I cannot in this study hope to deal systematically with either the state of research, reviewing the various points of view, the diverse interpretations of the pericopes, the fluctuating opinions regarding the meaning of \textit{dikaiosùnē} in the different contexts, or, on the other hand, the vast literature representing the debate. Rather, I intend first to identify some of the problems which are reflected in the debate. Next, I will try to determine by means of a componential analysis whether Paul actually used \textit{dikaiosùnē} or, for that matter, the expression \textit{dikaiosùnē theou}, in one specific sense or perhaps in a number of senses. Thirdly, I will endeavour to substantiate the results of this analysis by submitting a discourse analysis of Romans 3:19-31, hoping to clarify Paul's intention in this pericope and the function of his \textit{dikaiosùnē}-pronouncements in this context. Lastly, the deep structure of these pronouncements will be analysed with a view to determining their exact theological purport.

1. Problems generated by the research into Paul's use of \textit{dikaiosùnē}

1.1 Foremost amongst the questions to be answered is whether \textit{dikaiosùnē} is used in an ethical or a forensic sense. 'Ethical' would imply that the righteousness in question is 'doing what is right', 'living righteously'. 'Forensic', on the other hand, points towards the idea of God's judgement, stressing either the aspect of a declaration of freedom, or the result of such a declaration (i.e. the actual freedom possessed on account of being declared righteous).

In this connection the question regarding the present or future nature of righteousness becomes important. Righteousness understood forensically has to be interpreted in terms of a present reality or, for example, the future acquittal on the day of judgement. That we have to deal here with an eschatological factor which, so to speak, transcends the futuristic sphere and allows for righteousness to be experienced as a present reality, is widely accepted.

1.2 A second field of discussion hinges on the question whether
dikaiosúne reflects a characteristic of God or an action. Does it speak, for example, about God's aequitas, his being non-partial, his justness; or does it speak of his act of punishment or acquittal? Or is the characteristic which it reflects (if such is the case) that of God's covenantal faithfulness, his trustworthiness?

1.3 In the expression dikaiosúne theou, what is the function of the genitive? It has been called a subjective or an objective, or relational, or a possessive genitive or a genitive of author or origin, or of quality. The problem here lies not only in a difference in interpretation which, of course, naturally leads to a choice between the various functions of the genitive, but also in a lack of clarity and understanding of what is meant by these genitive appellations, and, furthermore, in a mixing together of genitival function under an appellation which, then, does not fit the issue.

To explain this point I shall have to define beforehand the genitival functions. In traditional grammar 'subjective genitive' designates an action, an object or a situation emanating from the noun in the genitive (the subject of the action or origin of an object or situation). 'Objective genitive' describes the relation where the action is directed towards the noun in the genitive which thus forms the object of the action. In the case of a possessive genitive, the noun in the genitive is literally or metaphorically in possession of the noun determined by it. In the case of a genitive of quality, the noun in the genitive describes the quality of the word determined by it. From these definitions it must be clear that there can be no distinction regarding class between a subjective genitive and a genitive of author or of origin. Also, the objective genitive may be designated 'relational' because of the relation between action and object, but, in fact, all genitive expressions deal with different kinds of relations.

In view of the above, it is indeed strange, for example, to find scholars opposing the viewpoint of dikaiosúne theou as subjective genitive to that of the genitive of author (Bultmann 1967:470; Donfried 1980:61). It is also strange to find scholars combining two interpretations, as it were, under one genitival designation, and then opposing this to another viewpoint which should actually be designated by the chosen genitival designation. This happens, for example, when dikaiosúne theou is described as a subjective genitive saying that it is God's own righteousness which he also imparts to man (Käsemann 1964:182).

One gets the impression that authors use the term 'subjective' here because they think of righteousness as something subjective to God, something pertaining to him and thus not existing objectively outside of him. However, this implies a total misunderstanding of the
terminology regarding genitival descriptions. This misunderstanding is increased when this so-called subjective genitive is opposed to the genitivus auctoris. In reverse, one should beware of arguing that dikaiosûnê theou must be an objective genitive because it deals with something which God gives to people, thus something objectifiable outside God.¹)

If anything at all becomes clear from the above, it is that the use of genitival appellations is inadequate to describe all kinds of theological refinements coupled to the expression dikaiosûnê theou. But if the grammar cannot allow for these interpretations (e.g. the metaphorical possessive 'God's own righteousness as a characteristic of God' with the subjective 'the righteousness which comes from God to man') it is a question whether the expression is not being misinterpreted. To this we shall have to pay attention.

1.4 The latest issue in the debate, raised by Käsemann (1964), opposed by Bultmann (1967), expanded by Käsemann's pupils Stuhlmann (1965), Müller (1964), and nowadays quite widely accepted (cf. Du Toit 1979:270; Donfried 1980:61), deals with what is called the power character of dikaiosûnê, which is understood to have been personified. In his opposition to this interpretation, Bultmann (1967) stressed the 'gift character' of dikaiosûnê over against the idea of its being a personified power. Now Käsemann does not deny that dikaiosûnê in some contexts is indeed God's gift to the believers. However, he is looking for a unitary principle of interpretation which will hold good for all instances. This he finds in the idea of the power of dikaiosûnê which sets free and renews (1964:181, introductory footnote).

The problem with this viewpoint is, as I hope to prove, that it is not possible to verify that dikaiosûnê itself, or in its combination with God, ever reflects the idea of power as a component of its meaning. In this respect Bultmann (1967:472) is undoubtedly correct in saying that those instances where dikaiosûnê may be interpreted as personified reflects no more than a stylistic turn of phrase and should not be accorded theological significance. On the other hand, it should be granted that the whole liberating process of God's saving action is understood by Paul to act powerfully in man's life situation, freeing from sin and renewing man's existence. This power from God, however, has to be localized in Pauline soteriology as such, without being linked directly to the idea of dikaiosûnê for which there is, if I see it correctly, no exegetical ground whatsoever.

2. COMPONENTIAL ANALYSIS OF dikaiosûnê in Paul²)

Diagram 1 (see p.16) reflects in the vertical columns those factors
from each context which may point towards a diagnostic component of meaning. For the sake of clarity, I stress that not all factors reflected in this way necessarily act as diagnostic features. Once these factors are noted, one has to determine which (if any) acts diagnostically. The rest may then be eliminated for the purposes of a descriptive analysis. In the case of diagram 1, some features which do not point to diagnostic oppositions have been retained (e.g. the feature of the grace of God and the salvific work of Jesus) because these can help us to determine common factors in the Pauline understanding of δικαιοσύνη. Also, some other features stressed in the literature (e.g. the idea of power) have been retained in the diagram because of their importance in the debate and to point out the clearly negative result attained by this analysis.

The evidence noted in diagram 1 leads us to the following list of diagnostic oppositions:

1a. Event over against 1b. Abstract
2a. Event with God as subject over against 2b. Event with man as subject
3a. Event: right living according to the law over against 3b. Event: right living on the basis of the right relationship with God
4a. Abstract: condition over against 4b. Abstract: characteristic
5a. Characteristic of God over against 5b. Characteristic of man
6a. Gift of salvation through Jesus over against 6b. Claim of the law
7a. Received by faith over against 7b. Human achievement.

Using these diagnostic components, a tree diagram is presented (cf. diagram 2, p.17) reflecting the use of δικαιοσύνη in the corpus Paulinum. In diagram 2, I have indicated for which meaning, according to my understanding as noted in diagram 1, δικαιοσύνη was used in the various contexts of Romans. As it happens, meanings 3) and 6) do not appear to have been presented by δικαιοσύνη in Romans and, therefore, for these two I have supplied some examples from the rest of the corpus Paulinum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action of God</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action of man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract: Characteristic of God</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract: Characteristic of man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract: condition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uprightness of God</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uprightness of man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.ness acc. law/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own R.ness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace/gift of God</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive: of God</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imputation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus' Redemptive work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation/Liberation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast: human wrongdoing/falsehood</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise/contract/covenant</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical context</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eschatology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast with the law</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Righteousness in Paul

God as subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Man as subject</td>
<td>Condition/State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Characteristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man's own righteousness</td>
<td>Of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deeds performed through faith</td>
<td>Of man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man acts righteousness acc. to the requirements of the law and by own achievement</td>
<td>Uprightness, justness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man lives an upright life by virtue of his right relationship to God</td>
<td>Uprightness, rectitude</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

God puts man in a right relation to himself

1) Putting in a right relationship
   - (Rm 1:17; 3:21, 22, 25, 26)

2) Living scrupulously
   - (Rm 9:31; 10:3b, 5)

3) Living uprightly
   - (2 Cor 6:14; Ef 5:9)

4) Right relationship with God
   - (Rm 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17, 21; 6:13, 16, 18, 19, 20; 8:10; 9:30; 10:3a, 3c, 4, 5, 6, 10; 14:7)

5) Uprightness
   - (Rm 3:5)

6) Rectitude
   - (2 Cor 9:10)
As far as Romans is concerned, the following remarks should be made:

2.1 The meaning 'putting in a right relationship' (Rm 1:17; 3:21,22,25,26)

It is apparent that we are dealing here with two contexts\(^3\) of which 3:19-31 is the richer, although 1:8-17 does supply us with enough material to be sure of our case.

In 3:19-31 the expression \(\text{dikaiosùnē theou}\) was used (3:21,22,25,26). We are clearly dealing with an action of God, which God undertakes by his grace, thus presenting man with his free gift (3:24-26). His action results in salvation (3:24) which is received by man, not through his own achievement (3:20,21), but when he puts his trust in Jesus (3:22,26). Jesus' redemptive work achieved salvation (3:25) in the present time which has become God's eschatological time of salvation (3:26). As far as I see, in this passage alone of all Pauline occurrences, does the idea of substitution play any role in connection with that of \(\text{dikaiosùnē}\): God gave Jesus as an offering or a means towards reconciliation (3:25 \(\text{kilastērion}\)): in his death he sacrificed his blood in the place of those who trusted on him (3:25), thus allowing God's patience to come into effect (3:26) so that he could overlook the sin previously committed (3:25).

The above statement that \(\text{dikaiosùnē theou}\) in this passage reflects an action of God, is proved by the parallel usage of the participles \(\text{dikaiouvēnai}\) in 3:24 and \(\text{dikaiouonta}\) in 3:26, but also by the explanatory \(\text{dīa tēn pāresin}\) in 3:25. \(\text{Dikaiosùnē theou}\) becomes an eschatological reality when God acts: when he overlooks sin, when he puts people right with himself (3:25,26) - indeed it is God's act of putting people in the right relation to himself. The same fact is substantiated by the parallel coupling of \(\text{dīa pisteōs}\) (3:22), \(\text{ek pisteōs}\) (3:26), \(\text{pistei ... chōris érgon nómou}\) (3:28) with \(\text{dikaiosùnē}\) on the one hand and verbal forms of \(\text{dikaiō}\) on the other.

The context of 1:17 does not add significantly to this information, whilst it proclaims the same basic pattern found here, as a glance at diagram 1 will confirm.

2.2 The meaning 'living scrupulously' (Rm 9:31; 10:3b,5)

In all three of these occurrences the event depicted is that of the human action of living scrupulously according to the law. It deals with Israel's pursuit of the law, its trying to follow the law of righteousness and not succeeding exactly on account of this pursuit, which can only be understood as its own striving to achieve in the
religious sphere by doing what the law requires.

The expression 'law of righteousness' (9:31) can, to my mind, only signify, 'the law which requires scrupulous living according to its own norms' and which inevitably becomes a person's own achievement (10:3b). It is the action of religious man doing what the law requires (10:5). It can only be his scrupulous living \( ek (tou) r\-mou \), that is determined by the law.

On the emotive level, it is important to note the negative value accorded to this event of human endeavour, contrasted as it is with the gratuitous gift from God of the state of being in the right relation to him, not by works but by faith (10:4; 9:30). To Paul, religion consisting of human attempts to do what is right can in no way lead to salvation and life, but contains in itself the seeds of failure.

2.3 The meaning 'right relationship with God'

(Rm 4:3,5,6,9,11,13,22; 5:17,21; 6:13,16,18,19,20; 8:10; 9:30; 10:3a,3c,4,5,6,10; 14:17)

This usage, describing a condition of man, namely, that of being, existing in the right relation to God, or the eschatological state or situation where the right relation to God exists, seems to be the most common in Paul, and especially in Romans. As in the case of the event of salvation (God's action of putting man right with himself) the contexts often contain the element of man's trusting God or Jesus (4:3,5,6,11,13,22; 9:30; 10:3,4,6,10; 14:17), as well as the idea that the condition was brought about by the grace of God - thus being God's gift to man (4:3,5,6,9,11,13; 5:17,21; 6:13,17, 18,19,20; 9:30). This aspect is almost always highlighted by means of contrasting it to the law, symbol of human achievement (which is lacking only in the case of chapter 8). Again the condition defined in terms of salvation/liberation (as above) is often specified as having been brought about by the redemptive work of Jesus (4:22; 5:17-21; 6:13; 10:3,4,6,10). Elements special to specific contexts are those of eschatology (chapters 4, 5 and 10); of imputation (chapter 4); and of promise (chapters 3 and 4); whilst only chapter 6 in Romans places the argument concerning this condition in an ethical context. In view of the continuing debate on whether Paul used \( dikaiosune \) in an ethical or a forensic sense, a few remarks on the ethical context reflected in chapter 6 are in order.

Du Toit (1979:270) understands \( dikaiosune \) as being strongly personified in chapter 6 and grants Käsemann his understanding of \( dikaiosune \) as power. It is 'verkörperte Macht' (Du Toit 1979:270). Since chapter 6 deals with the christian way of living (ethical con-
text), and since the ideas of ἡπακοή and ἁγιασμός form the positive, and ἁμαρτία, ἀνομία and ἀκαθαρσία form the negative parallels to δικαίοσύνη, this last idea must also deal with righteous living without, however, directly signifying the same (271). One should distinguish between 'Gerechtigkeit als normierender Macht und Lebensgerechtigkeit' (271). In chapter 6 we have primarily to do with 'Gerechtigkeit als gestaltende Norm, die Lebensgerechtigkeit zur Folge hat' (271). Although the righteousness of God in this chapter is the same as in the previous chapters it has a different nuance: 'ihrr fordernder Aspekt steht jetzt in Vordergrund. Die gabe Gottes wird eine Lebensnorm' (271). However, in verse 16 (ἡπακοής εἰς δικαίοσύνην) it probably describes 'die Gerechtigkeit als Lebensinhalt' (271).

A glance at diagram 1 will establish the fact that I find no evidence for coupling the idea of power to δικαίοσύνη, either in Romans 6 or in any other Pauline context. The same holds true for the idea of personification. As far as the last aspect is concerned, one has to grant that this interpretation is possible. However, I think it improbable. And even if accepted, the context(s) does not allow for the great theological significance attached to this. But to return to Du Toit - if what he says is true, namely that God's gift of righteousness (which is then what? ... salvation? ... active, personified renewing power? ...) has become the power which sets the norm for right living, we are left with a number of important questions. Does Paul, then, see righteousness of God as a new law over against the Old Testament law? If so, what is its function? The Old law could not save. Can the new law save? Surely not! Then, since it leads to a new way of living, does it point the way to such a new life? If so, what sense does it have to interpret it as power?

What the context does point out here, is the fact that δικαίοσύνη cannot be understood in the ethical sense of doing what is right. And this holds true for 6:16 as well. What are contrasted as antithetical parallels in this verse are not ἁμαρτία and δικαίοσύνη but ἀκαθαρσία and ἡπακοή. If one makes oneself available to someone, serving as a slave in obedience, one becomes the slave of that person. Now, he can be a slave to sin, or a slave to obedience, meaning in this context: obedience to God. Slavery to sin leads to death; being obedient to God leads to δικαίοσύνη. Clearly the opposites are sin - obedience; death - δικαίοσύνη. 'Death' in this context refers to the state of lostness, the condition of not having been revived unto life (6:4,8,13); alternatively δικαίοσύνη here refers to the state or condition of having been put right with God.

Likewise, in verse 13 a contrast exists between making oneself available to sin over against making oneself available to God. In the first case, one's members function as weapons fighting for evil. In the other case, one's members function as weapons fighting for
Being available to sin means fighting in the interests of the existing state of evil; being available to God means fighting in the interests of the new state of affairs brought about by the death and resurrection of Christ (i.e. the state or condition of having been put into the right relationship with God). Here 'having been put into the right relationship with God' has eschatological, rather than personal overtones. Verse 18 stresses that salvation implies: no longer bound to the old life situation, the old dispensation where sin conditioned existence, but freedom now to serve the eschatological new dispensation which is conditioned by the fact of being in the right relation to God. One's service now consists of furthering the interests of God's new state of affairs. When this service is rendered it leads to sanctification (6:19).

Thus we can conclude that the ethical demands of chapter 6 exist in the demand to live the new life (6:1-11) and to be available for God's service (6:12-14). In verse 18 the imperative, the ethical element, is contained in edoulōthēte; the indicative is God's eschatological gift: the state of being in the right relation to God. Whoever serves the interests of this new situation created by God in Christ, finds that his service brings about personal renewal, a new walk of life.

As far as the remaining occurrences of this usage in Romans are concerned, I do not propose a detailed discussion because they will speak for themselves, in view of the above argument supported by the use of diagram 1.

2.4 The meaning 'uprightness' (Rm 3:5)

This is the sole instance in Romans where dikaiosūnē is used to refer to a characteristic of God. In this context, human lack of trust is contrasted with God's trustworthiness, his fidelity (3:3); human falsehood with God's truthfulness (3:4); and human injustice with God's justice and uprightness (theou dikaiosūnēn) (3:5). The question is posed whether God's acting in judgement, his show of wrath, does not prove him to be unjust (3:5). For Paul, however, there can be no discrepancy between God's rightful judgement and his uprightness (3:6ff). Over against the total human degeneration, God stands vindicated as the only truthful one - characterized in his uprightness by his complete integrity (3:4,7-18).

2.5 Some general remarks

2.5.1 Some scholars find it hard to believe that a great thinker such as Paul would be so indiscriminate as to use in more than one sense a term of such importance to modern theology as righteous-
ness. The truth of the matter, however, seems to be that he used it in no less than six senses of which four appear in Romans.

2.5.2 One of the arguments submitted in connection with the interpretation of \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \) as power, is the submission that \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \text{ theou} \) is a fixed formula with technical meaning (cf. Stuhlmacher 1965:69). Against this it has been pointed out that the Pauline terminology is not a fixed formula since in combination with the genitive \( \text{theou} \) (autou) many combinations exist: \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \text{ gar theou} \) (Rm 1:17); \( \text{theou dikaiosun\(\text{en} \)} \) (3:5); \( \text{tes dikaiosuin\(\text{es autou} \)} \) (3:25), and others. Moreover, our finding was that the combination with \( \text{theou} \) overlaps the various meanings for which \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \) was used and this, of course, excludes one definite technical sense. Diagram 1 shows in effect that the combination \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \text{ theou} \), in one or another of its forms, expresses the idea of God's action of putting man right with himself (1:17; 3:21, 22,25,26); God's characteristic of uprightness (3:5); and man's condition of being in the right relationship with God (10:3a,3c; also 2 Cor 5:21). In the first and third of these cases the genitive is subjective in nature: in the first, righteousness as the action of God, in the third, righteousness as the state or condition originating from God who gives it to man; in the second case the genitive expresses the righteousness belonging (in a metaphorical sense) to God.

2.5.3 Although not often the case, \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \) in some Pauline contexts does have an ethical sense. It can be seen negatively in Romans regarding keeping of the law, living scrupulously; and positively in other contexts regarding living uprightly on the foundation of faith. In most cases, however, the \( \text{dikaiosun\(\text{e} \)} \) is God's gift or gracious action, with the ideas of substitution and imputation present in some contexts. In these last cases one may stress the idea of forensic righteousness, but it is by no means generally present.

3. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 3:19-31

The analysis given on the next page differs from that by Louw (1979a:ad loc; 1979b:59-64) in two respects.

1. That which Louw separates as cola 6 and 7 are taken here to be one colon only. Louw's colon 7 is as it stands without matrix, which means that he comes to his division by means of a transformation on account of the implied contrast between his cola 6 and 7. Since a discourse analysis aims at finding the semantic contribution of the surface structure one should not deviate from the last.

2. Louw's clustering of the pericope allows for four clusters, con-
Discourse analysis of Romans 3:19-31

Verse Colons

19 1 ὁδόνεν δὲ ὃτι διὰ ὁ νόμος λέγει τοῖς ἐν τῷ νόμῳ λαλεῖ, ένα

20 πᾶν στόμα φαγῇ καὶ ὑπόδωκος γέννα τὰς ὁ κόσμος τῷ θεῷ

21 διὸ ἦς ἐργον νόμου οὗ δικαίωθησται τάσα σάρξ ἑνόπλον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπεγνώσεις ἁμαρτίας.

22 δικαίωσόν τιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προσπήν,

23 δικαίωσόν τίνι ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὑπὲρ σαῦτος τοῦ Θεοῦ

24 δικαίωσόν μοι ὑμᾶς ἐργοῖ τῆς αὐτοῦ χάρις ὡς τῆς ἀπολύτρωσεως

25 ὑπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ

26 ὅπο τίνι ἐνδείξημεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ διὰ τὴν πάρεσιν

27 ὅπο τίνι θεοῦ, ὅπο τίνι ἐνδείξημεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ

28 ὅπο τίνι θεοῦ, ὅπο εἰς τὸ ἐνδείξημεν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ
sisting of A: cola 1,2; B: cola 3-7 (6 according to my numbering); C: cola 8-14 (7-13 according to my numbering); and D: cola 15-21 (14-20 according to my numbering).

Louw sees the close connection between cola 1 and 2 on the one hand, and cola 14-20 on the other, but because he links 3 and 4 to 1 and 2 and understands his cluster C to have the contrast of nomos and pistis at its centre, he argues against clustering cola 18-20 into a separate section. These arguments all rest on the specific decisions made by Louw regarding the pericope, so that they seem to have very little weight in themselves. As in the case of my first remark above, one should allow the formal aspects of the pericope the greatest weight in determining its clusters. These formal aspects consist of syntactic elements as well as of words and expressions which have structural weight on account of recurrence, parallelism, antithesis, and so on.

In diagram 3 the structurally important elements have been marked in such a way that links and divergences can easily be noted. From the evidence noted in diagram 3 it now appears that we are in fact dealing with five clusters: A: cola 1,2; B: cola 3-6; C: cola 7-13; D: cola 14-17; and E: cola 18-20. In commenting on this analysis I do not intend a full discussion of the material since this can be found in Louw (1979b:59-64). My comments will deal with the clustering and the emphasis of the pericope with a view to a better understanding of the dikaiosuínê expressions contained in it.

Cluster A clearly deals with the law - colon 1 stating its purpose and colon 2 its negative value with regard to being put right with God.
The topic of *nōmos* and its relationship to the idea of being put right with God has already been touched on in previous pericopes (2:1-16; 2:17-29). It was then dropped in the foregoing pericope (3:1-18). In 3:19,20 (cluster A) Paul returns to the idea. It is, however, immediately overshadowed by his positive reflections on *dikaiosūne*, thus leading to cluster B.

That cluster B starts with colon 3 and continues until the end of colon 6 can be seen from the following:

1. Cola 1 and 2 deal with *nōmos*; cola 3-6 with *dikaiosūne*, *pisteuō*, the redemptive work of Christ, the saving action of God.

2. It may be argued that colon 2 already uses *dikaiothēsetai* and that *nōmos* still plays a role in colon 3. But in colon 2 *dikaiothēsetai* is negatively bound to *nōmos*: the law cannot put one in the right relationship with God. In colon 3 the same happens with *nōmos*: the *dikaiosūne* *theou* is instituted without the law, although the law testifies to it. Thus it is clear that colon 2 deals with *nōmos*; colon 3 with *dikaiosūne* *theou*.

3. The theme of *dikaiosūne* which starts in colon 3 is explicated till the end of colon 6, whereas *nōmos* plays no further role.

4. Colon 3 and the following are separated from cola 1 and 2 by the very distinct *nun de*: up till now the law reigned; from now on something totally different appears on the scene - God's *dikaiosūne*.

It may appear that cola 7-13 again return to the theme of the law, *nōmos* appearing in cola 9, 12 and 13, and being implied in colon 10. However, *nōmos* in cola 9 and 12 do not have the same function as in cluster A. The idea of *ērgon nōmov* in cola 10 and 13 indeed relates to cola 2 and 3 but is in no way thematic in cola 7-13. These cola rather form a separate unit, namely, cluster C which deals with *kauchēsis* and is a conclusion regarding cluster B, introduced by *oun*.

Cola 14-17 have a new set of structural markers (cluster D). It is set off from cluster C by its thematic *Ioudaion - peritomenē; ethnōn - akrobustia*. At the same time its introductory *ἐ* marks it as a second conclusion to cluster B: the *ἐ* following on *oun* can only be read as a second *oun* closely related to the first. This second conclusion forms cluster D.

Cola 18-20 mark a return to the idea of law. The use here of *pisteōs* is in this case not thematic. Cluster E, as was the case with A, deals with the law. Above it was argued that the introductory *ἐ* of cluster D had to follow on the *oun* of cluster C. Now, cluster E is introduced by *oun*. Interestingly enough the repetition here
of οὖν opens up the scope of cluster E since it can now be a third conclusion to B, or a conclusion regarding A, but then in view of B and its satellites. The last proposition seems to be the case. Clusters A and E both deal with the law, cluster A saying: it has its value but not for dikaiosùnê, and cluster E saying: the fact that dikaiosùnê is attained by faith and not by the works of the law, does not render the law obsolete, but rather establishes it.

What Paul meant by this last statement, he does not clarify, but again drops the matter to keep returning to it throughout the rest of Romans.

The structure of Romans 3:19-31, as analysed above, is a sort of palindrome often found in Paul where the centre piece contains the actual guiding idea to be conveyed, this idea being encircled as it were by another idea which precedes it and again follows it - thus:

A
B
A

In this case the centre piece is further elucidated by means of two conclusions, whilst the second A-section concludes on the first A by taking into account what is stated in the centre piece with its conclusions - thus:

A
B
C
D
A

Where does all of this lead us? Louw (1979b) is certainly correct in stating that colon 4 is the pivot point of the whole pericope. It makes the point that God puts man in the right relation to himself through trust in Jesus Christ, and that God does this for everyone who has this trust. Within cluster B this pivot point binds with colon 3 reiterating that the eschatological action of God came about without the law. It also binds with cola 5 and 6 which follows through with the idea that God's action implies everyone who trusts in Jesus Christ, since these cola state that everyone has sinned and lacks the glory of God - but also that God freely and gratuitously brings everyone who trusts in Jesus into this right relationship with him by setting him free on the basis of Jesus' redemptive work.

The points to note here are:

1. The right relationship with God does not come about by means of man's achievement (i.e. by his keeping of the law).
2. God acts to bring man into the right relationship with himself.
3. God acts by means of Jesus Christ whom he gave as sacrifice in his death.
4. God was thus patient in overlooking sin.

5. The right relationship is attained by trusting God's eschatological action in Christ.

Outside cluster B, the pivotal relationship is also clear. Cluster C concludes that, because being in the right relationship with God was solely the work of God for which man could but trust God, no man may boast about his having been put right with God since it was no achievement of his own. Cluster D, again, concludes that since God's action was for all men alike, for everyone who trusted in him, he indeed is the God for all mankind - that is, for everyone who trusts in him. Clusters A and E state that although the law cannot put man right with God, it is not destroyed by man's trust in God. Rather, when man comes into the right relationship with God, God's law is hereby somehow established in its own particular value and purpose.

4. DEEP STRUCTURE ANALYSIS OF SOME PHRASES IN 3:21-26

In colon 3 chōris (abstract) nómoù (object) relates syntactically to dikaiosûnē (event) theou (object). This can be expressed in the kernel sentences:

1. God puts into the right relationship.
2. The law is absent.

Syntactically pephanérōtai (event) is related to nun (abstract), providing the kernel sentences:

1. Something (God's action) becomes evident.
2. It happens now.

Basically⁴ this colon thus conveys the idea that in the time of the author and his readers, in the present reality of their existence, it became evident that God acted to put people into the right relationship with himself.

Colon 4 presents a reduction form where pephanérōtai has to be supplied. As in colon 3 where chōris nómoù is understood to be imbedded into dikaiosûnē theou, we here have to see diá pístēs Iēsou Christou as imbedded into dikaiosûnē theou. Diá (relational) binds with pístēs (event). Iēsou (object) binds with Christou (abstract). The genitive is objective (although subjective genitive has recently been argued by Williams 1981:272ff). The following kernel sentences form the basis of the utterance:
1. God puts into the right relationship.

2. Jesus is the anointed one.

3. (People) put trust in Jesus.

Into pephanerotai is imbedded eis (relational) pantas (abstract) tous pisteuontas (event).

In this case the kernel sentences are:

1. People trust.

2. They are many.

The main idea carried by this colon is that God puts man into the right relationship with himself through the trust that people place in Jesus the anointed one and that this saving action of God becomes evident to all who thus place their trust in Jesus.

Cola 5 and 6a reflect negatively on man's natural state of depravity. The latter part of colon 6 twice contains references to God's dikaiosune in the two endeixin phrases. God provided Jesus to be a sacrifice for reconciliation: eis (relational) endeixin (event) tēs dikaiosunēs (event) autou (object) (i.e. God provided Jesus in order to reveal the fact that he puts people into the right relationship with himself). The kernel sentences are:

1. God shows.

2. God puts into the right relationship.

Into endeixin is imbedded dia (relational) tēn paresin (event) tōn prosegonōtōn (abstract-event) hamartematon (abstract-event). The publicizing of his saving action was brought about when he overlooked the previously done sin. The kernel sentences are:

1. God overlooks sin.

2. People act sinfully.

3. They do it previously.

God's provision of Jesus as sacrifice for reconciliation is further qualified by pros (relational) tēn endeixin (event) tēs dikaiosunēs (event) autou (object). Into endeixin is imbedded en (relational) to mēn (abstract) kairop (abstract), and eis (relational) tō eînai (abstract) autōn (object) dikaiōnta (event) tōn ek (relational) pisteōs (event) Iēsoû (object).
Here the kernel sentences are:

1. God shows.
2. God puts into the right relation.
3. The time is present.
4. God is just.
5. God puts man right.

This latter part of colon 6 thus once more stresses the fact that God puts man right with himself. God wants this fact to become publicly known in the present time thus proving that God is both upright in character and therefore also puts right with himself that man - every man - who places his trust in Jesus.

FOOTNOTES

1. Oepke 1953:262, referring to Targumic commentary on Deuteronomy 33:21 argues for the objective genitive - then says: 'der Genitiv ist ein gen. relationis. Es handelt sich um die Gerechtigkeit, die "vor Gott gilt" oder die Gott dem Menschen zuspricht'. The last case of course would be one of subjective genitive, but is perhaps here equalled with objective genitive because the righteousness as something God gives to man is thought of as an objectifiable 'something' outside God. This kind of misrepresentation may have arisen in the literature on account of the valid discussion of subjective experience by man of God's gift, the 'object' of righteousness, as reflected in Stuhlmacher 1965:28ff.

2. Ideally a componential analysis, not only of dikaiosûnē but also of its derivations, should be undertaken. For reasons of space we deal only with dikaiosûnē, however in the hope that it will sufficiently illustrate the procedure and point to the results that can be expected.

3. The pericopes according to which the inner context of each instance was determined, are in accordance with the analysis of Louw (1979a and b).

4. I say 'basically' because not every phrase in this colon is discussed here. The same goes for the rest of this section.
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