of the law is not yet treated in this passage, so that the problem also cannot be blunted in this way. The decisive thing is that the doctrine of judgment according to works not be ranked above justification but conversely be understood in the light of it, although this perspective is not yet apparent here.’ E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, p. 58, tr. G. W. Bromiley (Eerdmans Pub. Co 1980). He failed to grasp the independent status of God’s law of works.

Besides, I read ‘*telos nomō*,’ (10:4) as not ‘(Christ as) the fulfillment of the law,’ but ‘(Christ as) a goal of a law [of works].’ This passage has been argued whether it should mean either ‘fulfillment’ or ‘end’ (Cranfield, *op. cit.*, II, p.515). But I take it none of these two options but ‘a goal’. According to TLG, this interpretation is advocated by Chrysostom who understands it in an analogy of the sentence such as ‘Health is *telos* [a goal] of Medicine’. J. A. Cramer, *Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum*, vol.4 *Catena in epistolam ad Romanos*, p.370, (Oxford 1844).

(28) J. Calvin, *In Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos Commentarii*, ch.8., v.9.

(29) This can be said to be ‘theological language’. In fact, there is a case

that a solution for this passage is proposed by appealing to a theological jargon 'final judgment'. J. Dunn says that 'Somewhat surprisingly, this is the first time Paul uses *dikaioō* in the aorist in Romans – apart from 3:4 (God) and 4:2 (Abraham). In more general references and references to his fellow believers the present indicative (3:24, 26, 28;4:5) and future (2:13;3:20, 30) have predominated. The tense here certainly indicates an act of God in the past, but that should not be allowed to dominate the doctrine of justification drawn from Paul to the extent that it has, or to overwhelm the force of the other tenses. Read together with these texts and in the light of the arguments so far, *dikaiōthentes* is best taken to denote God's acceptance into that relationship and status (which Abraham enjoyed as 'the friend of God,' 'this grace in which we stand' -v.2), and which God will acknowledge and vindicate in the final judgment (denoted in the forward-looking 'hope of glory'-v2)'. J. Dunn, *ibid.*, p.246.

J. Dunn does not seem to understand the function (*ergon*) of the past tense such that he generally deals with it by expanding without limitation towards the last day so as to accommodate this aorist tense with other tenses. This kind of explanation is hard to understand. Dunn treats that the past tense would 'denote' or signify the future tense so as to vindicate it in the final judgment.

V. W. Joest understands the issue of the past tense in such a German pun as 'Gabe und Aufgabe' that a person who was justified in his faith as a gift (Gabe) has an assignment (Aufgabe) of leading an ethical life. He says that 'Die in Christus sind, sind die *dikaiōthentes* ...Die *dikaiōthentes* sind die Gerecht-gesprochenen. Sie sind es 'in Christus', weil Gottes Freispruch sie mit Christus zusammenspricht'. By confirming the presence of Christ in man who believes, he continues that 'dass Wandeln im Geist nicht nur als Gabe gegenwärtig,

sondern zugleich als Aufgabe vorausgehalten ist'. Joest grasps a function of the Holy Spirit which makes the Christ event being present in man. But the connection of Gabe and Aufgabe does not explain why Paul raises positive passions such as peace and joy in our passage. I argued that these are raised as the evidence of having received the intercession of the Holy Spirit. Paul is not concerned with our ethical obligations as Aufgabe in this context. He presents ethical matter in Romans ch. 12 onwards. Paulus und das Luthersche Simul Iustus et Peccator, *Kerygma und Dogma* I S.274, 280, 1955.

- (30) A conspicuous fact in his usage of tense is that the presence indicated by 'now (*nun*)' and 'this present opportunity (*tū nun kairū*)' is emphasized by Paul as the operator indicating the opportunity of salvation (3:21, 26, 5:9, 6:19, 22, 7:6, 8:1, 18, 22, 11:5, 31, 16:26). Incidentally, while the present time in two passages (8:18 and 8:22) is spoken with respect to suffering, they are also spoken from the positive perspective of overcoming the present difficulty in hope which is grounded by the Christ event and his second coming. We can find in the usage of the past tense and the usage of 'now' that Paul develops our event in a superior theory of time and space through God's intervention to the history in the Christ event.

Time and space in Paul is not characterized as an *apriori* form which can be abstracted from consciousness in which our experience comes about nor reducible to the physical time and space. Eternity which is different from the physical time as the number of movements is made clear as a reality because of the occurrence of the resurrection which overcomes sin and death of the soul. Paul's *ergon* language comes about through his personal lively present association with Jesus Christ through the intercession of Spirit. A new era has come and that it is the reality which can be always said

to be 'now' because of the resurrected Lord.

- (31) Concerning the 'Christ event', I would like to confirm in general way that an agent's responsible action can be taken to express a historical event in a context, insofar as there is a superior agent or fortune behind the agent. As I argued in section 8 in detail, Paul employs the past tense to express what has happened in Christ involving the event of believers later than that event as well.

The 2nd aorist (e.g. 'died to sin (*apethanes: apothnēskō*)') is grammatically said to be either (1) 'constative (summary) or complexive aorist' or (2) 'perfective (or effective, or resultative) aorist'. N. Turner explains of (1) that 'it conceives the idea as a whole without reference to the beginning, progress, or end; it is a total yet punctiliar aspect ...The action is represented as complete, an assumption which must be made from the context, which indicates that no further action of the same kind is contemplated'. Concerning (2), he says that 'the emphasis is all on the conclusion or results of an action'. N. Turner (J. H. Moulton) *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol.III, p.72 (Edinburgh 1963).

It seems to me that this offers a grammatical guarantee to take some kind of action as an event, if a superior agent is tacitly at least being involved in another agent's action. Consider the sentence 'Caesar crossed the Rubicon river'. If his action is determined by a superior unseen agent, this sentence can be transformed into a sentence expressing an event: 'It took place Caesar's crossing the Rubicon river'. The description of a historical event can be taken to be an expression of a fact without considering the intention which may exist behind the event. In an event, even if there is a hidden agent or fortune, one can describe it as what has simply happened, insofar as there is such a superior agent. Granted that various acts

in one's life are carried out by his/her intentions, we can describe them as events, if his/her intention is made by a superior agent or accords with the one of superior agent. Jesus' spontaneous life was pleased well by God in every respect so that Paul characterized Jesus' life as the Christ event.

Since Paul regards that he can describe the life of Jesus to be the one in which God's intention is realized, he does not refer to the intention of 'Jesus Christ' and grasps 'through faithfulness of Jesus Christ' (3:22) as a mediatory event in the category of an event in Romans.

- (32) H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to The Epistle to The Galatians*, p.198, tr. G. H. VENABLES (Edinburgh 1873).

Acknowledgement: A part of an earlier version of this paper is read in 'A Seminar on Paul's Epistle to the Romans' (Helsinki University, 29th April 2014). I am grateful to Dr. Mika Perälä who kindly invited me and arranged for two talks on both Aristotle and Paul in Helsinki and Professor Risto Saarinen and Professor Ismo Dunderberg who organized this seminar. I am grateful to Professor Simo Knuuttila and five other presenters on Romans for and with their joyous and helpful discussions. My argument for the compatibility between God's election and human freedom in Section 12 is a response to Professor Knuuttila's comments. A part of an earlier version of this paper is published in my article 'Uchimura Kanzo on Justification by Faith in his Study of Romans: A Semantic Analysis of Romans 3: 19-31' in *Living for Jesus and Japan —The Social and Theological Thought of Uchimura Kanzo—* ed. H. Shibuya and S. Chiba (Eerdmans 2013). I am grateful two editors late Professor H. Shibuya and Professor S. Chiba for their editorial works and

helpful comments. Besides, I am grateful Professor Troels Engberg-Pedersen who dedicated ten hours discussion on Paul in December 2013 to and with the person whom he has never met but came to know through his old friend Professor David Charles. I am grateful to Professor James Dunn who commented several times on my earlier versions through e-mail. My argument for the compatibility between Romans and Galatians in Section 11 is a response to one of his comments. I am grateful Dr. Jack McKelvey for his helpful comments who is a former student of Rev. Maurice Charles, the father of David Charles. I cordially thank to Professor David Charles who has been kindly leading me for almost thirty years mainly on Aristotle and in some occasions on Paul too. While it took for me forty years to convince myself on the justification by faith ever since I was puzzled for the first time, I have cordial gratitude in my mind to those people who have been associated with me over these years.