

too often, so he surveys her, unmoved — until, yes, until she utters one simple sentence suddenly spanning an interval of years since he left home resentful of its humble status — 'I am your mother!'

There is an ineradicable bond between mother and child. If then it is inevitable that they should separate, it is possible, no, it is proper that they should come together once again. But not as of old; rather in a new relationship. After her child has gone away, grown to maturity and found independence, he should return bearing a gift. His mother once gave to him, now he should give to her. What should he give? Respect? Yes. There is too little respect for parents today, not least for mothers. Love? Yes, but charged with more than sentiment, love which is concerned for the mother's well-being, actively concerned. And a character, a standing and accomplishments of which the mother can be proud — 'This is *my son!*' 'This is *my daughter!*'

There are sons and daughters who deny their

mother the opportunity for legitimate pride in their accomplishments by forsaking them. This is wrong. There are others who dishonour by their misconduct the good home their mothers cherish. This is a tragedy. There are others who come back to their mothers with hands full of gifts — accomplishments, understanding and love.

Jesus came back to his mother on the Cross of Calvary. He came back as the dutiful son providing her a home with his beloved disciple, John. More than this, much more, he came back to her as her Saviour. If no son, no daughter, can possibly come near this unique relationship with their mother, they could save her the loneliness of separation by the love they show. This is what Mothering Sunday asks children to do. This is what Mothering Sunday asks mothers to accept when it is offered. The love of their children who are no longer dependent on her as once they were, but who love them all the more from their new-found independence.

Is Romans 1³⁻⁴ a *Pauline* Confession After All?

BY DR. VERN S. POYTHRESS, TH.M., CAMBRIDGE

NEW Testament scholarship generally traces Ro 1³⁻⁴ back to a pre-Pauline confessional formula.¹ However, the possibility remains that Paul himself formulated Ro 1³⁻⁴ 'on the spot', using a number of traditional expressions to show his agreement with the common Gospel message. Or, as a third alternative, he may have quoted from a confessional formula which he himself had earlier composed. The differences between these three alternatives are like the differences between (1) a modern preacher who quotes from the Apostles' Creed, (2) a preacher who uses traditional church language and perhaps King James English to summarize the Gospel, and (3) a preacher who quotes from a confession that he himself has composed.

The third alternative is most unlikely in Paul's case. Since, in addition, its results would be almost impossible to distinguish from the results of free composition, we will confine ourselves to the first two alternatives: (1) Ro 1³⁻⁴ is a quotation (perhaps with alterations) from a pre-Pauline confessional formula, and (2) Ro 1³⁻⁴ is a Pauline free composition with some traditional expressions.

Myself, I am not at all sure which of these two is the correct explanation. Since the second alternative has suffered eclipse, I shall try to present the strongest possible case in its favour. The argument falls into two parts: (I) an attempted refutation of evidence in favour of pre-Pauline origin, and (II) a collection of evidence against pre-Pauline origin.

I. Inconclusiveness of evidence in favour of pre-Pauline origin of Ro 1³⁻⁴

The chief arguments in favour of pre-Pauline origin are as follows: (a) Ro 1³⁻⁴ has participial construction and parallelism of sentence structure such as are characteristic of fixed formulas.² (b) Ro 1³⁻⁴ uses *sarx* and *pneuma* in a non-Pauline way.³ (c) It mentions the Davidic descent of Jesus, in which Paul was not interested.⁴ (d) It involves adoptionist rather than pre-existence Christology in *horisthentos huiou theou*.⁵ (e) The crucifixion of Christ is missing, which would not be expected if Paul was freely composing.⁶ (f) It contains expressions like *horisthentos huiou theou* and *pneuma hagiōsynēs* not characteristic of Paul.⁷ (g) Ro 1³⁻⁴ is set forth by Paul as a summary of the *euangelion theou* (v. 1), and hence we are led to expect something traditional (cf. 1 Co 15¹⁻⁴, 2 Ti 2⁸, 1 Ti 3¹⁵⁻¹⁶).⁸

Let us see what objections may be brought against these arguments, one by one.

Concerning (a). Though the participles and parallelism of vv. 3-4 suggest formulaic origin, they do not demonstrate it. The parallelism of construction results mostly from *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma*, which look suspiciously Pauline (see below under (b)). The participial construction is simply the most natural way for things to be expressed in the syntactic context of Ro 1².

Concerning (b). Note first that not all are agreed that both *sarx* and *pneuma* were present in the

pre-Pauline creed.⁹ If one or both were absent, then the *sarx/pneuma* opposition has been introduced by Paul himself. In that case, the occurrence of *sarx/pneuma* is in itself no argument for the pre-Pauline origin of other portions of Ro 1³⁻⁴.

Second, note that Paul uses *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma* separately in a sense approaching that of Ro 1³⁻⁴ (see Ro 4¹, 9^{3,5}, 1 Co 10¹⁸, Eph 6⁵, Col 3²², 1 Co 12⁸). When the two are brought together, *kata sarka* must ordinarily take on negative connotations in opposition to *kata pneuma*. But when the two are applied to Christ, is not this the one exception?¹⁰

The collocation of *sarx* and *pneuma* is certainly pre-Pauline (1 Ti 3¹⁶, 1 P 3¹⁸, Mt 26⁴¹). But *kata sarka/kata pneuma* is much more distinctive to Paul. Hence it is difficult to believe that the *kata* plus accusative constructions were in the supposed pre-Pauline formula.

Concerning (c). Argument (c) maintains that Paul was not interested in Davidic descent. But an allusion to Christ's Davidic descent in fact does occur elsewhere in Romans (15¹²). Moreover, it is possible that Davidic ideas may be in the background of Paul's reference to the 'root' in Ro 11¹⁶⁻¹⁷ and of his quotation from the Davidic Psalm 18 in Ro 15⁹. The relative scarcity of reference to David may be due only to the fact that it was characteristic of Paul's evangelistic preaching rather than his teaching to Christians. Ac 13²²⁻²³ is a confirmation of this, if one grants that it is an accurate representation of Paul's evangelism. In any case, can one imagine that Paul would have left out Davidic descent in evangelistic preaching to Jews?¹¹

Concerning (d). What about the supposed 'adoptionism' of Ro 1³⁻⁴? First, *horisthentos huiou theou* probably has in common with Ac 2³⁶, 4²⁸, 5³¹, 10⁴², 13³³ a specifically Messianic sense.¹² The declaration or installation idea goes back to the decree (*hōq*) of Ps 27.¹³ 'Constituted Son of God' is not so much a reference to Christ's deity (though that is assumed by Paul) as to the transformation of his humanity. It is better, then, to say that the passage speaks of enthronement, not adoption.¹⁴

In general, the so-called 'adoptionist' language of the early Church did not signify the adoptionism of later centuries. Rather, 'adoptionist' language was used to put all the emphasis on the significance of the resurrection, without regard one way or the other for Christ's deity prior to the resurrection.¹⁵ But could not Paul himself at times talk in the same way (1 Co 15⁴⁵)?¹⁶

Concerning (e). The cross is undoubtedly important for Paul. But that does not mean that he must always mention it. For example, Paul refers to the crucifixion only seldom in 1 Thessalonians. Moreover, had he so desired, Paul in writing Rom-

ans 1 could have drawn on traditional material that included reference to Christ's death (1 Co 15³⁻⁴).

Concerning (f). Neither *horizō* nor *pneuma hagiōsynēs* occurs elsewhere in the Pauline corpus. Their joint occurrence in 1³⁻⁴ is therefore a significant piece of evidence. However, the evidence can be accounted for by Paul's use of traditional language as well as by actual verbatim quotation. Moreover, the evidence must not be overrated. *Horizō* occurs with significant frequency only in Acts. If it represents a factor in apostolic preaching (Ac 2²³, 10⁴², 17^{26,31}) rather than simply a redactional term (Ac 11²⁹), then perhaps it is characteristic of Paul's evangelistic preaching too (Ac 17^{26,31}).

As for *pneuma hagiōsynēs*, not all agree that it was part of the supposed pre-Pauline formula.¹⁷ The phrase is attested, as far as I know, only in Test. Lev 18¹¹ (but one MS has *pneumati hagiō*).¹⁸ In the crucial passages in the O.T., the LXX translates *rwh qd-š* by *to pneuma to hagion* (Is 63¹⁰⁻¹¹, Ps 51(50)¹³). Then how did Ro 1³⁻⁴ come to have *pneuma hagiōsynēs*? Consider the alternatives. First, suppose Paul was quoting a confession known in Greek. Why did the confession retain this particular Semiticism, *pneuma hagiōsynēs*, contrary to the uniform practice of the LXX and the N.T. writers? One might argue that the confession contained traditional material, and so was more likely to be Semiticizing. But one could also argue that a confession would be less likely to exhibit peculiarities or idiosyncrasies than an individual writer. Now consider the second alternative. Suppose that Paul was translating from a Hebrew or Aramaic confession. How would this confession have become known to the Greek-speaking Romans?

Concerning (g). The observation about the context of Ro 1³⁻⁴ is correct, but it does not require that Ro 1³⁻⁴ be an actual citation.

What, then, shall we conclude about the arguments for pre-Pauline origin of Ro 1³⁻⁴? Though the counterarguments just adduced might prevail against one of the reasons (a)-(g), they are not completely convincing against the combined weight — especially when points (f) and (g) are taken into consideration. Hence we do well to postulate that Paul used traditional material in some fashion. Paul's gospel was a gospel that he held in common with the other apostles (1 Co 15³⁻¹¹, Gal 2^{6-9, 14-21}). In a summary of this gospel, in Ro 1¹⁻⁵, he was bound to call upon certain stock expressions. *Ek spermatos David, huiou theou, en dynamei*, and *ex anastaseōs nekron* must be counted among them. In addition there occurs the collocation of *sarx* and *pneuma* as in 1 P 3¹⁸ and 1 Ti 3¹⁶. All in all, Ro 1³⁻⁴ has a decidedly traditional flavour to it. This is exactly the effect that Paul desired. He was demonstrating his essential agreement with the 'gospel of God' common to the whole

church and indeed to the Old Testament (*graphais hagiiais*, v. 2).

II. Evidence against pre-Pauline origin

However, it is another matter to claim that Ro 1³⁻⁴ goes back to a fixed confessional formula. The difficulties with insisting on this 'credal' view of Ro 1³⁻⁴ are as follows.

(a) Does not this view push back into apostolic times a rigidity of formulation characteristic only of the second and later centuries?¹⁹ New Testament 'creeds' show tantalizing similarities to one another but seldom verbal identity — just what we would expect in a situation of fluidity.

(b) If Paul quoted a creed known in (say) Corinth or Jerusalem, how could he be sure that it would be recognized as such in Rome? If the Romans did not recognize it, would not the whole effect of quotation be lost? If it was a Roman creed, how did Paul come to know its exact words? Admittedly, travel in the Roman Empire was quite free. But presumably hymns and stock phrases were more likely to be transmitted this way than fixed confessional formulas.

(c) *Hagiōsynēs* cannot be adequately accounted for. Explaining its presence in a Greek-language creed is as difficult as explaining it in Paul himself. If, however, Paul reached in a fluid way into the Aramaic traditions in the Palestinian church, the explanation is easier.

(d) As we have seen, *kata sarka* and *kata pneuma*

are probably neither totally Pauline nor totally pre-Pauline. The free use of traditional material, rather than actual quotation, better accounts for this.

(e) Ro 1³⁻⁴ is too well adapted to the rest of Romans to allow comfortably for its pre-Pauline origin. Throughout the Epistle one finds the recurring theme of Jew and Gentile. This theme is already present in the two-part confession, whose first part brings Christ into relation to Jews (seed of David), and whose second part brings him into relation to Gentiles, who through the Gospel become part of 'spiritual Israel'. The title 'Son of God' itself hints at the relation to the Gentiles, since in the background passage Ps 2²⁻⁹ God's 'Son' exercises dominion over the *nations*. Paul's supreme desire is that his brethren, related to Christ *kata sarka* (Ro 9³⁻⁵; cf. 2²⁵⁻³²), may come to be related to him as Son of God *kata pneuma* (Ro 11¹⁷⁻²⁹). Ro 11²¹⁻²⁴, which speaks of this matter, uses *kata physin* in a sense virtually parallel to the *kata sarka* of Ro 1³. Ro 1³⁻⁴, then, encapsulates the substance of the Epistle.²⁰ Is it plausible to think that a pre-Pauline formula could do this well?

Admittedly there are difficulties in maintaining a Pauline origin for Ro 1³⁻⁴. But there are also difficulties, not always recognized, in maintaining that it is a pre-Pauline formula. A kind of compromise is achieved by postulating that Ro 1³⁻⁴ is a free composition using a number of traditional expressions and ideas. We cannot be certain which explanation is correct. But the compromise position represents a live possibility.

¹ The pre-Pauline origin of Ro 1³⁻⁴ was first suggested by J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (Göttingen, 1917), 89. Since then, it has collected a substantial amount of support (see bibliographies in F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology* (London, 1969), 268-269 n. 44, and H. Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*, 3rd ed. (Stuttgart, 1970), 193-194 n. 187.)

² O. Betz, *What Do We Know about Jesus?* (London, 1968), 95; G. Bornkamm, *Paul* (London, 1971), 248; E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (Tübingen, 1974), 8; W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (London, 1966), 108; V. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (Leiden, 1963), 50; E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Darmstadt, 1956), 385; H. Schlier, 'Zu Röm 1, 3f', *Neues Testament und Geschichte*, ed. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke (Zürich-Tübingen, 1972), 209; K. Wengst, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh, 1972), 112; Zimmermann, 197-198.

³ Schlier, 209; E. Schweizer, 'Röm 1, 3f. und der Gegensatz von Fleisch und Geist vor und bei Paulus', *Neotestamentica* (Zürich-Stuttgart, 1963), 181 (reprinted from *Evangelische Theologie*, 15 (1955), 563-57).

⁴ Betz, 95; Bornkamm, 248; R. Bultmann, 'Neueste Paulusforschung', *Theol. Rundschau*, 8 (1936), 11; A. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors* (London, 1961), 26-27; Neufeld, 50-51; Schweizer, 180; K. Wegenast, *Das Verständnis der Tradition bei Paulus und in den Deuteropauli-*

nen (Neukirchen, 1962), 71 n. 1; Wengst, 112; Zimmermann, 194.

⁵ Bultmann, 11; C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London, 1932), 4-5; Hunter, 26; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen, 1955), 31-32; Schlier, 209-210; Wengst, 112.

⁶ Schweizer, 180.

⁷ Betz, 95; Bornkamm, 248; Kramer, 108; Schweizer, 180; Wegenast, 70 n. 1; Wengst, 112.

⁸ Schweizer, 180.

⁹ *Sarx* and *pneuma hagiōsynēs* both occur in the pre-Pauline formula according to C. Burger, *Jesus als Davidssohn* (Göttingen, 1970), 26-28; Hahn, 247; Käsemann, 8-9; Schweizer, 180-181; Wegenast, 71; Zimmermann, 196-198. Both are omitted according to Bultmann, 11; O. Kuss, *Der Römerbrief* (Regensburg, 1957), 8; Wengst, 112-113. *Pneuma hagiōsynēs* alone belongs to the formula according to L. Legrand, 'L'arrière-plan néo-testamentaire de Lc. 1, 35', *Revue Biblique*, 70 (1963), 181; E. Linnemann, 'Tradition and Interpretation in Röm 1, 3f', *Evangelische Theologie*, 31 (1971), 273-275.

¹⁰ I am one of those who think that 2 Co 5¹⁶ refers to knowing-in-a-fleshly-manner, not to knowing Christ-according-to-the-flesh. The reference is not to Christ's earthly life, but to Paul's earlier Pharisaic rejection of a crucified Messiah. Hence 2 Co 5¹⁶ sheds little light on Ro 1³⁻⁴.

¹¹ 'Man muss wohl auch damit rechnen, dass die Briefe ein etwas einseitiges Bild vom Sprachgebrauch des Apostels geben. Zu Juden mag er anders gesprochen haben, vgl. *Ap 17, 3; 18, 5; 26, 23*. Ihnen gegenüber musste die Messianität Jesu mehr thematisch dargelegt werden' (N. Dahl, 'Die Messianität Jesu bei Paulus', *Studia Paulina in honorem J. de Zwaan* (Haarlem, 1953), 88).

¹² B. Schneider ('κατὰ Πνεῦμα Ἀγιοσύνης (Romans 1⁴)', *Biblica*, 48 (1967), 370-376) has argued for the close relationship of the Acts passages to Ro 1³⁻⁴.

¹³ See especially L. Allen, 'The Old Testament Background of (προ) ὀρίζεω in the New Testament', *NTS*, 17 (1970-71), 104-108; J. Blank, *Paulus und Jesus* (München, 1968), 252-254; M.-E. Boismard, 'Constitué fils de Dieu (Rom I⁴)', *Revue Biblique*, 60 (1953), 5-17.

¹⁴ Blank, 253-254.

¹⁵ 'The statement is pretheological. It attests the facts that Jesus was a real man, that He was acknowledged as Messiah, and that after His resurrection, though not before, He was worshipped as Son of God' (C. H. Dodd, 5).

¹⁶ Ph 2⁶⁻¹¹ could be cited too, if it were not for the fact that it may be pre-Pauline. The best exposition of the compatibility of Ro 1³⁻⁴ with Pauline theology is probably John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, I (Grand Rapids,

1959), 5-12. Cf. also Geerhardus Vos, 'The Eschatological Aspect of the Pauline Conception of the Spirit', *Biblical and Theological Studies* (New York, 1912), 228-230; *idem*, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Princeton, 1930), 155-156 n. 10; W. Sanday and A. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed. (Edinburgh, 1902), 7-8.

¹⁷ See n. 9 above.

¹⁸ *Pneuma syneseōs kai hagiastmou* in Test. Lev 18⁷. Erik Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis* (Rome-Freiburg-Wien, 1959), 351-352, has produced another possible case from the 'Amulet von Acre' (Georg Kaibel, ed., *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum*, XIV No. 2413, 17 (Berlin, 1873)). However, the test is uncertain. *Pneuma hagian* occurs in Ps 142: 10 LXX ABS¹, Dan Th 4: 8, 9, 18, 5: 11A, Sus Th 45, Dan LXX 5: 12, 6: 4, Wis 1: 5, 9: 17, Ps Sol 17: 42.

¹⁹ Later references to Davidic descent continue to show fluidity of expression (Ign Eph 18:2, 20:2; Ign Ro 7:3; Ign Smyrn 1:1; Ign Trall 9:1; Barn 12:10; Justin Dial. 43:1, 45:4, 100:3, 120:2).

²⁰ 'In dem Evangelium, wie es Röm 1²⁻⁴ zusammengefasst wird, liegen die grossen Antithesen des Römerbriefs, zwischen Fleisch und Geist, Gesetz und Christus, schon thematisch eingeschlossen' (Dahl, 90-91).

Book Reviews

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT

RECENT years have seen no less than three major critical introductions to the Old Testament by German scholars being translated into English, and now a fourth has come to join them. The names of O. Eissfeldt, A. Weiser and G. Fohrer have already acquired a text-book familiarity to a great many theological students. Otto Kaiser's work, now in an English translation, therefore stands as the latest of a long line (*Introduction to the Old Testament: A Presentation of its Results and Problems*, translated by John Sturdy; Blackwell [1975], £8.00, pp. 420). The author is himself a former pupil of A. Weiser and teaches in the University of Marburg. Some justification for yet another work in this field appears to be called for, but a careful reading of Kaiser's work quickly establishes that it contains a great deal of material that is not to be found in the earlier volumes. In particular it is evident that Kaiser is conscious that many of his potential readers will already have access to the earlier works, and so he avoids a lot of unnecessary duplication and concentrates on describing the most recent work. The bibliographies, too, are very selective, but give a very full account of fresh work from the last ten years. All in all therefore it offers a good general synthesis of the main positions in Old Testament scholarship in the mid-1970s.

In general such works are difficult to review because they contain so much information on a wide range of problems, and it is only possible to look at a few of them. Furthermore the distinctiveness of Kaiser's approach only really becomes clear when compared with the positions advocated by Eissfeldt and Fohrer. On one point in particular students will have good cause to be grateful to Kaiser in that he expounds fairly fully the view advocated by M. Noth that the history from Joshua to 2 Kings was composed during the period of the Babylonian exile as a single connected whole. Hitherto, despite the wide international acceptance of such a view, it has not been well described in English text-books. In general Kaiser is content to set forth the views of others and to present broad criticisms of them, seldom setting out any novel positions of his own. In a work of this kind this must be regarded as a virtue, since it keeps the student aware of what are the most widely accepted positions on particular problems. Much more characteristic of Kaiser's own research is the very interesting, and at times striking, analysis of the prophecies of Isaiah 1-39.

The translation by John Sturdy can be regarded as reasonably well done, although here and there the rendering of some semi-technical expressions is misleading. For instance on p. 58 the 'law of Yahweh's privileges' gives the wrong impression, since the reference is to privileges conferred by