



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	The Faithfulness Project: Proposal & Theses
Author(s)	Chiba, Kei
Description	This document is posted on The Faithfulness Project website https://thefaithfulnessproject.org/
Issue Date	2024-02-14
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/91366
Rights	CC BY-NC-ND 4.0
Rights(URL)	https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Type	learning object
File Information	TFP Proposal and Theses_14 February 2024.pdf



The Faithfulness Project: Proposal & Theses

PROPOSAL: A corrected translation of the Apostle Paul's Letter to Romans and its implications

Kei Chiba, D. Phil.

In The Faithfulness Project, we claim that a correction of the mistranslation of one crucial theological passage of Romans 3:22 leads to the resolution of many controversies within the doctrines of Christianity. This passage has been broadly misunderstood ever since Jerome's Vulgata edition based on Vetus Latina in the 2nd century. While the traditional rendering is '*non enim est distinctio (diastolē)* (For there is no distinction or difference [among people who believe])', our proposal is 'For there is no separation (*diastolē*) [between the righteousness of God and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ]'. God's revelatory act is at issue here, not the human mental states of believing. Paul reports according to God's revelatory act through Christ event what God has willed and made known to his faithful people through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.

On the basis of this correction, we will be able to resolve controversies persisting for centuries concerning such matters as the Gospel and the Law, that is, 'the law of faithfulness' or 'the law of Christ' and 'the law of works' or 'law of Moses' (3:27, Gal.6:2, 1Cor.9:9, 9:21). Furthermore, we can address controversies between God's predestination and human responsible freedom (9:6-11:32, 6:6:11-14, 14:22), between Divine predilection and God's fairness (9:13, 2:11), between God's righteousness and His love (2:3-8, 11:22, 8:39), between the things before (in sight of) God and the things before (in sight of) man (14:22, 6:19), between God's vicarious punishment of his Son in the atonement of mankind's sin and the Anselmian cooperative work of Father and Son (3:21-26, 2Cor.5:19). Among other things, through this correction we uncover Paul's methodological principle which we shall call the collaboration of *logos* (universal argument) and *ergon* (being at work here and now). We will argue for Paul's mutually complementary method of *logos* and *ergon*.

In this proposal, we offer our reading of the relevant passages concerning the non-separateness between God's righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ in its scope and arguments. The translation will be followed by our main theses with supporting evidence. At first, however, we shall briefly introduce the method of our semantic analysis of the relevant texts, from which these theses are derived.

1. Methodological Background

1:1 A brief methodological introduction: *Logos* and *Ergon* in complementariness

Paul proclaims the gospel by employing the complementary arguments of both 'persuasive argument of wisdom' and 'demonstration of the Spirit and [God's] power' i.e., 'by means of *logos* (universal argument, theory) and by means of *ergon* (being at work here and now, practice)' (Rom.15:18, 1Cor.2:4). A theory or account (*logos*) which can be understood universally and a practice or work (*ergon*) which is particularly at work here and now are mutually complementary. A bright girl who is asked 'how far would you walk in 2 hours, if you walk 4 kilometer per hour?' cannot answer it by saying 'I will get tired by then'. This is the correct answer for a person who considers 'the weakness of your flesh' (Rom.6:19). A *logos* such as a mathematical formula is one thing, but the relevant *ergon* is another thing.

Paul says that ‘I speak after the manner of men because of the weakness of your flesh (Rom.6:19). In this horizon of man-centric language, one can be either ‘the slave of righteousness’ or ‘the slave of sin’ (6:19-20). But Paul proclaims the gospel ‘by means of *logos* and *ergon*’ (15:18). While Paul delivers a ‘persuasive argument of [God’s] wisdom’ on the righteousness of faithfulness without referring to the Holy Spirit being at work at all in Romans chapters 1:17-4:25, he delivers ‘demonstration of Spirit and [God’s] power’ in chapters 5-8, in which he reports on the Holy Spirit being at work here and now by interceding and reporting God’s cognition on the Christ event inside of our weak flesh (Rom.6:18-19,1Cor.2:4). The Holy Spirit intercedes for us ‘with sighs’ from the inmost of our souls ‘according to God’; ‘the Spirit helps us in our weakness’ (Rom.8:26-27). By articulation and mediation in the comprehensive understanding of matters before God and matters before man, and further the intermediary work of the Holy Spirit and the treason of personified sin, *Romans* can be read without falling into contradictions (Rom.11:33).

According to his own awareness and declaration, Paul intends to convey his speech act itself as being carried out within ‘the gospel’, that is, ‘the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes [i.e., everyone whose faith God is pleased with]’ (Rom.1:16). Paul’s basic approach in proclaiming the gospel in Romans consists in the complexity of his *ergon* (work, deed, practice) and its articulation by *logos* (word, account, theory). 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 means of word and work (*logōi kai ergōi*), in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of Spirit (15:18-19).

In this passage of Romans, Paul explains his own cognition with clear awareness of his own missionary work in virtue of both his word and work hitherto and hereafter: Paul proclaims the Gospel and practices signs and wonders ultimately in the power of the Spirit of God which Christ brought so that Gentiles may be convinced to believe in the gospel. It is reasonable to suppose that unless a creature like Paul himself is set in a new relationship with God, he cannot convey what he intends to convey. This basic approach in proclaiming the Gospel is shared by Jesus of Nazareth too. This basic method of cooperation by means of word and work is found in the Gospel according to Luke too. It is reported that two disciples of Jesus talked ‘concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who was a prophet mighty in work and word (*ergōi kai logōi*) before God’ to the resurrected Jesus himself without noticing him on the way to the village of Emmaus (Luk.24:19). The Gospel is accomplished by the cooperative works of the heavenly Father and the Son in their words and works.

This passage, however, suggests also that given that the word (*logos*) and the work (*ergon*) are juxtaposed against each other, they are somehow contrasted with the other. They must have their own characteristics, although it can be compatible with the claim that the Spirit is at work here and now in virtue of Paul’s argument (*logos*) 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. In this passage, while it is alleged that Paul’s letter describes the works of God and of the Spirit, and of God’s association with man and the interaction between them which are brought by Christ, it remains his own speech act. This speech act may be a constituent of the compound work together with the works of God and of Spirit. Considering this *possibility* (this is a mere utterance from a limited human perspective), we can at least confirm that insofar as the word and work which Christ brought through Paul is introduced by his remark that ‘I will not dare to speak anything save those..’, his whole letter is a human practice (*ergon* being at work here and now) in terms of uttering words in the most basic sense of *ergon* and also in the minimum sense. 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 the Creator and the Mediator and their relationship with creatures under the constraints of human language.

Paul finds two steps between listening human words and believing with understanding them so as to call on God as follows; ‘How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they preach, except they be sent? Even as it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that bring glad tidings of good things! (Rom.10:14-15). 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. Each content of ‘word and work’, however, can be sorted out as something independent in itself, by distinguishing the peculiar language layers contained in the letter. This method is called ‘semantic analysis.’

In the history of philosophy, Aristotle is the man who systematically develops the method of complementariness between *logos* and *ergon*, such as theory and practice, hypothesis and verification, demonstrative universal knowledge and particular heuristic inquiry, demonstration and induction, and the account of the meaning of a term and the thing referred by the term being at work. In one passage of his *Nicomachean Ethics*, he writes that ‘Hence it appears that true theories (*logōn*) are most useful, not only with a view to knowledge, but with a view to life also; this is because the arguments are entrusted by means of their being in harmony with the works (*tois ergois*). Therefore, they encourage those who understand them to guide their lives by them’ (*NE.XI.1172b3-8*). Any theory can be entrusted by verifying it here and now. Since Aristotle developed a method that reliably advances thought and knowledge, it is reasonable to assume that his philosophy has been profoundly influential in guiding history. Thus, it is reasonable to suppose, concerning the Pauline methodology of thought, that when he engaged in a philosophical analysis of God’s revealing acts, he tried to persuade Jews and Gentiles by offering a semantic analysis of God’s works and its relations with human works which is handed down throughout the history of Israel till God’s revelatory acts in Jesus Christ, according to the Aristotelian method (with or without knowing it).

1:2 Semantic analysis

By ‘semantic analysis’ we mean, on the whole, a human intellectual activity which considers relationships among three matters: the language either written or spoken, the soul of the relevant language user, and the world which is signified and referred to by the relevant linguistic act as the manifestation of the relevant soul by means of a system of symbols. We follow the Aristotelian realist account of meaning. Aristotle writes of the relationships among these three matters as follows: ‘Spoken sounds are symbols of affections in the soul, and written marks are symbols of spoken sounds. And just as written marks are not the same for all, neither are spoken sounds. But what these are in the first place (*prōtōs*) signs of affections in the soul are the same for all, and what these affections are likenesses of things in the world are clearly the same for all’ (*De Int.16a3-8*).

When someone’s linguistic expressions in speaking and writing successfully convey the meaning of terms and sentences which are composed of the terms to his/her community members so as to communicate each other, they are ordered in a system of phonetics and syntax of the relevant language. They are called ‘symbols’ because they substitute *primarily* (*prōtōs*) for affections in the soul and then in the successful things which they are designed to signify through speaking and writing. While they are not ‘the same for all’ according to the differences of language systems, such as English and Japanese, they are the same for all in terms of the affections in the soul of which linguistic expressions are primarily their signs. This is because what occurs in the soul such as perception and thought is basically caused by the

thing/event in the world. On the basis of the soul's faculties of being made like the agents in the world, Aristotle develops a realist account of how the meaning of a term and a sentence is determined. What determines the meaning of a term and a sentence is ultimately the external thing in the world. David Charles comments that 'In cases of successful thinking and perceiving, entities in the world liken the relevant faculty to themselves. Likening is a causal process in which the starting point is (e.g.) a particular external object'¹

Since linguistic expressions through 'symbols' and 'signs' in a man-made system is 'primarily' concerned with the soul of man, we can understand the meaning of an empty term such as 'Pegasus' and 'Goatstag'. Soul's mediation between word and world enables people to talk about the meanings of non-existent terms, insofar as the relevant system of symbols which resides in the soul is coherent. While 'Goatstag' does not exist in this world, its meaning can be understood as 'half goat and half stag', insofar as goats and stags respectively exist and liken the affections in the soul. Terms and sentences constitute a coherent language network, insofar as they convey a coherent system of meanings. This network primarily resides in the soul.

We carry out a semantic analysis of Paul's Letter to Romans by sorting out how many coherent language networks there are. In Romans, the relevant agents are God, Jesus, Christ, Holy Spirit, Paul the speaker, and people who are referred to by 'I', 'we', 'you' and 'they.' The relevant things signified and referred to by the words and sentences are the matters before (in sight of) God, before (in sight of) man and the matters bridged between God and man through the work of the Holy Spirit. Agents, utterances, and their meanings constitute *sui generis* independent language networks. We have sorted out five mutually independent language networks according to the agents involved and the meanings which are determined by the relevant realities referred to by these words.

1:3 A language of revelation sorted out by semantic analysis: Paul's general method of dealing with God's revelatory acts - *Logos* and *Ergon*

When Paul delivers God's cognition, judgment and act within this constraint, he maintains 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 cognitions and acts. Insofar as we adopt the realist account of the meaning of a term, the content of God's revelation should be primarily treated as reality in the sight of God. 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 actually is. The significance of a term is fixed by an object in the world through the causal impact of the object against a human soul.

It is reported that when Jesus said 'Everyone who is of the truth hears my voice', Pilate then asked Jesus 'What is truth?' (John.18:37-38). Jesus claims of himself that 'I am the way, and the truth, and the life' (14:6). This utterance is true, insofar as Jesus is the way, the truth and the life. Jesus claims that his words and deeds match with reality, that is, matters before God such as God's cognition and will. Jesus testifies through his faithful life that God reveals human nature is supposed to have eternal *life* and thus he is the *way* of mediation between man and God. In a word, Jesus claims that his being testifies to any *true* matter before God and before man.

Among various theories of truth, we commit to the correspondence theory of truth on the basis of the coherence theory of truth. The correspondence between word/language and world/reality requires a coherent and consistent language network as its constituent. Wittgenstein says that 'When we first begin to

believe anything, what we believe is not a single proposition, it is a whole system of proposition'². Even if a whole system is open for further investigation, it is required that a system which contains a certain amount of words and sentences must be coherent in itself. A coherent language network primarily resides in the soul, through which it may refer to corresponding realities/facts in the world. If it is successful, components of the network refer to their corresponding things/events. Thus, by bracketing the correspondence between word and reality for a while, it is legitimate to discuss and examine whether a language system is coherent in itself. According to basic epistemology, knowledge is defined as a justified true belief. For instance, a belief that 'it is a fine day' turns out to be knowledge by observing the clear blue sky, insofar as it is fine today. Aristotle says, concerning the cognitive aspect of the word 'belief', that 'Every opinion is accompanied by belief, belief is accompanied by understanding, and understanding is accompanied by account of reason' (*De An*, III3.428a21f). Without believing a sentence to be true, there is no opinion or judgement; without understanding and being convinced of it, there is no belief; and without having an account of reason, there is no understanding or knowledge. The reasoning must be derived from the reality so as to produce its knowledge. Our cognitive processes begin with opinion and judgement based on perception and thought which accompany beliefs and their coherent system and then form some reasonings to justify them. Finally understanding and knowledge of how the world is come about on these bases.

Paul also commits to this pre-requisite constituent of belief/faith for knowledge, when he says that 'So faith comes from what is heard, and what is heard comes by the preaching of Christ' (Rom.10:17). Man forms a belief through gaining pieces of information on the basis of what is heard and taught. In general, any knowledge claim presupposes the notion of truth according to which the matching or correspondence between a claim/proposition and its relevant thing/event is confirmed.

Paul makes a knowledge claim on the basis of the Christ event which is revealed in the course of history, by believing that his utterance and sentence are true in the sense of corresponding to God's cognition and will which are revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul claims that 'We *know* that the old man of ours was crucified with him so that the body of sin might be destroyed, and we might no longer be enslaved to sin' (Rom.6:6). This utterance delivered by the past tense cannot be understood as a meaningful sentence, unless the Holy Spirit is at work in interceding at the time of his utterance by assisting and reminding Paul of God's cognition on the cross that the death of Jesus was Paul's death of his old self. This knowledge claim is based on both the Christ event as a revealed fact in the past and the Holy Spirit's intercession being at work here and now. This claim is said to be 'an *ergon* language' composed of the cooperative work of two entities, that is, the Holy Spirit and Paul. By 'an *ergon* language', we mean that unless a particular utterance being at work here and now is presupposed, the utterance would not be meaningful. When Paul wrote 6:6, unless the Holy Spirit was at work in intercession by traversing the past Christ event and the present inmost part of Paul's soul, it would become a false statement.

In Romans chapters 5-8, Paul develops 'our' testimony under the awareness that the act of intercession by the Holy Spirit is being at work here and now. For instance, the utterance in the present perfective sentence that 'God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given to us' is true, insofar as the Holy Spirit is at work in interceding between God and people who are referred to by 'us' at the time of utterance, by conveying God's love in Jesus Christ 'according to [the will of] God (*kata theon*)' in continuation (Rom.5:5,8:27). On the other hand, in Romans 3:21-4:25, Paul explicitly develops his theory of righteousness based on faithfulness according to God's revealing act through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, without referring to the Holy Spirit's being at work, so as to be theoretically and universally understood as something coherent and valid. This argument can be 'a *logos* language' which is carried out by reason alone, or 'the persuasive argument of [God's] wisdom' (Rom.5:18, 1Cor.2:4). Also, in his argument of predestination in Romans 9:6-11:36, there is no occurrence of the word

‘Holy Spirit’. This fact shows that Paul is quite aware of his methodology of preaching the Gospel by word and work. He says that ‘I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise’ (1:14).

Given that Paul is clearly aware of discerning his ways of persuasion either by employing the Holy Spirit’s or God’s wisdom (if we are allowed to say this, as if we can control the Holy Spirit), it compels us to apply a semantic analysis to all 433 verses of the text of Romans by sorting out the language layers in which he delivers the Gospel by means of *logos* and *ergon*. When we undertake this semantic analysis of Romans, we find out that Paul articulated plural networks of language for each of them to be independent and coherent. Readers can be reassured with the discovery of coherence in these passages, in that while Paul is committed to reality before God, he is coherent in his arguments. Our basic and simple hypothesis in this semantic analysis, which would hopefully be agreed to by Paul himself, is that God is a language user. He says that ‘the words of God were entrusted to the Jews’(Rom.3:2). God must have his own language networks with the meanings of the relevant terms. Paul, in our view, constitutes five mutually independent and coherent language networks; [A] the revelation of God’s righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (1:17,3:21-26), [B] the revelation of God’s wrath from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men under the Mosaic law (1:18-32) and [C] autonomous free and responsible human beings (e.g.3:27-31). There are also two language networks, one of which is the compound one symbolized as [D], between [A] and [C] mediated by the Holy Spirit here and now, and the other of which is the compound one symbolized as [E], between [B] and [C] mediated by Sin personified. One characteristic of these two layers [D] and [E] consists in that Paul’s utterances are true insofar as they are mediated by the Holy Spirit or Sin personified here and now, although each of them can be universally stated with some alterations such as transforming it in a conditional sentence in the coherent networks.

In our context, what God thinks and acts primarily establishes the reality before God 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 of Himself (3:22,1:18 (‘from heaven’)). Then, it grounds and endorses the meanings of the relevant terms which a speaker like Paul utters by gazing at reality. In spite of the limits of human language, Paul assumes that he can deliver what God’s cognition and will are concerning human beings. With respect to the human cognitive faculty called ‘intellect (*nūs*)’, Paul is confident that no matter how deep and unsearchable ‘God’s wisdom’ is, what is revealed through Jesus Christ can be known: ‘Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your intellect, that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect’ (Rom.11:33,12:2). The will of God, what is good and acceptable, can be known through the work of intellect.

Paul’s realist attitude in language is supported by his employment of the term ‘revelation (*apokaluphsis*)’ which implies independent reality in the following three passages (1:17 (3:21),18, 8:18(2:6)). This word in its verbal form in these passages conveys God’s revealing acts towards human beings. The word ‘revelation’ is crucial to opening the new dimensions of reality in the sight of God as [A] (1:17,3:21) and [B] (1:18,2:6). Its third and last occurrence conveys the revelation of a new heaven and earth in the day of last judgment (A and/or B) (8:18, cf.2:6). When Paul reports the revelation, the language space formed in the report is presented as the event thoroughly in the sight of God without involving any human initiative (except Jesus of Nazareth in some sense). 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 reveals 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 be primarily understood by God. This is what Paul reports as [A] and [B].

An *ergon* language of revelation here and now consists of four components. Paul's reports of God's revelation of his righteousness involve the parallel items of (a1, b1) the revelatory act, (a2, b2) its content, (a3, b3) its mediation and (a4, 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 here and now. Therefore, Paul's reports of God's being at work here and now can be sorted out in universal statements in a general way as being independent and coherent as well. *Ergon* and *logos* are mutually complementary.

God's cognition of man through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ can be called [A] 'a report of the revelation of righteous man in Gospel' or 'a language of self-completeness of the righteous man before God under the law of faithfulness'. 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 people 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). God was faithful and thus righteous, when his promise was realized in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. When Paul gazes at 'the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' which is not separated from God's righteousness and forms 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*)', 'this opportunity' and 'justifying anyone on the basis of Jesus' faith'. The subsequent passages in 4:1-25 are Paul's endorsement for this language of revelation on the basis of the relevant passages of the Old Testament (This is also labelled [A] too for the sake of simplicity of argument without particularly distinguishing its particular *ergon* from its universal *logos*, insofar as a particular work can be in some way universalized.).

Likewise, God makes known his righteousness based on works as the wrath from heaven through the Mosaic law of works or 'the law written in men's hearts' to evil doers (cf.2:15). God's cognition of man through the law can be labeled as [B] 'a report of the revelation of God's wrath against sins of people under the law of works' or 'a language of self-completeness of God's wrath against sins of people before God under the law of works.' He reveals his righteousness based on works by applying the Mosaic law to certain types of human deeds (1:18-32). 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). God is righteous when he carries out his works by punishing this ungodliness and unrighteousness according to distributive justice, such as 'an eye for an eye' or simply in virtue of 'giving them up' by letting them do evil things (1:24,28). When Paul gazes at 'the law of works' and forms the words, it constitutes an independent language network of 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'. The following passages of 2:1-3:20 are Paul's endorsement for this language of revelation on the basis of the relevant passages in the Old Testament (This is also labelled [B] too for the sake of simplicity of argument without particularly distinguishing its particular *ergon* from its universal *logos*).

1:4 Complexed *erga* (works) between matters before God and matters before man

When Paul, in turn, gazes at mankind as being independent of God's initiative, he describes the reality from a man-centric perspective. We shall call the people of this third group [C] 'relatively autonomous and neutral beings both for righteousness and sin' who live in their responsible freedom. Paul describes this third type by saying, 'I speak after the manner of men (*anthrōpinon*) because of the weakness of your flesh' (6:19). 'Flesh' means a principle of life for a natural entity having a body made of earth such as 'flesh of men and another flesh of beasts and another flesh of birds' (1Cor.15:39). 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 of the spiritual realm as his/her own constituent. This phrase, 'after the manner of men' 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.

The other two (fourth [D] and fifth [E]) networks are concerned with this third one, signifying the weak autonomous flesh which is interceded or by [D] the Holy Spirit or tempted by [E] sin. While the Holy Spirit intercedes here and now between God's will and man, sin which is personified tries to be parasitic to the letters of God's law of works by making use of it and leads man into death before God through biological death which is 'the wage of sin' (6:23). The bridge between before God and before man is made here and now by the Holy Spirit so that the utterance will be false, if there is no intercession between them at the time of utterance. For instance, Paul's claim that [Ergon D] 'Love of God has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given to us' will be false, if there is no intercession at the time of utterance (5:5). This utterance in a particular time and place, which is called 'an *ergon* language', can be claimed universally without considering the context of utterance such as [Logos D] 'Whenever the love of God is poured into our hearts, it is through the intercession of the Holy Spirit' which is called 'a *logos* language'.

The medium of the Holy Spirit interceding for us here and now conveys the Christ event as a present event in our inmost soul, while the Christ event is expressed by the past tense. This is because the Holy Spirit, which freely comes and goes in time and space like 'the wind', conveys God's will to the faithful people (cf. John.3:8). For instance, such past sentences as 'Since we were justified on the basis of [Jesus'] faithfulness... Now since we were justified in his blood' (Rom.5:1,9) cannot be understood, unless the Holy Spirit intercedes for us here and now by ensuring that the past Christ event is our present event which is confirmed in that 'we have peace with God'(5:1). This is Paul's 'demonstration of spirit and [God's] power' being at work here and now.

In Romans, there are some passages which cannot be meaningfully understood without presupposing the work of the Holy Spirit. We construe that Romans chapters 5,6,8 are basically constituted by Ergon D language. In these chapters, in our 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 utterances are true. The characteristic of Ergon D language is not to sever the language before God from 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 to 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 to the Christ event

in the 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, we shall simply make a claim that the past tense is employed to signify the Christ event which took place in Golgotha *circa* CE.30.

Romans 6:6-11 offers a good example of 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 understanding all other passages involving the past tense consistently. Paul says:

Knowing this (*ginōskontes*), that the old man of ours *was crucified with him* (*sunestaurhōthē* [aor.2, pass.]), that the body of sin might be done away, so that we should no longer be in bondage to sin; for he that was put to death has been 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, see note7).

This passage clearly indicates a layer of reality. Paul's utterance comes from gazing at an actual place where God recognizes that all people who believe died as 'the old man of ours (*ho palaios hēmōn anthrōpos*)' together with Christ in his actual death on the cross. According to Paul's report by employing the past tense, God regards the death of Christ as involving the death of the old man whose faith God is pleased with at that time of the events 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. What is known in Paul through the intermediary work of the Holy Spirit here and now is that the death of the old man of ours brought liberation from our sins. This is because the Holy Spirit, which traverses time and space freely like 'the wind', intercedes with God's cognition on the death of Jesus in the bottom of the souls of his faithful people so as to make certain the content of their belief and bestow peace to them.

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 [A] the Christ event and [C] '*the old man of ours*' represented by Paul himself whose body still lives in [C] horizon. We take it that this is an Ergon D language in Paul's awareness. If we concede the weakness of flesh, it is described as Er.C (a-in C) (where 'Er.C' stands for being at work here and now which is described from the man centric perspective, such as Paul's being aware of the death of his old man and 'a-in C' (with a small letter 'a' instead of [A]) stands for a matter before God, insofar as it is understood by human cognitive capacity [C]). This concession of weakness does not prevent us from being simultaneously interceded upon by Spirit. In chapters 5,6,8, Paul is on the whole engaged in the demonstration of Spirit and power in the *ergon* language, putting aside the persuasive argument of wisdom in the *logos* language. 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.

Concerning Paul's interesting discussions on [E] language in chapter 7, we can only point out in this proposal his assertion from the perspective of the Gospel, which has been demonstrated by verse 6 of chapter 7 and thus liberated from the law of works by saying that 'we were discharged from the law, having had died to that wherein we were held'(7:6).

With the presentation of the Gospel, it can be said that the law of works has been given a new function to drive people from pursuing the righteousness of works, which is inevitably doomed to fail, to the righteousness of faithfulness realized by Jesus of Christ, as it is said ‘Christ is the goal of the law’(10:4).

The traditional law of works is now assigned to a new role as a tool for repentance by invoking agonies of sin, as it is said that ‘the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. Did that which is good, then, being death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good, in order that sin might be shown to be sin, and might become exceedingly sinful through the commandment. We know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin...O wretched, I, a man!’ (Rom7:12-13). This first person ‘I’ is employed as the respondent to a commandment which is addressed by the second singular pronoun ‘you should not covet’ (7:7). According to semantic analysis, this is a fictional entity which signifies anyone who is tempted by the sin addressing ‘You’. It refers to any speaker who lives under the law of works in one’s own responsibility. The sin is personified, just as the serpent in the garden, so as to tempt a man by being parasitic of the letters of the law. The new role of law is to provoke a conflict among three competitors; that is, the commandment, the sin personified, and the intellect of ‘inmost man’ in ‘I.’ It does not matter whether ‘I’ refers to Paul himself before or after his conversion. Paul argues that anyone whosoever is addressed by the commandment should be in conflict by shouting the misery of ‘I.’ When personified sin is at the work of temptation (we symbolize ErE), ‘I’ is supposed to cry ‘O wretched, I, a man!’ so that any speaker or any man who calls oneself ‘I’ under sin’s temptation is urged to repentance by transferring to faithfulness from the law through the agony of sin (7:24). Paul chooses ‘I’ in order to depict the three-way conflict dramatically and universally by demonstrating, on the one hand, the holiness of the law of works and depicting, on the other hand, how sin tempts man and how man overcomes it. Thus chapter 7 is immediately followed by chapter 8 in which the intercession of the Holy Spirit is at work here and now in the context of transferring from agony of sin to peace and victory.

In general, the Holy Spirit is at the work of intercession with sighs in the bottom of the hearts of ‘the saints’ by conveying the matters of Christ in God’s cognition to be the matters of these persons as ‘being the sons of God’ (Rom.8:19,8:27). Paul says that ‘the Spirit helps us in our weakness; for we do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words’ (Rom.8:26). 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 as ‘for us’ by saying ‘Who shall separate us from the love of Christ?’ (8:35).

In other passages as well, Paul employs 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 tense is the event of the people who are referred to as ‘we’, including Paul himself. This can be explained in the same way as the one about Romans 6:6-11, quoted above.

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 (cf. Ps.139). Man is a relatively autonomous creature of God, insofar as he/she is free and responsible (cf. Ps.8:5).

1:5 On the cognitive faculties being at work: towards reconciliation of Catholicism and Protestantism

We briefly consider Paul's theory of mind and body in grasping the nature and relationship of flesh, ensouled body and inmost man. Soul as the principle of life as constituted by 'flesh' and 'the inmost man (*ho esō anthrōpos*)' in which 'intellect (*nūs*)' and 'spirit (*pneuma*)' potentially reside, as they are to be 'refreshed' each occasion 'in newness of spirit' as the locus of heart's cognition of intelligible things and heart's passive states such as 'God's peace surpassing every intellect' (Rom.7:6,25,8:1-4, 12:2, phil.4:7). Paul says that 'If anyone is in Christ, he/she is a new creature'(2Cor.5:17).

Concerning the [C] man-centric autonomous perspective, while flesh is the commanding part of a living natural *body* being in itself neutral with respect to righteousness and sin, 'the inmost man' is where intellect and spirit take place according to the initiative acts of their objects such as the Holy Spirit (Rom.8:1-13, 1:3, 6:19-20, 1Cor.15:39, 2Cor.3:3,Phil.2:6-7). 'Flesh' is not merely identical with body. This is because while Paul says in the past tense 'when we were in *the flesh*' because of his understanding of there to be plural principles of our life, he cannot say 'when we *were* in *the body*', insofar as we are living in this world as a non-separate entity between soul and body (Rom.7:5). Since 'we' live not merely according to the flesh but are able to live according to the spirit which is a more basic principle of life, the flesh is ordered and subsumed by the spirit. If the Holy Spirit is at work in the inmost man who 'walks not after the flesh, but after the spirit', the whole man is now to be refreshed and ordered by the works of spirit and intellect so as to unify and gradually bring about life to the whole body as well (8:1,10-11).

Thus Paul orders 'Do not be conformed to this world but be transformed by the renewal of your intellect, that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect' (12:2). Paul claims that man can know God's will in such a way that the faculty of intellect is renewed by the objects of intellect e.g., the will of God, not by immediately grasping the intelligible objects in the manner of the articulated proposition but in the manner of a direct impact from its intelligible object, either hitting (knowing) or not hitting (being ignorant), without falling into falsity because of the passive cognitive faculty. 'Discerning' follows this intuitive work of intellect in the manner of articulating a sentence such as 'this is the thing which God is pleased with'.

The Holy Spirit may intercede in such cases as knowing God's will and may not intercede in such cases as God 'gives up' people to their behaviors of 'all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men' (Rom.1:18-32). Thus, this conditional sentence implies that there may be a case when the Holy Spirit does not dwell in the inmost part of someone's heart. The work of the Holy Spirit belongs to God's freedom. We have no right to claim that the Holy Spirit dwells in ourselves all the time, although we believe it here and now.

Jesus also concedes to the weakness of flesh, when he preaches the gospel by parables (cf. Luk,8:9). He teaches about heavenly matters by using earthly matters, even in a relatively autonomous world. When Jesus explains the Jewish tradition on the matter of divorce that 'For the hardness of your heart Moses wrote you this precept', he concedes to it with a warning not to be overcome by the weakness of the flesh (Mak.10:5). At least, we can understand the meanings of the allegedly spirited utterances at a general level by articulating dimensions of language networks between matters before God and matters before man without appealing to the Spirit. *Logos* and *ergon* would have been properly sorted out in Romans, as we claim that Paul is quite aware of his own methodology in their complementarity.

If we focus on Paul's methodology of discerning the *logos* (word, account) from the *ergon* (work, practice), we may be able to classify Catholicism and the Protestantism respectively into two camps without

conflict. Martin Luther, for instance, is committed to the theological language of [D] by appealing to the intercession of the Holy Spirit being incessantly at work (*energein*), 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. Luther says that ‘Faith is a work of God in us, which changes us and brings us to birth anew from God’. Luther also says that ‘One article reigns in my heart, the *Fides Christi* (Faithfulness of Christ), from which, through which, and in which (*ex quo, per quem et in quem*) all my theological thoughts flow day and night’. Calvin also claims that ‘this [severing between [A] and [C]] would be, as it were, to render Christ asunder (*quasi Christum discernere*)’.³ This adherence to the language of [D] is adhering to the complexity of *erga* (works) in any man of faith here and now. This is the gist of Protestantism.

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, when he says ‘How is it that you sought me? Haven’t you known that I must be in my *father’s* house’, although ‘father’ is used by homonymy (Luk.2:49).

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. This assumes that the Holy Spirit is at work anytime where our faith is at work. Indeed, the content of our faith must be this, that we are chosen and loved by God as sons/daughters of God here and now through Jesus Christ.

On the other hand, Paul seems to be more cautious in explaining the Holy Spirit’s work of intercession between God and man. He employs a conditional sentence and writes that ‘If Christ is in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit is life because of righteousness. If the Spirit of him that raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead shall also give life to your mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwells in you’ (Rom.8:10-11).

Catholicism consists in severing the dimensions of [A] from [C] in terms of account (*logos*), although the Holy Spirit may be at work (*energein*) at any time. Catholicism includes man-centric ethics such as Aristotelian virtue theory, according to which man is supposed to be virtuous up to the sage (*sapiens*) and the saint (*sanctus*) levels. Insofar as the *logos* and the *ergon* are distinguished in terms of account, we suggest that Protestantism and Catholicism can be reconciled with each other. We cannot pursue this issue further. In our proposal, we focus on the analyses of the language of revelations so as to offer a new interpretation of the passage 3:21-31. We will show that when the mistranslation of the crucial passage in Romans 3:22 is corrected, many theological controversies can be resolved.

1:6 The framework for any theological and biblical interpretation

In Section 2, we offer a new translation of the relevant texts which are divided by the relevant language networks of [A], [B] and [C]. We will analyze Pauline languages in his Romans from the perspective of semantic analysis in the commensurate dimensions of both people who believe and people who do not. We offer Paul’s mutually coherent and independent language networks so as to be understood by everyone without considering his biblical, historical and theological backgrounds. In effect, we can at least establish the basic constraints within which any kind of biblical and theological interpretations should be carried out.

We believe that this attitude is shared by Paul himself, who keeps this commensurability in mind as his clear intention, when he appeals to Gentiles apart from Jews and proclaims the Gospel as understandable for anyone; ‘I am under obligation both to Greeks and to barbarians, both to the wise and to the unwise’ (Rom1:14). Thus, it is reasonable for him to argue by distinguishing matters before God from matters before man, and *logos* from *ergon*, so as to convince Gentiles and wise people without appealing to any work of the Holy Spirit.

This semantic analysis may be primarily established 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, we will hopefully reduce excessive, subjective and even historical interpretations of the text⁴. In this proposal, however, we do not stay merely in the pre-stage of historical, theological interpretations. We will offer new theological understanding of Paul’s arguments by making it clear that a current human language such as Greek, however it is limited, can capture God’s initiative revelatory acts including his will, cognition and judgment on mankind.

In this proposal, as a necessary consequence of the semantic analysis of Romans 3:19-31, we will suggest several different translations and interpretations from the traditional ones. In his commentary on 3:21-26, E. Käsemann assessed this passage as ‘one of the most difficult and unclear passages (der schwerfälligsten und undurchsichtigsten) of the whole letter’⁵. On the contrary, we will make it clear that this passage can be clearly analyzed and understood by offering a new translation without leaving any room for different readings. While we primarily show the consistency in the mooted passages of Paul’s Romans, we suggest some theological consequences which can be derived because of the force of arguments themselves on the basis of this linguistic analysis. We present five theological theses concerning the non-separateness of God’s righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (Theses 2:1-2:5). These may shed new light on ongoing theological debates. Then we present our own proposal (Theses 2:6-2:8) on some theological debates such as the fairness or impartiality of God, justification by faith based on Section One and Romans 3:27-31.

2. Main Theses: On the crucial sentence ‘For there is no separation [between God’s righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ]’ (Romans 3:22).

2:0 - The translations of the relevant passages [A], [B] and [C] are as follows.

Text [A] 1:16-17 and [B] 1:18

¹⁶ The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes, Jews first and Greeks.

¹⁷[A] For God’s righteousness is revealed in him [Jesus Christ] on the basis of [God’s] faithfulness to [man’s] faithfulness, just as it is written ‘The righteous lives on the basis of [God’s] faithfulness’.

¹⁸[B] For wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold down the truth in unrighteousness.

Text [B] 3:19-20 is Paul’s conclusion of the report of [B] God’s revelation of wrath (1:18-32) and of its arguments (2:1-3:18) based on the Old Testament.

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 Therefore every flesh on the basis of a law of works will not be justified. For there is [God's] knowledge of sin through a law.

Text [A] 3:21-26 is the report of God's revelation of his righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.

²¹ But now apart from a law, God's righteousness being witnessed by the law and the prophets, ²² God's righteousness has been manifested through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ to all people who believe. For there is no separation [between the righteousness of God and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ]. ²³ This is because all people committed sins and are fallen short of the glory of God, ²⁴ and are now the people being justified as a gift by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus, ²⁵ whom God set forth as a locus of divine presence in his blood through the faithfulness resulting in the demonstration of his righteousness because of the passing over of sins committed beforehand ²⁶ in God's forbearance, for a demonstration of his righteousness in this opportunity in which he might himself also be righteous, in justifying the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faith'.

Text [C] 3:27-31 is Paul's conclusion of his own interpretations drawn from [A] God's revealing act of non-separate righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ and [B] God's revealing act of his wrath.

²⁷ Where then is the boasting? It is excluded. By what kind of law? Of works? No, but by the law of faithfulness. ²⁸ We recognize therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from a law of works. ²⁹ Or is God the God of Jews only? Isn't he the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, ³⁰ since there is indeed one God who will justify the circumcised on the basis of faith, and the uncircumcised through the faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]. ³¹ Do we then nullify a law [of works] through the faithfulness? May it never be! No, we confirm a law.

Theses 2:1 - The basicness of God's faithfulness

'No separation' explains why (Thesis 2:1) God's righteousness is now revealed 'apart from a law' and (Thesis 2:2) why it is revealed 'to all people who believe' rather than all who observe the law:

Text: ²¹ But now apart from a law, God's righteousness being witnessed by the law and the prophets, ²² God's righteousness has been manifested through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ to all people who believe. **For** there is no separation [between the righteousness of God and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ].

Because of their non-separateness, the law of faithfulness is more fundamental than the law of works, which can be separated from the righteousness of God as a matter before God.

Paragraph [A] 3:21-26 is Paul's report of God's cognition, will and deed on His righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. This report is a specification of a language of revelation in 1:17 that 'God's righteousness is revealed in him [Jesus Christ] on the basis of [God's] faithfulness to [man's] faithfulness'. Since the word 'being revealed' is used in 1:17, 'being manifested' is employed in 3:21 as its specification involving clearness with respect to the knowledge between the revealer and recipients in the sight of God.

According to Paul's report, God regards that His righteousness which is revealed in Jesus' faithful life is a matter of faithfulness both for God's side and man's side. God shows this by saying 'through the *faithfulness*... to all people who *believe*' that 'God's faithfulness (*tēn pistin tū theū*)' is something which is

to be received by a corresponding faithfulness, so that their faithful relationship is bi-lateral and reciprocal because of its basicness of soul which is applied to both God and man⁶. In other words, man can respond to God's faithfulness which is revealed through his Son with nothing but his/her faithfulness. This faithfulness on man's part should be placed in the most basic part of each heart, called 'the inmost man', as the source of any positive and creative activity both for God and his creature man (Rom.3:3,5:5, 7:22,2Cor.4:16). Paul characterizes the occurrence of faith in the inmost man under the auspices of the Holy Spirit, by saying that 'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in *to believe*, that you may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Spirit'(Rom.15:13).

In 3:21-26, 'Now' what is revealed as a cognition and a deed of God is the non-separate relationship between God's righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. The issue of being separate or non-separate with respect to God's righteousness indicates which law, either 'of works' or 'of faithfulness', is more basic for God (3:27). While the Christ event is witnessed by the law and the prophets, God's revealing act through this event is different from the Mosaic law of works which conveys another aspect of God's righteousness. 'Apart from a law', another kind of righteousness is revealed through the Christ event. This indicates that the law of faithfulness, which is not separate from God's righteousness, is more fundamental for God than the traditional law. This is because God recognizes in Himself, as it is said that 'For there is no separation', that the faithfulness of Jesus Christ is not separate from His own righteousness. Anything positive in contrast with the Mosaic law must be inferred and recognized from this basic revelation.

This text presupposes a history of Israel up to the fulfillment of God's promise. God regards that 'now' indicates the fulfillment of God's new covenant which is 'being witnessed by the law and the prophets' in the history of Israel. Jesus says that 'Neither is new wine put into old wineskins; if it is, the skins burst, and the wine is spilled, and the skins are destroyed; but new wine is put into fresh wineskins, and so both are preserved' (Mat.9:17). The Gospel must be put into the law of faithfulness which is newly revealed as the non-separate medium of God's righteousness.

God's faithful righteousness which has been revealed through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ has its origin in God's election of Israel and His promise or covenant with His people. Paul reports 'God's faithfulness' by reminding the readers of God's fellowship with mankind through the history of His elected people; 'What advantage then has the Jew? Much in every way: chiefly the words of God were entrusted to them. For what if some did not believe? Shall their unfaithfulness make the faithfulness of God without effect? By no means: let God be true, but every man a liar' (Rom.3:1-4). God chose His people by His own and only initiative: 'I will be your God and you will be my people' (Lev.26:12). God is the only faithful agent of His election and promise. God's revealing acts are addressed to His elected people in such a way as having entrusted His words to the Jew. While God as the creator of the universe lives in eternal presence as being outside of its time and space, God has renewed His promises to His people, such as Noah, Abraham and Moses in various occasions in the human history especially of His elected people Israel (Gen.9:9, 15:18, Exod.24:7-8). Faithfulness is a basic attribute of God with regard to the mankind, insofar as He associates with His chosen people in faithfulness through His promises. The author of the letter to the Hebrews mentions fourteen people as the representatives of faithful people depicted in the Old Testament (Heb.11:1-39).

According to God's plan, as it is said 'the time is fulfilled', the incarnation of His own son requires preparation for His people in regard to their awareness of the direction of their history so as to understand the significance of the event in Jesus' cross and resurrection (Mak.1:15). The people of Israel were trained by God's law of faithfulness and God's law of works and by God's messengers as prophets so as to know and receive the righteousness of God in blessings and in punishments. In the course of Israel's history, Jeremiah reports God's new covenant that 'Behold, the days come, says the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, says the Lord: But this shall be the covenant;

after those days, says the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people'(Jer.31;31-34). Isaiah prophesizes the realization of a new covenant by Jesus of Nazareth as 'Jehovah's servant' that 'the discipline of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed' (Isaiah,53:5 (*paideia eirēnēs hēmōn*, cf. *musar* (Heb.)). Jesus says, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you' (Luk.22:20).

Paul understands this new covenant to be extended to 'all people who believe'. He quotes the reports of Isaiah: 'But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Isaiah says, 'Lord, who has believed our report?' So then faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, 'their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the end of the world' ... But Isaiah is very bold, and says, 'I was found of them that sought me not; I was made manifest unto them that asked not after me'' (Rom.10:16-20, Isa.65:1-2, 42:6-7). According to God's plan, the election of Israel who initially belongs to the old covenant is now extended to the Gentiles as well. Through the special discipline of his elected people by the law of works, the Gospel of Jesus Christ is now proclaimed as the realization of a new covenant for all people who believe along with the preparation of the history of faithful people. In his lifetime, Jesus basically confines himself to the 'the lost sheep of Israel' by respecting the law of Jews (Mat.15:24). Whenever faith is found, however, among people in any race either Romans or Greeks, he surpasses the tradition according to a deeper law and the plan of God. When he was amazed of the faith of a Syrophoenician woman who asks for the cure of her daughter by saying that 'Truth Lord: yet the dogs eat of the crumbs which fall from their masters' table', Jesus cures the daughter by saying that 'great is your faith: be it unto you even as you will' (Mat.15:21-28).

'The gospel' as 'the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believes' is addressed to 'the Jew first, and also to the Greek' that is Gentiles (Rom.1:16). God's faithfulness is only met by man's faithfulness. This is because it constitutes the basic part of one's soul and also God's soul, insofar as God initiated with a faithful association with human beings. Paul, in fact, describes the basicness of faith in a doubtless and fundamental relationship with God without which all other things are wrong by writing that 'anything which is not based on faithfulness is sin' (Rom.14:23). There is a sign which shows the basicness of faith in human conduct. Believing belongs to a category of mental behaviors in which 'desiring something' and 'conducting it' are simultaneous. In all other cases such as being hungry, becoming a president, there are time lag to accomplish them. Because of this basicness, anyone can have faith insofar as he/she is infant-like towards his/her Heavenly Father, regardless of one's own states of his/her soul in terms of the strength and degrees of character virtues concerning good and bad and cognitive virtues concerning truth and falsity. Jesus commends infant-like faith by saying that 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein'(Mak.10:15). Paul also argues, quoting Psalms 31 that God indeed justifies His faithful people without applying the law of works to them, as it is said that 'Now to one who works, his/her wages are not reckoned as a gift but as his/her due. And to one who does not work but believes him who justifies the ungodly, his/her faith is reckoned as righteousness. So also David pronounces a blessing upon the man to whom God reckons righteousness apart from works: 'Blessed are those whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered; blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not reckon his sin' (Rom.4:4-8). Since to believe is nothing but to accept the content of God's revealing act such as God's faithfulness and righteousness based on its non-separate faithfulness of Jesus Christ, man is supposed to gain access to His righteousness by believing Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ as the mediator.

When the forgiveness of sin is bestowed to all sinners as a free 'gift', it is not appropriate to describe the believing as a *condition* to receive it, because this is the matter of desiring or not. From the human perspective, desiring which can be simultaneously followed by believing is entirely our own discretion. Jesus characterizes this as an infant-like faith.

Paul confirms that the human faith which is preceded by God's faithfulness is simply at work in responding to it without specifying whom he/she believes by simply expressing the act of believing itself.

In an *ergon* language, when a piece of faith emerges in the bottom of the soul here and now by being assisted and prompted by the Holy Spirit, as it is said that ‘God’s love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which was given to us’, the utterance ‘I believe’ is confessed in itself without being accompanied by its object (5:5). Paul says that ‘Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in *to believe*, that you may abound in hope through the power of Holy Spirit’ (Rom.15:13). This suggests God’s initiative of urging to have faith among the human counterparts. Likewise, in a conversation with a father who asks for the cure of his son, Jesus rebukes the father by saying that ‘If you can?’, all things are possible to the person who believes’. Then the father immediately replies that ‘Lord, I *believe*, help you mine unfaithfulness’, where the verb ‘I believe’ is uttered in itself (Mak9:24). Jesus’ powerful reply on faith which is worthy of surprise implies the basicness of faithfulness, according to which any positive deed and fruit are derived and produced from faithfulness.

Paul simply confirms the basicness of faith as ‘anything which is not based on faithfulness is sin’ (Rom.14:23). This basicness leads to the claim that the righteousness based on faithfulness, that is, the forgiveness of the sins of mankind is what God and Jesus have worked out together in son’s faithful obedience towards the cross as his will. Insofar as anyone who encounters faithfulness, what is left for that person is to confess faith from the bottom of their heart. This reciprocity of faithfulness is derived from the nature of faithfulness, due to its basicness of any affirmative and creative action. Faithfulness can be met by and exchanged only among faithful beings. Paul endorses God’s initiative of faithfulness by quoting a passage from the Old Testament that ‘just as it is written ‘The righteous lives on the basis of [God’s] faithfulness’ (Hab.2:4).

Reflectively speaking, the object of faith can be and should be mentioned together with the confession. Paul says that ‘What does it say? ‘The word is near you, on your lips and in your heart’ This is the word of faith which we preach; because, if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved’ (Rom.10:8-9). Vocal confession before the public is required to sustain a faithful life throughout for any person in the midst of the difficulties of this world. This is nothing but confirming the basicness of faith in each particular occasion so as to order his/her deeds.

In this way, righteousness and sin before God are determined not by observing the Mosaic law, but by ‘believing’ or ‘betraying’ according to the basicness of the law of faithfulness. This much is at least confirmed because of the reciprocity and bi-lateral relationship of faithfulness. God’s initiative of faithfulness in promise and covenant is unchanged in His associations with human beings throughout human history.

Now, this theme of God’s initiative of faithfulness is specified in 3:21-26 by demonstrating the non-separateness between God’ righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. God has shown His righteousness together with His faithfulness through Jesus Christ.

Thesis 2:2 - This basicness of faithfulness explains why God’s righteousness is addressed to all people who believe. The addressees of the revelation is not all people, but ‘all people who believe’, because of God’s non-separate righteousness from the faithfulness of Jesus Christ.

Since His righteousness has been revealed through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, God regards that this righteousness is not only more basic for Himself than the righteousness based on the Mosaic law of works, but also manifests the route of the faithfulness of Jesus Christ as the decisive way for anyone to make access to Himself after this Christ event. In order to mark the era, we shall call the new covenant ‘the non-separate faithful righteousness’. This is derived from ‘righteousness of God’ which is the content of what is revealed ‘through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ’ which is the non-separate medium of God’s revealing act. This new revelation is placed in the history of God’s people within the general framework

of 'righteousness based on the faithfulness (*hē de dikaiosunē ek pisteōs*)' (Rom.10:6). It should be reminded that there has been 'righteousness based on faithfulness' ever since the period of the Old Testament, such as with Noah, Abraham and David, who were the forerunners of 'Justification by Faith' (Rom.ch.4, Heb. Ch.11). The force of this new revelation consists in the non-separateness between God's righteousness and the faithfulness of the mediator. In order for any faith to be employed as the medium of God's revealing act of His righteousness, it must match with 'God's faithfulness' because of the reciprocity of the nature of faithfulness (3:3).

This calls for distinguishing between two senses of 'faith(fulness)' which Paul employs in his letters between [A] 'God's faithfulness' (3:3) and [C] man's faith as a mental state. There are two phases or contexts in which the same word '*pistis* (faith(fulness))' is employed. On the one hand, insofar as [C] human perspective is concerned, there are 'progress', 'growth', 'things lacking' in faith and there are 'weak' people in faith (Phi.1:25, 2Cor.10:15, 1Thesa.3:10, Rom.14:1). In a word, insofar as human mental states are concerned, believers sway and vary from person to person and from time to time. In the language of revelation, on the other hand, [A] God regards '*pistis* (faithfulness) of Jesus Christ' as something which matches His own faithfulness, called 'God's faithfulness', which is non-separate from His righteousness so that it is employed as a medium between God and man so as to show His righteousness and to justify the faithful people (3:3)⁷. This offers the criterion in virtue of which any faith which is seen among people is ordered.

We should grasp the meaning of a term according to the difference between God's matters and man's matters. 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. In Pauline locutions, the noun '*pistis*'(faith(fulness)) is ascribed to both God and man, while the verb '*pisteuō* (believe)' and its conjugations are ascribed only to man (eg.4:3,15:13). This is because 'God's righteousness' and 'God's faithfulness' do not suffer from any change, given that God is Himself in an eternal presence. There is no need to express his eternal characteristics in verbs, although verbs are employed when God deals with human beings here and now through the mediators Jesus Christ and Holy Spirit. When God Himself is reported with respect to His characteristics, Paul does not express them by verbal forms. The agent of a revealing act which is expressed by employing the verbs in active voice such as 'set forth' and 'justify' through Christ event is ascribed to God alone. The active verbs 'believe', 'sin' and 'fall short' are ascribed to men who are in the sight of God, that is, 'men' under God's cognition. Mankind is in flesh before God, so that it is inevitable to be expressed by verbs such as 'believe' and 'being justified'. In these language layers [A] and [B], the human being is rendered by the third person, such as 'they' and 'anyone (*hostis*)', while [C] the C group people are addressed by the subjects 'we' and 'you'.

Romans 3:21-26 is in the language of the [A] group, that is, 'the language of self-completeness of righteous man before God', 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 the flesh. Paul distinguished between the (f1) 'faithfulness of Jesus Christ' (3:22), which I will term (f1), and (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. As it is sated above, this (f2)-type of our own flesh varies from person to person, and also varies from time to time within one person. 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).

God understands '*pistis*(faithfulness)' expressed in the phrase 'the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' as sufficient faithfulness for His revealing act of righteousness. God is pleased with the faith of Jesus of Nazareth so that He bestows upon Him the honored name of 'Jesus Christ' and employs Him as a medium of revealing His righteousness. This implies that while God regards that 'all people who believe' by 'confessing Jesus to be lord' know and receive His righteousness, it is not that 'all people' know His righteousness (Rom.10:9). Without having faith toward Jesus as Christ, God regards that there is no access to His non-separate righteousness. This non-separateness conceptually requires faith on the part of its addressees because of the reciprocity of faith(fulness). Apart from the infant-like faith, we can also say from God's perspective that this should not be misunderstood as *a condition* for anyone to be justified. God did not set a condition for justification to each person, because He has already known what the relevant person is going to do in the future and who is justified by his/her faith *sub specie aeternitatis* (under the aspect of eternity). The phrase 'all people who believe' signifies a characteristic of the recipients which is derived from the nature of the medium of revelation in God's initiative. Because of the non-separate faithfulness of Jesus Christ as the medium of revelation of God's righteousness, it is addressed to the *all* people who believe.

In his reports of God's revealing act, Paul employs the third person singular and plural pronouns such as 'all people who believe', '*hoitines* (whosoever)' and also 'world' which do not specify who he/she is in a concrete context as the addressees of the revelation (Rom.3:22,1:25,32,2Cor.5:19). This is a Pauline device in conveying God's cognition, although there is no doubt that God has known to whom He has revealed His righteousness through and in the mediator. According to God's cognition, the person who has received it *knows* God's righteousness in a general way through the Christ event. When Paul reports this relation as God's cognition and will, the language of revelation does not involve any mental state of having faith on man's part except 'the faith of Jesus' (3:26). What is a matter before God in this revelation is the faith of people of which God is in favor so as to make it sufficient for the knowledge of God's righteousness and for receiving it.

Even if a pious person thinks that he/she knows God's righteousness, God might not agree with it. For God's judgment is not specifically revealed to each particular person in such way as it is revealed through and in Jesus Christ. Even Paul says about his own salvation that '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 in a general way, insofar as he belongs to Jesus Christ as a matter before God.

That is why it is crucial and substantial to have faith on man's part regarding what was revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul orders to people of Rome that 'The faith which you have according to yourself, have it *before God*' (Rom.14:22). The phrase 'before God' is concerned with what is understood by God in terms of 'faith(fulness)'. Insofar as God justifies the faith of each faithful person, God understands his/her faith as the faith based on 'Jesus' faith'. For anyone, to believe is to receive God's cognition through the Christ event so that he/she is 'the one on the basis of Jesus' faith' (3:26).

As a preceding form of justification by faith in the Old Testament, Paul quotes the pioneering case of Abraham that 'the faith was reckoned to Abraham as righteousness' (Rm.4:9, Gen.15:6). On this basis, Paul infers the justification of any of Abraham's descendants who is described as 'anyone at all on the basis of Abraham's faith (*tōi ek pisteōs Abraam*)' (4:16). This expression is the same locution of 'anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faith (*ton ek pisteōs Iesū*)' (3:26). Since it is unthinkable for us to have faith *in* Abraham, this phrase must be also understood as the faith which is held by Jesus of Nazareth. Anyone who follows Jesus' faith will be justified. In fact, Paul quotes passages from the Old Testament about 60 times in this

letter, all of which are positively employed to endorse his arguments. This indicates that Paul never deviates from Jewish tradition so that he may be able to prove God's new covenant to be the fulfillment of promises in the Old Testament. To proclaim Jesus to be Christ is for the salvation of not only Gentiles but also for his brethren Jews (Rom.9:1-5).

In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus emphasizes that the audiences are the sons/daughters of His Heavenly Father; He teaches audiences how to pray by calling on 'Our Father in Heaven' (Mat.6:9). Jesus has held infant-like faith, believing Himself to be the Son of His Heavenly Father, as it is said, 'the faith of [being] son of God (*tē [pistei] tū huiū theū*)' (Gal.2:20). This general description of the recipients of God's righteousness is inevitable, now that righteousness based on faithfulness is the decisive way to be justified for human beings. This is an implication of God's revealing act through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. Just as anyone whose faith God is pleased with is supposed to know His righteousness through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, anyone who follows Jesus' faith is regarded by God to be righteous. It is reasonable to claim that anyone who is in doubt of the Christ event cannot know God's righteousness nor cannot be justified by God due to his/her failure of having proper faith to be pleased with by God.

That is why anyone who lives in the intermediate time between the Christ event and the last judgment and thus between what is made known and what is not made known is required to have faith in one's own responsibility. Since we are not able to specify who the blessed person is, it is essential to believe that the blessed ones are ourselves, simply because of God's love revealed in the Christ event. Paul reports in Romans 3:21-26 what kind of people in general know God's righteousness and are justified by God, by specifying the characteristics of recipients of God's righteousness. It is not made an issue the amount or degree of faith that such people hold as their mental states before man. God indeed justifies His faithful people without applying the law of works to them, as it is quoted before that 'Now to one who works, his/her wages are not reckoned as a gift but as his/her due. And to one who does not work but believes him who justifies the ungodly, his/her faith is reckoned as righteousness'(Rom.4:4-5). Since to believe is nothing but to accept the content of God's revealing act such as God's faithfulness and righteousness based on its non-separate faithfulness of Jesus Christ, man is supposed to make access to His righteousness by believing Jesus of Nazareth to be the Christ the mediator. This is a reason why the addressees of the revelation are not 'all people', nor 'all people who observe the law of works,' but 'all people who believe' in the sight of God.

Thesis 2:3 - On the three components of the phrase '*through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ*'

Since God alone is the agent of his revealing act, the words 'Jesus Christ' are never taken as signifying an agent⁸. The phrase '*through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ*' is taken to be an event as a whole with a preposition 'through' which signifies the medium of God's revealing act, where the 'of' in this phrase is 'the genitive of belonging'⁹. God employed the faithfulness which has belonged to Jesus Christ as the non-separate medium of His righteousness, bridging between His righteousness and all people whose faith God is pleased with. In this paragraph Paul reports God's revealing act, without considering any mental state of man except the one of Jesus of Nazareth. God is pleased well with 'Jesus' faith' which is demonstrated throughout his faithful life until his spontaneous and sacrificial death (3:26). By blessing this historical event, God has exalted Jesus by giving him the honorific title of 'Christ (*Messiah* (the anointed))' so that his whole life is taken as a glorious event. In Pauline letters, a name 'Jesus Christ' is a combination of the proper name 'Jesus' with an honorific name 'Christ' (the anointed) who is ordained by God as a liberator from the law of works and thus a savior. God regards his faithful life to be a whole event which brings about salvation for mankind.

In Galatians, Paul makes '*pistis*' a personification which is accompanied by such verbs as 'to come' and 'to be revealed', where Paul orders God's plan in a sequence of historical events. He describes the

justification by faith as a goal in the course of history of Israel by tracing its relation to the Mosaic law of works: ‘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 we may be justified on the basis of faithfulness’ (Gal.3:22-23). It is noteworthy that the ‘*pistis*(faithfulness)’ here is characterized to be something ‘to come (*elthein tēn pistin*)’ and ‘to be revealed (*tēn mellūsan pistin apokaluphēnai*)’. Revelation of the law to Moses is followed by the revelation of faithfulness which took place in Jesus Christ. This historical consequence of ‘*pistis*’ being revealed marks a decisive point ‘this opportunity’ (3:25) in Romans. While the people of Israel were guarded and disciplined by Mosaic law as their tutors for centuries, this law was overcome by the law of faithfulness, insofar as the commandment of love is subsumed in the law of faithfulness (Rom.13:8-10, Gal.5:6.). We hold that God regards the phrase ‘the faithfulness (*pistis*) of Jesus Christ’ as an event to the effect that the faithfulness belonged to and happened in Jesus Christ, just as it is depicted in Galatians, which characterizes faithfulness something ‘to come’ and ‘to be revealed’ (See note.7).

Therefore, this genitive is not the objective genitive which is a traditional rendering in the sense of man’s having faith in Jesus Christ or the subjective genitive in the sense of the faith which Jesus Christ has. Our mental state of having faith cannot be a medium of God’s revealing act and also, as it is often pointed out, having faith both in the medium and in the addressees, which appears twice, would fall into redundancy. Furthermore, this genitive expressed in ‘Jesus Christ,’ which does not signify any agent, immediately excludes an interpretation of this passage as the subjective genitive (the faithfulness which ‘Jesus Christ’ holds as an agent). A linguistic characteristic of ‘Jesus Christ’, unlike ‘Christ’ and ‘Jesus’, is never taken to be a subject signifying an agent in Pauline letters, while it remains legitimate to make an identity statement with a ‘be’ verb, such as ‘Jesus Christ *is* our lord’(Phil.2:11)¹⁰. This is because Paul could not ascribe *one* action to such a special entity who is both Son of God and wholly man at the same time. Throughout his letters, ‘Jesus Christ’ signifies a mediator between God and man by being both entities, which is accompanied by prepositions such as ‘through’, ‘in’ and ‘according to’ (e.g., 1:8, 3:22, 5:1, 11, 15, 6:3, 11, 7:25, 8:1, 15:5, 30). The God-man nature of Jesus Christ is introduced as follows: ‘The gospel is concerned with his Son, who was born from the seed of David according to the flesh and discerned as Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord’ (Rom.1:3-4). On the other hand, ‘Christ’ and ‘Jesus’ are respectively taken to be agents, such that ‘Christ intercedes for us’ and ‘Jesus took bread’ (Rom.8:34¹¹, 14:9, 15:3, 7, 1 Cor.11:23, See note 6).

Thesis 2:4 (2:4a, 2:4b) - The cooperative work of the redemption of sins through God’s ‘presence’ on the cross of Jesus explains (2:4a) (2:4b) why ‘there is no separation’.

Text:²³This is because [the reason why there is no separation is that] all people committed sins and are fallen short of the glory of God,²⁴ and are now the people being justified as a gift by his grace through the redemption in Christ Jesus,²⁵ whom (2:4a) God set forth as a locus of divine presence in his blood through the faithfulness resulting in the demonstration of his righteousness because of the passing over of sins committed beforehand²⁶ in God’s forbearance, (2:4b) for a demonstration of his righteousness in this opportunity in which he might himself also be righteous, in justifying the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus’ faith’ .

Paul offers explanations in a single long sentence (verses 23-26) for the reasons why there is no separation between God’s righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. God set forth Jesus Christ for the demonstrations of His non-separate righteousness (2:4a) by abiding with him on the cross in his blood

throughout this faithful event and (2:4b) by justifying in this opportunity anyone whose faith God regards it to be on the basis of 'Jesus' faith'.

(2:4a) The first proof of non-separateness: God abided with Jesus on the cross.

In this single long sentence, God's two wills are reported in the course of the paradigm history of Israel. Two groups of human beings are set out through an opportunity of decisive revelation of faithfulness. God's cognition is revealed through the event of the redemption of Jesus Christ, that all people committed sin under the Mosaic law of works.

In the first part of this single long sentence in Romans 3:23-26, it is reported that how God judged all people under the Mosaic law of works was a precondition of this opportunity so as to make it clear what the faithful event of Jesus Christ has brought about. God regards that all people committed sin, insofar as God applied the law of works to all people. Therefore, all people, that is mankind as a whole, have fallen short of receiving the glory of God. In previous chapters Romans 1, 2 and 3, Paul has already reported the revelation of [B] God's wrath, that is, another kind of His righteousness on the basis of God's bestowal of the Ten Commandments to Moses which is reported mainly in Exodus. Its concomitant events, such as idolatry among the people led by Moses, represent a model case in his report of God's wrath in 1:18-32 that 'God's wrath is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and wickedness of men' (1:18)¹². Through the argument for this kind of revelation of God's righteousness in the report of revelation [B] 1:18-32 and its arguments 2:1-3:20 by quoting various passages from the Old Testament, Paul concludes God's judgment about people who live under the law of works: 'Now we know that whatever the law says it speaks to those who are under the law [of works], so that every mouth may be closed, and the whole world may be brought under the judgment of God. Therefore, every flesh before God on the basis of a law of works will not be justified. For there is [God's] knowledge of sin through a law' (3:19-20). Thus, the law of works is now done away with any kind of justification.

Since any one cannot be justified by any work of the law, 'all people' are now to be justified by Christ's redemptory work as a free gift by His grace. God does not consider man's deeds and characters such as virtuous or sinful states of mind. Instead, God considers man through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. God has presented His righteousness to mankind through the cooperative redemptory work with His own Son. All people are now the addressees of God's redemptory work of sin through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ by justifying faithful people under the law of faithfulness. What is left for mankind is to receive this offered gift on the cross. This reception is called 'faith'.

As we have been arguing from man's infant-like perspective and from God's omniscient perspective, this reception is not a *condition* to be justified. One reason for this is that the righteousness based on faithfulness conceptually requires faith on the part of its addressees because of the reciprocal nature of faith (fulness). Faithfulness is the most basic human conduct for any further cognitive development concerning truth as well as any further growth in character concerning goodness. While the deviation of reason falls to fanaticism, the deviation of passive emotion (pathos) such as fear falls to superstition. Without having faith in each counterpart, there occurs no faithful event in any situation. Even Jesus did not and could not perform wonderful cures for ill people, where there was no faith on the counterpart (Mak.6:4-6). Forgiveness of sin does not take place in Jesus' on going life course, where there is no reciprocal faithfulness. The other reason for not considering this as a *condition* for justification is that God has already offered to mankind His righteousness based on His son's non-separate faithfulness. The non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness is a kind of self-contained work between Father and Son which has been bestowed upon the world as a free gift by grace alone. Where there is a gift upfront, no one can raise a condition to be received except, if we should dare to say, the denial of recipient's not desiring. Because of His Son's faithful event, God does not have to impute the trespasses of men to

themselves anymore. God ‘justifies the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus’ faith’. The third reason consists in that God has already known what the relevant person is going to do in the future and who is justified by his/her faith *sub specie aeternitatis* (under the aspect of eternity). God does not have to set a condition on anyone. Because of the non-separate faithfulness of Jesus Christ as the medium of revelation of God’s righteousness, it is addressed to *all* people who believe (Thesis 2:2).

In the language of revelation, God assigns the word ‘redemption (*apolutrōsis*)’ to the role of transitioning from the law of works to the law of faithfulness. A traditional word ‘*apolutrōsis*’ signifies ‘release on the payment of ransom’ as a religious ceremony of offering a sacrifice for the payment of their sins to God. It now conveys a new connotation. ‘Redemption of Jesus Christ’ is to buy all people who committed sins against the law of works through the payment of the sacrificial death of Jesus of Nazareth as the result of his spontaneous and faithful life. God regards that all people have lived at one time under the law of works (cf.5:12,14, Ps.14). Thus ‘redemption’ or ‘buying back’ now signifies the transferring all people who committed sin from the law of works to the law of faithfulness. Insofar as people stick to the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, God does not impute their trespasses to themselves. They don’t have to pay their debt anymore. In the situation that all people must be redeemed, God sacrifices His own Son to gain all people by means of a free gift of redemption. Given the revelation of non-separate righteousness based on the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, which is more basic for God than the one of the traditional law, God regards of Himself that He does not do any injustice in not applying the law of works anymore. Because God’s forbearance of not applying the Mosaic law is to transfer the sinners who were in bondage under the law of works to righteousness under the law of faithfulness which shows God’s more basic righteousness. In the Old Testament, sacrifices were done to fulfill the law of works under the Mosaic law of works. In a parallel passage of Galatians, however, Paul says about the redemption that ‘Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law’ (Gal.3:13). In order to fulfill the law culminating in love, people must be liberated from the bondage of the law, letters of which are doomed to be sin’s lodging places.

Although the previous situation was a negative presupposition of the revelation of the Gospel in which it was expressed by a past tense together with a universal quantification ‘all people *committed* sin’, God recognizes that this past tense is now supposed to be changed into the present tense ‘all people *are* now the people being justified as a gift by his grace (*dikaiūmenoi*: present passive participle)’. God’s justification based on faithfulness as a free gift by grace is the power of redemption in their self-contained work such that it now atones all sins of all people by not exercising the application of the law of works concerning their past sins.

On this historical consideration on the relationship of the two laws, Paul reports God’s cognitions concerning the reason why God’s righteousness which is revealed apart from the law of works is not separated from the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. This is because God set forth Jesus Christ as a locus of His own presence (*hilastērion*) in his blood through the faithfulness, resulting in the demonstration of His righteousness because of the passing over of sins committed beforehand. God was there on the cross where Jesus was suffering with his death cry in the flesh in pursuing the completion of his faithful life. Just as it is reported that Jesus shouts on the cross ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’, Jesus may not be aware in his death cry that his father was abiding with him during his passion (Mat.27:46). We must note that even in this desperate situation, Jesus appeals to no one else but his God. God is pleased well with the faithfulness of Jesus. It is said in a parallel passage of 2 Corinthians that ‘God was *in* Christ reconciling the world to himself, not counting their trespasses in themselves and entrusting to us the message of reconciliation’ (2Cor.5:19). In the moment of suffering for Jesus to carry out the mediatory work of reconciliation between God and man, ‘God was in Christ’. ‘A locus of divine presence (*hilastērion*)’ is

literally the lid of the ark of covenant over which God meets with His people¹³. This is the first reason why there is no separation between them.

(2:4b) The second proof of non-separateness: God justifies anyone whose faith God regards to be on the basis of ‘Jesus’ faith.’

It is reported, on the other hand, that God has been passing over sins committed beforehand in His forbearance. This is a sort of amnesty by God’s mercy. But this does not imply that God was unjust thus far by passing over of sins, insofar as His more fundamental righteousness based on faithfulness has been applied to the faithful people and God is waiting the repentance of sinners. This faithful event is a good opportunity for God to prove His righteousness apart from the law of works. This opportunity brings about the liberation of the law of works for God, insofar as all people are transferred to the law of faithfulness. Paul reports the way of God’s employing Jesus’ faithful life till his death as ‘for a demonstration of His righteousness in this opportunity.’ From God’s perspective, it is indeed a good opportunity for Him to take the faithfulness of Jesus Christ as an indication of His righteousness. Paul reports their non-separateness by mentioning ‘through the [Jesus’] faithfulness in his blood resulting in the demonstration of His righteousness’ and ‘He might himself be righteous... in justifying anyone at all on the basis of Jesus’ faith’. God bestows justification based on the non-separate faith of Jesus to anyone whose faith God is pleased with. This is the second proof of God’s non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness.

As it may be noticed, there is a gap between bestowing a gift of righteousness to ‘all people’ and ‘justifying the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus’ faith’. God does not reveal at this stage whether the number of ‘all people’ and the number of ‘all people who believe’ are the same. This will be made known at the last judgment (Rom.2:15-16,8:18). While God does not individually specify the people who know His cognitions, the number of all people who believe has already been counted by God as a matter before God. This gap is derived from God’s plan to secure the significance of having faith on the part of man. God lets man know the basicness of faith and its power through the Christ event during the intermediate period of time. This may also prevent the elected people from being able to boast of themselves rather than ‘boast of the Lord’, as if they could take it as their own merit (Rom.3:27, 1Cor.1:31). There is no contradiction between God’s foreknowledge and God’s abstaining from letting the faithful people know their justifications.

Since Jesus of Nazareth was handed over spontaneously to the authority of Jews and Romans as the result of His faithful life, God bought everyone by having paid with His own Son. While Jesus of Nazareth was alive, it is reported that He said, ‘Many are called, but few are chosen’(Mat.22:14). After His faithful death, God regards that all sinners, that is mankind as a whole, are invited to receive His Son as the free gift of non-separate righteousness through faithfulness. All people are called to believe that Jesus is the Christ the savior. This implies, because of the basicness of faith, that God does not apply the law of works any more to the person whose faith God is pleased with. The basicness of faith, in contrast with the law of works, is that ‘anything which is not based on the faithfulness is sin’ (14:23). This transference has been carried out, insofar as anyone lives with Christ before God under the law of faithfulness. In Galatians, Paul is personally confident of the redemption by saying that ‘I through the *law* [of faithfulness] died to the *law* [of works], that I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me’ (Gal.2:19-20). In a parallel passage of Romans, Paul likewise says that ‘There is therefore now no condemnation for those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the *law* of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made you free from the *law* of sin and death’ (8:1-2). Since God’s righteousness in this new revelation is not severed from the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, anyone who receives Jesus Christ is already participating in this gift before God.

Thesis 2:5 - Anselmian cooperative theory of atonement: denial of vicarious punishment

Now that God has abided with suffering Jesus, it is not that God vicariously punishes His Son for the sake of the sins of all people. The claim of vicarious punishment or penal substitution would have been for God to apply the law of works to His Son in the midst of His Son establishing the Gospel. Through the faithful life of Jesus of Nazareth, the law of faithfulness was established in history. Neither did God deal with the devil by paying a ransom, while He was with His Son on the cross. The Gospel has been established by the law of faithfulness. New wine should be put into new wine skins. The alternative theory of atonement, which we agree with, is Anselmian cooperative theory. Anselm argues for the atonement theory ‘by reason alone’, without quoting any passages from the Bible. This method of not quoting any biblical passages (some of which were mistranslated) exempted Anselm from a wrong interpretation of atonement. He 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 (*Cur Deus Homo* prefatio). Anselm introduces a cooperation of Father and Son that ‘For what greater mercy can be conceived than when God the Father says to the sinner condemned to eternal torments, and having no power to redeem himself from them, ‘Accept My only-begotten Son, and give Him for thyself; and when the Son Himself says, ‘Take Me and redeem thyself?’(XX). A disciple of Anselm named Boso, who took the role of an unbeliever called ‘fool’, is now convinced by his teacher’s argument; ‘The whole world can hear nothing more reasonable, or sweet, or desirable. I, indeed, hold so much faith from this that I cannot tell you with what great joy my heart bounds. For it seems to me that God can reject no one who draws near to Him in this name’ (*Cur Deus Homo* XIX). When the Anselmian Father orders the sinner to ‘accept’ His Son, He did not punish His Son at all or pay a ransom to the devil. The atonement which is brought about by the non-separate Father’s righteousness from Son’s faithfulness should be called ‘the cooperative atonement’.

Thesis 2:6 - ‘There is no respect of person in God’ and there is room for transitioning from the law of works to the law of faithfulness by repentance.

Two laws are ordered by God’s non-separate righteousness. God is impartial in applying either of His two wills as ‘the law of works’ or ‘the law of faithfulness’ to relevant people. Although the latter is more fundamental for God than the former (Thesis 2:1), the law of works is effective, insofar as God’s will is culminated in love (Rom.13:8-10). Jesus says that ‘For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, not an iota, not a dot, will pass from the law until all is accomplished’ (Mat.5:18).

Between these two kinds of righteousness, Paul claims that ‘there is no respect of person in God’ (Rom. 2:11). For God impartially judges every man according to which law the relevant person lives by. Paul says in one passage about people group [B]: ‘The doers of the law will be justified’ (2:13) and ‘God will recompense each person according to his/her works’ (2:6). The person who lives under the law of works is judged by God according to whether he/ she observes the law of works. Thus, Paul urges such persons with the charge that ‘the person is a debtor to do the whole law’ (Gal.5:3). Paul himself commits to the following understanding of the law that ‘all the law is fulfilled in one word, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself’ (Gal.5:14). The culmination of the law of works is to love God with one’s strength and with all one’s soul and to love neighbor as yourself (Mat.22:34-40). Paul says that ‘the person that loves another has fulfilled the law’ (Rom.13:8). Without taking the route of faithfulness, Paul assesses that no one fulfills the law of works culminated in love (cf. Rom. 3:20, Thesis 2:4).

There is a room for transitioning from [B] the addressees of God's wrath to [A] the righteous people by faith through their repentance: 'Do you presume upon the riches of his kindness and forbearance and patience? Do you not know that God's kindness is meant to lead you to repentance?' (Rom.2:4). Paul also says that 'Godly grief produces a repentance that leads to salvation and brings no regret' (2Cor.7:16). The person who has a possibility of repentance is a neutral and possible entity for both [A] righteous man before God and [B] the addressee of God's wrath who may result in the sinner before God. On the other hand, for the person whose justification takes place here and now, it is not that there is an alteration of God's cognition by canceling the justification and then condemning his/her sin. Paul says that 'For the gifts and the calling of God are irrevocable' (Rom.11:29).

In the intermediate time between the Christ event and the last judgment, there is a gap between what is made known and what is not made known. From God's perspective, there are things which God has made known and there are things which God has not made known yet according to His own plan. What man can make a knowledge claim about is what God has made known. While God's redemption is addressed to all people who committed sin, it is not personally made known that all people are justified here and now by God. The faithful relationship must consist in reciprocity because of the faithfulness of the mediator. Through the Christ event, it is not yet made known whether the number of 'all people who believe' and 'all people' are the same. This will be made clear at the last day of judgment (Rom.8:18). It is clear, however, that God bestows righteousness to all people as a gift of grace through the redemption of Jesus Christ. God is justifying here and now anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faith that is, anyone who is regarded by Him to be following Jesus' infant-like faith to His Father.

There is a salient asymmetry between God, who is in eternal presence and thus knows everything in advance throughout the course of history, and man, who lives in history under the intermediate period of time between what is generally made known and what is particularly not made known. Concerning the Gospel, human beings of any time, even the people of the 30th century, can make this knowledge claim, insofar as he/she receives Christ's past event as one's own event in God's cognition. The belief that our past sins are understood by God to be made forgiven and our new selves are now to live with the resurrected Christ is essential for us to know the Gospel. Man is not made known, for instance, about particular future events for each person. It remains a matter of faith. Man creates his/her own future with faith by holding the faith in one's responsibility as a matter before God. Paul encourages people, 'The faith which you have according to yourself, have it *before God*' (Rom.14:22).

Because of His revealing acts in the due course of history, God allowed Himself to be involved by delivering His cognition in the past tense that 'all people committed sin' which may involve future events from the perspective of Paul at the time of writing this letter as well. That is, God allows the sins of future people after this letter written by Paul, such as people in the 21st century, to be described by the past tense because of the Christ event. Through this decisive historical event, God regards that He has bestowed a gift of justification by grace to all people in any point of history through the redemption of Jesus Christ. God makes known that since His non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness has been taken place in history, He has established the law of faithfulness in virtue of which all people can receive the free gift of righteousness. It is confirmed in various passages in the Bible that God's free gift of redeeming sins is addressed to all people in the world (John.3:17, 2Cor.5:19, Isaiah,65:1). God is impartial in this respect too.

Thesis 2:7 - Human-centric perspective in deduction of justification by faith: [C]3:27-31 is Paul's conclusion drawn from [A] God's revealing act of non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness (3:21-26) and [B] God's revealing act of his wrath (1:18-32).

Text: ²⁷ Where then is the boasting? It is excluded. By what manner of law? Of works? No, but by a law of faithfulness. ²⁸ We recognize therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from a law of works. ²⁹ Or is God the God of Jews only? Isn't he the God of Gentiles also? Yes, of Gentiles also, ³⁰ since there is indeed one God who will justify the circumcised on the basis of faith, 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.

In passage [C] 3:27-31, 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 boasting on one's own part before God, such as regarding oneself as righteous and virtuous before Him, is excluded. There is no room for man to boast about oneself due to the free grace given to all people who believe under God's cognition through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. Boasting in the sight of God is now excluded 'through a law of faithfulness'. God's will being manifested in the Christ event is 'a law of faithfulness' so that faithfulness is more basic than works with respect to the righteousness of both God and man (Thesis 2:1).

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'. This is introduced as 'Therefore, we recognize that man is justified by faith apart from a law of works.'

Everyone can agree that Paul now moves his sight to his fellow man and the human mind in [C] passage (3:27-31) and establishes the new situation of human beings from a man-centric C perspective. This can be confirmed by his reference to man-made divisions 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'.

We have to be aware that the locus of justification by faith is delivered in a passive manner as 'man is justified by...' in which God's initiative is involved in the minimum way (3:28). Since the main point of v.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. By taking a 'therefore (*ūn*)' reading, the argument flows smoothly with man's initiative; since God's will through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ is more basic than His will of works, we recognize, 'therefore', that a man is justified by faith apart from a law of works. This implies that the whole sentence is delivered in C dimension. In this dimension, God's initiative may be symbolized as Ergon (a- in C), where the small letter 'a' signifies the fact before God A *within* the dimension C.

This reading of man's initiative is natural in this paragraph, because Paul is concerned with man's new state of mind. This '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.

We should not sneak in God's initiative in interpreting the dative of agent '*pistei*' (3:28). Given that we have made clear so far, that faithfulness is a bi-lateral relation between God and man, either of these beings can be taken as the agent of *pistis*. 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: 'a 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 the subordinate clause ‘a man’ suggests that man, whoever he/she 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’ faith. He employed ‘*pistei*’ which is the dative of agent to the effect that a man is justified by his having faith. As we have confirmed the reciprocity of *pistis*, this faith must be somehow 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 a man is justified by faith’ of which God is pleased with.

Concerning the reading of ‘*chōris ergōn nomū*’ (3:28), although it is possible to translate it either as ‘apart from a law of works’ or ‘apart from works of a law’, we 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. Paul meant that ‘Therefore, we recognize that a man is justified by faith apart from a law of works.’

In order to confirm this reading, it is useful to consider 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 verses 28 and 29? Since the law of faithfulness is more basic than the law of works according to God’s will, Paul recognizes in verse 28 that the so-called justification by faith is endorsed. Then 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 or readers in general so as to confirm that God is the God of both Jews and Gentiles. In His advocacy of justification by faith, Paul 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 viewpoint of semantic analysis that Paul, as a representative of humanity indicated by the subject ‘we’, understands the significance of God’s revelation in the faithfulness of Jesus Christ as 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 and Gentiles, i.e., the uncircumcised through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. All human beings are justified by faith.

Thesis 2:8 - Confirmation of the law of works: Faith being at work through love is powerful.

Lastly, an issue to be settled in 3:27-31 is whether this doctrine does away with the Mosaic law of works; ‘Do we then nullify a 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. This confirmation is carried out from two perspectives. Firstly, Paul argues in Romans chapter 7 that while he confirms the law of works as God’s will being ‘holy, just and good’, sin takes advantage of it by being parasitic to the law and tempts man to resist God’s will (7:12). Where the

law of works takes the lead of a legalistic life, it becomes a place of battle among three competitors within a man, that is, the sin personified, the law of works, and the inmost man by means of which the intellect and the spirit are to be at work against the will of God. The role of the law of works, then, is to make people agonize over their sins so that people may be led to die to the law of works and to live after the Holy Spirit (cf. Thesis 1:4).

Secondly, we can confirm the law of works more fundamentally. The law of works based on the old covenant of the Ten Commandments of Moses is holy, just and good, insofar as God ordered Moses to observe them. Jesus attests to the preciousness of the law by saying that ‘Think not that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfill them. For truly, I say to you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or one tittle shall in no way pass from the law, until all be fulfilled’ (Mat.5:17-18). Now that any boasting on a human’s part is excluded before God because of the basicness of the law of faithfulness and thus the justification by faith, the law of works concerning the issue of how to fulfill it is now to be ordered by the law of faithfulness. There is now one straight and narrow road for a man to walk, which is the road of faithfulness and thus nothing but the road of Jesus of Nazareth. Since God’s righteousness is revealed through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, this revelation leads man to believe in the Christ event and to follow Him. Jesus says that ‘Come to me, all who labor and are heavy burden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you, and learn from me that I am gentle and lowly in heart, and you will find rest for your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light’(Mat.11:28-30).

Thus, the hundreds of laws of works are transformed into love under the law of faithfulness, because Christ fulfilled the love of enemy, which is the gist of the Sermon on the Mount, by His faithful obedient life up to the cross. Jesus says that ‘On these two commandments [love of God and love of neighbors] are all the law and the prophets based’ (Mat. 5:18, 22:40). The faith brings about justification and justification brings about love as ‘a fruit of righteousness’ (Phil.1:10). Paul says that ‘Faith being at work through love is powerful’ and ‘Love does no evil to one's neighbor; thus love is the fulfillment of the law’ (Gal. 5:6, Rom.13:10). Love is activated based on the belief that one is loved by God, and the law can be fulfilled for people who follow Jesus. Because of the basicness of faithfulness, righteousness and sin before God are determined not by ‘coveting’ or ‘not coveting’ as in the Mosaic Law, but by ‘believing’ or ‘betraying’. Jesus said of the woman who cleansed his feet with her own tears and hair, ‘Her many sins are forgiven, because she loved much’ (Luk. 7:47). If we can confirm the proof of our sins having been forgiven by loving neighbors, then we could grit our teeth when faced with the wrongdoer and would be struck on the other cheek. This only prevents it from falling into the negative spiral of revenge like ‘an eye for an eye.’ Response in love to everything is based on faith in God's love toward mankind which has been shown through His Son. Peace can only be created by the strength of this faith in God’s love and mercy.

We are now able to conclude this proposal of The Faithfulness Project. Paul orders that ‘The faith you have according to yourself, have it before God’ (14:22). The phrase ‘before God’ indicates the faith which God is pleased with. Therefore, a content of our faith which we hold in our own responsibility must be to believe that our faith is understood by God as the one based on ‘Jesus’ faith’ (3:26). This prompts us to believe that God understands each of us in Jesus. This is confirmed by Paul’s remark that ‘God will justify... the uncircumcised through the faithfulness [of Jesus Christ]’. We are justified by God through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. This is the content of correct faith. Indeed, Paul believed so. He says that ‘I have been crucified with Christ; it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me’ (Gal.2:20). Furthermore, he believes that ‘Those who are of Christ crucified the flesh with its passions and desires’ (Gal.5:24). In The Faithfulness Project, we believe, on the basis of the non-separate righteousness of God with the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, that Christ is with us here and now.

3. A summary of the proposal focusing on the analyses of Roman 3:21-26

We summarize this proposal by stating what is deduced from the semantic analysis of God's language of revelation [A] concerning God's knowledge of Himself and His knowledge of mankind from God's point of view in Roman 3:21-26. The following eight articles implied in the revealed language network [A] 'a report of the revelation of righteous man in Gospel' or 'a language of self-completeness of the righteous man before God under the law of faithfulness'. This network is formed based on God's revealed act (ErA) through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. These are basic understandings derived from linguistic analyses, from which further understanding, including in theology, can be developed. Although this act of revelation may be accompanied by the intermediary act (ErD (AviaC)) of the Holy Spirit, Paul develops his argument in such a way that God's exclusive act can be extracted. And this is what Paul (with God's sanction) wrote in the letter of Romans, which systematically set out to persuade both the Jews and Gentiles, both the wise and the foolish. Here, the agent of revelation is God, and the mediating executor of revelation is Jesus of Nazareth. Paul reports on at least eight facts of God's self-knowledge and of mankind.

First, God recognizes that the revelation of His righteousness based on the faithfulness of Jesus Christ, is 'witnessed by the law and the prophets'. God recognizes Jesus' life of faith as the fulfillment of what He promised and prophesied through people such as Abraham, Moses and Isaiah in the Old Testament.

Second, God recognizes in this fulfillment that while His own righteousness can be separated from the law of works, as it is said 'Now apart from a law', there is 'no separation' in His new revelation of righteousness with respect to the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. This implies that God's non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness is more fundamental to God Himself than His righteousness based on the law of works.

Third, God recognizes that the addressees of this revelation of His righteousness are 'all who believe', not all people, nor those who observe the law of works, because of the relevant non-separateness. This implies that God demands from man only his/her corresponding faithfulness with respect to the righteousness. According to the reciprocal nature of faithfulness, it can only be met by the faithfulness of its counterpart. God does not require any other work from man's side with respect to righteousness. Since the initiative between these two agents belongs to God's faithful righteousness, man responds to God's prompting with his/her faithfulness at its 'the inmost man' by means of which its intellect and its spirit are the soul's functions to associate with God. God's recognition of the bi-lateral reciprocity of faithfulness between its counterparts endorses that it takes place in the bottom of heart from which any positive and creative relationship, up to righteous relationship, flows and emerges. Insofar as these two kinds of righteousness of God cover any human life activity, man will be judged by either of these criteria and will be justified through God's faithful righteousness alone.

Fourth, God recognizes through Christ's justifying event that the implication of its negative presupposition is that 'all people committed sins' and are unworthy of having His glory bestowed upon them. God recognizes that the sentence 'all people *committed* sin' with the past tense and universal quantification is now supposed to be changed into a sentence with the present tense 'all people *are* now the people being justified as a gift by his grace (*dikaiūmenoi*: present passive participle)'. This transition of tense implies that because of His revealing acts in the due course of history, God allowed Himself to be involved in delivering His cognition in the past tense that 'all people committed sins', which may also involve future events from the perspective of Paul at the time of writing this letter. That is, God allows the sins of future people, after this letter was written by Paul, such as people in the 21st century, to be described by the past tense because of the Christ event. Through this decisive historical event, God regards that He has bestowed a gift of justification by grace to all people in any point in history through the redemption of

Jesus Christ. God makes known that since His non-separate righteousness based on faithfulness has been taken place in history, He has established the law of faithfulness for all people who are now able to receive the free gift of righteousness, insofar as all people hold infant-like faith which is desired and uttered or conducted simultaneously. It is confirmed from various passages in the Bible that God's free gift of redeeming sins is addressed to all people in the world (John.3:17, 2Cor.5:19, Isaiah,65:1).

Fifth, God recognizes that all human beings are to be 'justified' by 'grace' free of charge 'as a gift' through 'redemption in Christ Jesus' for their sins. This implies that God's redemptory work through the Christ event is realized in the self-contained work between Father and Son without involving any human merit except the one of Jesus of Nazareth. Thus, all people (not merely faithful people) are addressees of Christ's faithful events. All people are called to justification here and now. Any human being of any time, even in the 30th century, can make the knowledge claim of the redemptory work of God and Jesus of Nazareth, insofar as he/she receives Christ's past event as one's own event in God's cognition. God recognizes that man's having faith to the effect that his/her past sins are understood by God to be made forgiven and his/her new self is now to live with the resurrected Christ is essential for him/her to know the Gospel.

Sixth, God recognizes that this transformational expression from the past tense to the present tense allows the law of works to be understood anew in relation to the Gospel. God is now able to free Himself from judging sinners under the law of works in relation to themselves, by offering his Son freely as a 'gift' under the law of faithfulness. God allows people to think positively that they were set free from the law of works, dead to that which held them captive and allows them to think positively that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made them free from the law of sin and death.

Seventh, God recognizes that 'He set forth Jesus Christ as a locus of His presence in Jesus' blood through the faithfulness resulting in the demonstration of His righteousness because of the passing over of sins committed beforehand in His forbearance'. God abided with Jesus on the cross. This explains why there is no separation between God's righteousness and the faithfulness of Jesus Christ. God recognizes that in His own patience He has passed over the sins that have occurred before, and has therefore not made His righteousness fully known. There is a reason for this patience for God: that His abstaining from the law of works applying to the people who committed sins is not be counted as wrongdoing or injustice on God's part, insofar as His patience is grounded and ordered by His revelation of a more fundamental righteousness so as to allow people repent of their sins and redeem them. This redemptory work is an 'opportunity' for God to make known his own righteousness 'through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ' and an 'opportunity', 'in which He might Himself also be righteous, in justifying the anyone at all on the basis of Jesus' faith'. God shows that He is not doing anything wrong by granting His permission for His Son's crucifixion. One cannot ascribe injustice to God for not punishing wrongdoers. Sinners are now to be forgiven by His higher righteousness, insofar as man has his/her own faith being based on Jesus' faith. By presenting Jesus Christ as His locus of presence, God recognizes that He will meet there with those people about whom He regards as having faith on the basis of Jesus' faith.

Eighth, God recognizes that Jesus shed his blood as a substitute for mankind's sins because of his faithfulness, which led to his voluntary death. God regards Jesus as the righteous man who fulfilled the law of works through his faith, which is being at work through love. In order to reward Jesus' faithful obedience unto his death, God liberated sinners from the law of works to the law of faithfulness, as Jesus wished. Furthermore, God recognizes that he did not commit the injustice of punishing Jesus in place of sinners, through so-called vicarious punishment. He recognizes Himself to be righteous as well by abiding with Jesus and justifying the faith of anyone whose faith is based on Jesus' faith.

¹ D.Charles, *Aristotle on Meaning and Essence*, p.81 (Clarendon Press Oxford 2000).

² L.Wittgenstein, *On Certainty*, ed.G.E.M Anscombe, G.H. von Wrighte, p.21, 141 (Oxford 1979).

³ M. Luther, Preface to the Letter of St. Paul to the Romans, Tra. Bro. Andrew Thornton, OSB "Vorrede auf die Epistel S. Paul: an die Romer" in *D. Martin Luther: Die gantze Heilige Schrifft Deudsch 1545*, ed. Hans Volz and Heinz Blanke. Munich: Roger & Bernhard. 1972, vol. 2, pp. 2254-2268. Luther, *Commentarius in Epistolam ad Galatas, Praefatio*, WA 40 I, ed. K.Drescher, p.3. (Weimar 1911) . J. Calvin, *In Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos Commentarii*, ch. 8., v. 9. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries 8, *Romans and Thessalonians*, tr. R. Mackenzie, et alt. p.164 (The Paternoster Press Carlisle 1960).

⁴ 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).

⁵ E. Käsemann, *An Die Römer*, S.86 (Tübingen 1974).

⁶ C.E.B Cranfield introduces seven interpretations on 1:17. The one of Ambrosiaster is the same as ours. 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).

⁷ Our 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^emîn*. The *Kal 'mn* [*e*mûnâ] 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^emîn* 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 *‘mûnâ*, ‘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 *‘mûnâ* properly represents the passive sense of *pistis*, as indeed the form of the word shows. ... Thus in its biblical usage the word *‘mûnâ* 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* p.154-156 (London 1910).

⁸ Concerning the ‘Christ event’, we 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. Paul employs the past tense to express what has happened in Christ involving the event of believers later than that event as well by means of the intercession of the Holy Spirit.

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’ (See. Section 1:3). 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 us 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.

⁹ We 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’, H.Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, p.314,1297 (Harvard UP. 1920).

¹⁰ By ‘Pauline letters’, I have in mind Romans, 1&2 Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians and 1Thesalonians. We do not go into the discussions of the authenticity of Pauline letters, it is enough to refer to these letters in order to confirm Pauline claims which are allegedly presented in this essay.

¹¹ Concerning 8:34 see *criticus apparatus*: while we agree with text P^{46vid} ⲘACFGL [reading ‘Christ’], disagreeing with some readings BD [reading ‘Christ Jesus’].

¹² There are parallel passages between Romans 1 and passages in the Old Testament in the Greek translation of *Septuaginta*; ‘God’s wrath’ (1:18 and Ex.32:10-13). ‘God handed them over’ (1:24,26,28 and Ex.21:13). ‘they became futile in their thinking’ (1:21 and Jer.2:5,10:14).

¹³ Concerning ‘*hilastērion*’, 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 our semantic analysis, the passage [A] should not be confounded with the passage [B] in which the sin is condemned by the Mosaic law. The gospel of Christ’s atoning event is revealed ‘apart from a law’, that is, by being separated from the Mosaic law. The verses 21-26 must not be understood under the Mosaic law. The interpretation of ‘*Hilastērion*’ as sin offering sounds to be direct transaction within the judicial law. Paul says in the previous sentence that ‘since all have committed sins 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 as a free grace. Thus we interpret ‘the redemption’ as God’s free grace which simply means the transfer of sinners delivering from their sins 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).

We 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 committed sins 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).

N.T. Wright also offers its interpretation as 'Meeting Place'. N.T. Wright, *The Day The Revolution Began*, Reconsidering the Meaning of Jesus's Crucifixion, p.327 (Harper One 2011). Cf.. Holy Bible King James Version, The Scofield Study System, on Romans 3:25 'Propitiation' (OUP New York 1909-2009).

From our standpoint, it is certain that *hilastērion* should not be read within the framework of [B] the Mosaic law. If so, [A] the gospel would be delivered from within the law of works. Paul only borrows the traditional wording to express the locus of Divine presence.