

Paul’s Ethnic Discourse on “Faith”: Christ’s Faithfulness and Gentile Access to the Judean God in Romans 3:21–5:1*

Stephen L. Young
Brown University

■ Introduction

In this article I pursue two interrelated goals. First, and more narrowly, I argue that the ἐκ πίστεως in Rom 5:1 plausibly refers to Christ’s πίστις (conventionally translated as “faith” or “faithfulness”) and not to the πίστις of Christ followers; and certainly not to the πίστις of Christ followers that is specifically “in Christ.”¹ To my knowledge no modern commentator identifies the πίστις in Rom 5:1 as Christ’s own. Several scholars suggest it in passing, and one presents a partial argument turning on several claims of coherence with his broader reading of Paul.²

* The members of the Spring 2010 “Issues in Pauline Studies” graduate seminar at Brown University provided valuable feedback on the paper that became this article, as did participants in the “Pauline Literature” session of the 2011 meeting of the New England SBL, where I presented an early draft. I am especially grateful to Stanley K. Stowers for his extensive suggestions and criticisms that immeasurably sharpened this article. I would also like to thank J.R. Daniel Kirk, Caroline Johnson Hodge, Dan G. McCartney, Stephen S. Taylor, and the anonymous *HTR* reviewers for their critical and helpful feedback. Finally, I am grateful to the Dolores Zohrab Liebmann Fund for its generous support that enabled completion of this article.

¹ Though I would argue the same for τῆ πίστει in 5:2, due to text-critical issues, space constraints, and the ability to examine ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 without treating τῆ πίστει in 5:2, I restrict my focus to 5:1. Greek text comes from the NA27; all translations are my own.

² Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11* (2nd Ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002) 151–52; Adela Y. Collins and John J. Collins reference Hays’s suggestion in a footnote to support their translation of Rom 5:1 (*King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008] 118 n. 70). John Dunnill asserts that “the word πίστις [in Rom 5:1–2] has both senses [Christ’s faith and the believer’s faith] fully present” (“Saved by Whose

I offer a more thorough case for the plausibility of this suggestion, especially by demonstrating how my reading of Rom 5:1 makes sense as an encapsulation of Paul's emphases in Rom 3:21–4:25.

Second, and more broadly, I exploit this exegetical issue and associated rereading of Rom 3:21–4:25 as opportunities to re-place Paul's discourse about Christ's πίστις within his fundamentally ethnic rhetoric in Rom 3:21–4:25. As I will illustrate below, in this passage Paul strategically explains how Gentiles have access to the power and blessings of a foreign deity, the Judean god.³ The mechanics of this access turn on the πίστις of Christ himself, as well as on the prior and related πίστις of Abraham, which establishes a lineage that can include Gentiles without them having to adopt the divinely appointed ancestral customs of the Judeans (i.e., the law). As such, in Rom 3:21–5:1 Paul represents his Christ cult as offering Abrahamic descent to Gentiles and thus an inheritance in the Judean god's promises and blessings. In this way we can bring the study of Paul's discourses about πίστις, and especially the debate about πίστις Χριστοῦ, into conversation with the growing research on Greco-Roman cultural codes relating to "ethnicity" and the extent to which Paul's letters operate and innovate within Greco-Roman ethnic ideas and assumptions.⁴ While not a main point of the article, I briefly discuss how clarifying the ethnic contours and mechanics of Christ's πίστις within Paul's discourse sets the table for examining how he configures the relationship between Christ's and his followers' πίστις.

Faith?—The Function of πίστις Χριστοῦ in Pauline Theology," *Colloq* 30 [1998] 3–25, at 16). Douglas Campbell offers a brief argument (*The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul* [Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2009] 823–25).

³ I use the label "the Judean god" to reinscribe in this article's historical description the "ethnic" nature of this deity from the point of view of Paul's audiences. This god is the god of the Judeans, just as, for example, Egyptians had their own ethnic god or gods. On why I choose the explicitly "ethnic" terminology of Judean instead of Jew for analysis of Paul's discourse, see Caroline Johnson Hodge, "Apostle to the Gentiles: Constructions of Paul's Identity," *BI* 13 (2005) 270–88, at 272–73. For arguments in favor of using the terminology of Judean for broader Hellenistic and early Roman period sources, see Ross S. Kraemer, *Unreliable Witnesses: Religion, Gender, and History in the Greco-Roman Mediterranean* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011) 26, 180, 186–200; Steve Mason, "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38 (2007) 457–512. For a counterargument to Mason, see Seth Schwartz, "How Many Judaisms Were There?: A Critique of Neusner and Smith on Definition and Mason and Boyarin on Categorization," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011) 208–38, at 221–38; and for recent discussions that probe relevant assumptions across publications in the debate, see Cynthia Baker, "A 'Jew' by Any Other Name?," *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011) 153–80; Michael Satlow, "Jew or Judaeon?," in *The One Who Sows Bountifully: Essays in Honor of Stanley K. Stowers* (ed. C. Johnson Hodge et al.; Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2013) 165–75.

⁴ See, e.g., Denise Buell and Caroline Johnson Hodge, "The Politics of Interpretation: The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul," *JBL* 123 (2004) 235–51; Cavan Concannon, "When You Were Gentiles": *Specters of Ethnicity in Roman Corinth and Paul's Corinthian Correspondence* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014); Johnson Hodge, "Apostles to the Gentiles"; idem, *If Sons, Then Heirs: A Study of Kinship and Ethnicity in the Letters of Paul* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).

The πίστις Χριστοῦ debate obviously looms in the background of this study.⁵ Briefly, a construction involving a form of πίστις as the head noun modified by some signifier for Jesus in the genitive case occurs seven times in the recognized seven letters of Paul: Rom 3:22, 3:26, Gal 2:16 (2x), 2:20, 3:22, Phil 3:9. To use the conventional terminology, should the reader understand them as objective genitives, with Christ as the object of πίστις, or as subjective genitives, with Christ as the subject of πίστις?⁶ These seven constructions operate within passages discussing δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ (conventionally translated as “righteousness of God”), δικαιοσύνη (“righteousness” or “justice”) for people, the law, Christ’s death, Abraham, Judeans, Gentiles, “sin,” the promise(s) of the Judean god, resurrection, πνεῦμα (“spirit”), and other such topics around which the modern theological and historical study of Paul have revolved since their inceptions. Given these associations, many participants in the debate represent the situation as though one’s entire construal of Paul’s intellectual positions and assumptions turns on one’s understanding of these seven genitive constructions.⁷ In recent years proponents of the objective genitive have effectively reorganized and strengthened their position.⁸ While exegetical arguments in favor of the opposing position incline me towards the subjective genitive view,⁹ neither side has by any means achieved a consensus or

⁵ See the oft referenced exchange between James D. G. Dunn (“Once More, ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ,” in Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 249–71) and Richard B. Hays (“Πίστις and Pauline Christology: What Is at Stake?,” in Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 272–97) for the basic lines of the debate. See also Matthew C. Easter, “The *Pistis Christou* Debate: Main Arguments and Responses in Summary,” *CBR* 9 (2010) 33–47.

⁶ For other proposed options, see, e.g., Wolfgang Schenk, “Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes und der Glaube Christi: Versuch einer Verhältnisbestimmung paulinischer Strukturen,” *TLZ* 97 (1972) 161–74; Preston M. Sprinkle, “πίστις χριστοῦ as an Eschatological Event,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ: Exegetical, Biblical, and Theological Studies* (ed. Michael Bird and Preston Sprinkle; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009) 165–84; Karl F. Ulrichs, *Christusglaube: Studien zum Syntagma πίστις χριστοῦ und zum paulinischen Verständnis von Glaube und Rechtfertigung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

⁷ See R. Barry Matlock’s comments about this (often unhelpful) phenomenon: “‘Even the Demons Believe’: Paul and πίστις χριστοῦ,” *CBQ* 64 (2002) 300–18, at 300–1.

⁸ R. Barry Matlock’s publications have led the way: “Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate: Cautionary Remarks from a Lexical-Semantic Perspective,” *NovT* 42 (2000) 1–23; idem., “Even the Demons Believe;” idem., “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 3:26: Neglected Evidence for ‘Faith in Christ?,”” *NTS* 49 (2003) 433–39; idem., “The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9,” *JSNT* 30 (2007) 173–203; idem., “Saving Faith: The Rhetoric and Semantics of πίστις in Paul,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 73–89. Francis Watson’s recent publications do the same, but from a more “intertextual” standpoint: “By Faith (of Christ): An Exegetical Dilemma and its Scriptural Solution,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 147–63; idem., *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 71–77; idem., *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2007) 238–45, 322–25.

⁹ Space constraints preclude a detailed assessment of the evidence and arguments. For recent subjective-genitive treatments of particular relevance, see Douglas Campbell, “The Faithfulness of Jesus Christ in Romans 3:22,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 57–71; idem., “Romans 1:17—A *Crux Interpretum* for the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate,” *JBL* 113 (1994) 265–85; Paul Foster, “The First Contribution to the πίστις χριστοῦ Debate: A Study of Ephesians 3:12,” *JSNT* 85 (2002) 75–96; Kenneth Schenck, “2 Corinthians and the πίστις χριστου Debate,” *CBQ* 70 (2008) 524–37; Mark

decisively taken the high ground. Though I envision my descriptive study lending further support to arguments for the subjective genitive, engaging in the general debate does not constitute my primary purpose.

Before moving on, it should be noted that proponents of the objective genitive sometimes rhetorically question “where does it stop,” if the subjective genitive is granted? What restricts scholars from treating every instance of πίστις without a modifying pronoun as Christ’s and thus eliminating any emphasis on the faith of the Christ follower?¹⁰ Beyond the dubiousness of this consideration from a descriptive perspective, as though Paul must necessarily affirm an idea long cherished in the history of interpretation, advocating a subjective genitive approach to the seven constructions in question should not involve denying that Paul writes often of Christ devotees’ πίστις or of them doing whatever πιστεύω means. Paul indicates that Christ followers (should) do whatever πιστεύω means twenty-nine or more times,¹¹ at least twice specifying Christ as the object or focus of the verb.¹² He writes that πίστις characterizes Christ devotees, though when using the noun πίστις he qualifies it with reference to God or God’s power, not Christ.¹³ Unambiguous uses of πίστις or πιστεύω with Christ as the object are rare in Paul’s letters.¹⁴ Nevertheless, a notion of πίστις or πιστεύω on the part of Christ followers occurs frequently. To state the obvious and to be clear about my own working assumptions, exploring possible uses of πίστις as signifying Christ’s πίστις does not involve eliminating the place of Christ followers’ πίστις in Paul. Simply finding arguments for the

R. Whitenon, “After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Neglected Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers,” *JTS* 61 (2010) 82–109; and Stephen L. Young, “Romans 1.1–5 and Paul’s Christological Use of Hab. 2.4 in Rom. 1.17: An Underutilized Consideration in the Debate,” *JSNT* 34 (2012) 277–85.

¹⁰ E.g., Dunn: “Once More,” 257–58.

¹¹ A form of πιστεύω occurs 42 times in the seven recognized letters. Twenty-nine of those occurrences have Christ followers (or someone representing them) as the subject and fall into one or more of the following categories: 1) God as the object, 2) Christ as the object, 3) what God has done in Christ as the object, 4) an unclear object or focus that could be one or a mixture of the preceding three options, 5) doing whatever this verb means treated as decisive for being a Christ initiate and experiencing the blessings of the Judean god, 6) doing whatever this verb means treated as characteristic of Christ followers. The relevant attestations are as follows: Rom 1:16, 3:22, 4:11, 4:24, 9:33, 10:4, 10:9, 10:10, 10:11, 10:14 (x2), 16, 13:11, 15:13; 1 Cor 1:21, 3:5, 14:22 (x2), 15:2, 11; 2 Cor 4:13 (x2); Gal 2:16, 3:22; Phil 1:29; and 1 Thess 1:7, 2:10, 2:13, and 4:14. I have eliminated Rom 4:3, 4:5, 4:17, 4:18 and Gal 3:6 for reasons that will become apparent when I discuss Abraham in Romans 4 below.

¹² Gal 2:16; Phil 1:29. Though a minority position, some deny Christ is the focus of the verb in Rom 9:33, 10:11, and 10:14 (e.g., Lloyd Gaston, *Paul and the Torah* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1987] 129).

¹³ 1 Thess 1:8 (ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἢ πρὸς τὸν θεόν); 1 Cor 2:5 (ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν μὴ ἦ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπου ἀλλ’ ἐν δυνάμει θεοῦ). In Philemon 5 Paul mentions the πίστις of Christ devotees towards the Lord Jesus. He also, however, includes τὴν ἀγάπην alongside τὴν πίστιν that Philemon has towards (πρὸς) not only Jesus, but also “into” (εἰς) all the holy ones.

¹⁴ As subjective-genitive advocates often point out (e.g., Hays, “What Is at Stake?,” 276–77). Obviously this claim either presumes a subjective-genitive reading or brackets the disputed seven passages.

subjective genitive convincing should not itself incline the interpreter one way or the other when analyzing any single use of πίστις. Neither should the subjective-genitive position entail some inherent marginalizing of Christ devotees' πίστις or the importance of individuals' response to Christ in Paul's discourse.¹⁵ Determining the meaning of any particular use of πίστις still requires an analysis of the linguistic and literary contexts of each.

■ Framing the Discussion of ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Rom 5:1

Scholars almost universally understand the ἐκ πίστεως of Rom 5:1 as a reference to the decisive "faith" of the "believer;" sometimes faith specifically "in Jesus."¹⁶ Every commentary of which I am aware interprets the passage thus. This understanding has become so taken-for-granted that most proceed with only a passing comment that it refers to the πίστις of Christ followers, which somehow effects δικαιοσύνη for them.¹⁷ Other commentators do not discuss this interpretive issue at all. One infers their understanding from the translation, comments on other aspects of the passage, or comments on other parts of Romans.¹⁸ James Dunn comes closest to

¹⁵ Pace Ben C. Dunson, "Faith in Romans: The Salvation of the Individual or Life in Community?," *JNTS* 34 (2011) 19–46, at 21, 25.

¹⁶ For the passages relevant to this article, I translate πίστις with "faithfulness," "trust," or "faith" and πιστεύω with "be faithful to," "trust," or "believe" – depending upon context. This contextual differentiation is simply to acknowledge the basic lexical-semantic point of scholars such as Matlock ("Detheologizing the ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Debate," 3–6) that each word does not have some undifferentiable "general, amoebic sort of sense that could ooze in the direction required," but that they have different senses that are properly selected and recognized based upon practical-linguistic context. Also, in the passages relevant for this study πίστις and πιστεύω do not necessarily connote private, passive, purely internal, and non-action/deed entities. In fact, the opposite often seems to be the case: e.g., Douglas A. Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel: A Suggested Strategy* (New York: T&T Clark International, 2005) 178–207; Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1994) 199, 228–29; and Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 122–24, 147–50, 212–13, 244–45, 345–46.

¹⁷ The following commentators at least mention that they understand the πίστις in Rom 5:1 as the Christ follower's: Brendan Byrne, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina 6; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1996) 162–63, 169; C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (New York: Long & Smith, 1932) 72–73; James D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (2 vols.; WBC 38; Dallas: Word, 1988) 1:246, 248, 262; Joseph Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993) 393–94; Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 2007) 348; Thomas Schreiner, *Romans* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker, 1998) 253; Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (3 vols.; Zürich: Benziger, 1978–82) 1:288–90.

¹⁸ E.g., Matthew Black, *Romans* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1989) 74–75; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1975–1979) 1:255; Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Philadelphia: Martien, 1864) 203; Ernst Käsemann, *Romans* (trans. Geoffrey Bromiley; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1980) 132–34; Douglas Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1996) 298; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1997 [1959–1965]) 1:58–64; Charles Talbert, *Romans* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, Ga.: Smyth & Helwys, 2002) 131–34; and N. T. Wright, *The Letter to the Romans* (ed. Leander Keck; NIB 10; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2002) 393–770, at 509, 514.

addressing the possibility of another understanding of the ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1, “The ἐκ πίστεως is certainly to be construed along the same lines as the same phrase in 3:26, 30 and 4:16.”¹⁹ Dunn interprets “the same phrase in 3:26” as a reference to Christ followers’ faith with Christ as the object.²⁰

The fact that most commentators on Romans adopt the objective genitive would seem to explain, at least to a significant extent, the assumed status of this understanding of πίστις in Rom 5:1. For most commentators the πίστις decisive for divine blessing in Paul, especially for δικαιοσύνη, is decidedly that of the Christ devotee. One thus rightly expects an almost automatic representation of the faith in 5:1 as Christ-follower faith; so automatic that the general lack of discussion and argument for it does not occasion surprise. What should cause surprise, however, is that commentators who adopt the subjective genitive also just as automatically, it seems, interpret the πίστις in 5:1 as the Christ follower’s. They too indicate this with passing comments or, more indirectly, through how they handle other aspects of the passage.²¹ So taken-for-granted and established is this reading of 5:1 that some opponents of the subjective genitive appeal to its ἐκ πίστεως.²² For such advocates of the objective genitive, this use constitutes an example of Paul considering the believer’s faith specifically in Christ to be decisive for δικαιοσύνη.

The understanding of πίστις in Rom 5:1 as the Christ follower’s has thus attained an assumed and axiomatic status. Commentators do not explain why they take its ἐκ πίστεως to refer to the faith of Christ devotees. As such, one must infer why they, at least tacitly, adopt this position. I imagine most would advance two primary considerations to support their readings if pressed about the issue. First, as mentioned above, it would be argued that elsewhere in Romans and Paul the πίστις decisive for effecting δικαιοσύνη is the Christ follower’s.²³ Second, it would be

¹⁹ Dunn, *Romans*, 1:246.

²⁰ E.g., “ὁ ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ is the one whose life has been determined by an act of faith (commitment) to Jesus (as Lord) and continues to be characterized by the attitude of trust in Jesus” (Dunn, *Romans*, 1:176).

²¹ Leander Keck, *Romans* (ANTC; Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 2005) 135–36; Talbert, *Romans*, 108–9, 131–34; Wright, *Romans*, 509, 514.

²² E.g., Richard H. Bell, “Faith in Christ: Some Exegetical and Theological Reflections on Philippians 3:9 and Ephesians 3:12,” in *The Faith of Jesus Christ*, 111–25, at 120–21; Arland J. Hultgren, “The ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ Formulation in Paul,” *NovT* 22 (1980) 248–63, at 258, 262; Schreiner, *Romans*, 184–85.

²³ For example, the following commentators articulate such positions about faith and righteousness in Paul and Romans: Byrne, *Romans*, 124–25, 162–63, 169; Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:203–4; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:166, 246, 248, 262; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 345–46, 393–94; Käsemann, *Romans*, 101; Moo, *Romans*, 224–26, 298; Murray, *Romans*, 1:110–11, 158–64, 363–73; and Schreiner, *Romans*, 181–86. Though Murray’s commentary is more overtly theological than most engaged here, his comments on Rom 3:21–23 helpfully illustrate this kind of underlying consideration: “It is hardly necessary to show that Jesus Christ is the object and not the subject of the faith spoken of. It would be alien to the whole teaching of the apostle to suppose that what he has in mind is a faith that is patterned after the faith which Jesus himself exemplified, far less that we are justified by Jesus’ own faith” (*Romans*, 1:110–11).

argued that Paul presents Abraham in Romans 4 as an example for Christ followers of δικαιοσύνη by means of their own πίστις; an example of “Justification by Faith.”²⁴ Interpreters have thus, at least implicitly, situated the δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 within this aggregation of interpretive positions. In the rest of the article I question this discursive situating of 5:1. After some brief comments about the subjective genitive position’s relevance for my treatment of πίστις in 5:1, I offer a reading of 3:21–4:25 to demonstrate the plausibility of understanding the πίστις in 5:1 as Christ’s own as well as to illustrate the ethnically-embedded significance of Paul’s claims about Christ’s faithfulness. I conclude by exploring further literary-contextual data rendering the proposed interpretation more plausible and by elucidating its coherence with other identifiable positions and assumptions in Paul’s letters.

■ Relevance of the Subjective Genitive

A subjective-genitive understanding of πίστις Χριστοῦ necessarily undercuts arguments that Rom 5:1 must have the faith of Christ followers in view because Paul only emphasizes their faith, especially when it comes to δικαιοσύνη for them. It establishes at least seven instances of πίστις in Paul that designate non Christ-devotee πίστις. Furthermore, it enshrines Christ’s πίστις in the midst of three passages classically viewed as revealing the dynamics of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and δικαιοσύνη for Christ followers in Paul (Rom 3:21–26; Gal 2:11–21; Phil 3:8–11).²⁵ Thus the references to God righteousing a person, a person being righteoused, and having a righteousness διὰ πίστεως Χριστου (Rom 3:22; Gal 2:16; Phil 3:9) or ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ (Rom 3:26; Gal 2:16) all indicate the instrumentality of the

²⁴ The following are several commentators who bring up their understanding of Abraham in Romans 4 as an example of Christ followers’ justification by faith, in connection with their discussions of Rom 5:1: Byrne, *Romans*, 162–63; Dodd, *Romans*, 72; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:246, 262; and Jewett, *Romans*, 350.

²⁵ I understand δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Paul as a reference to the Judean god’s eschatological saving righteousness, merciful faithfulness, and/or covenant faithfulness—often relating to his including Gentiles: e.g., Douglas A. Campbell, *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3:21–26* (JSNTSup 65; Sheffield, U.K.: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992) 138–65; Richard B. Hays, “Psalm 143 and the Logic of Romans 3,” *JBL* 99 (1980) 107–15; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 170–72, 195–202; and Sam K. Williams, “The ‘Righteousness of God’ in Romans,” *JBL* 99 (1980) 241–90. For convenience I translate δικαιοσύνη with “righteousness” and δικαιόω with a neologism, “(to) righteous” (for the latter, see E.P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* [Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1983] 13 n. 18). Paul does not assume a dichotomy between righteousing as meaning the Judean god’s including someone (especially a Gentile) within his eschatological people and righteousing as meaning this god’s reckoning people righteous such that their sins are not (or will not be) counted against them. I do not understand δικαιοσύνη θεου and δικαιοσύνη / δικαιόω for Christ followers in Paul as referring functionally to the same thing (*pace*, e.g., Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 235–38, 328).

faithfulness of Christ in these δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and δικαιοσύνη events.²⁶ The subjective genitive also shows Paul associating the faithfulness of Christ with the benefits of the Judean god that he discusses in non-righteousness terminology: Christ living “in” Paul and what this means for his life now (Gal 2:20) and the promise being given to the trusting ones (Gal 3:22). Adopting the subjective genitive position thus destabilizes the idea that Paul singularly emphasizes Christ devotees’ πίστις (in Christ) in connection with God’s enacting righteousness and related eschatological blessings for them. It thus also removes any related reasons for not reexamining Rom 5:1’s ἐκ πίστεως.

■ Selective Reading of Rom 3:21–4:25 and its Ethnically-Embedded ΠΙΣΤΙΣ

A selective reading of Rom 3:21–4:25 can demonstrate the plausibility of re-understanding ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 as an instance of πίστις in Paul that, while lacking a modifying pronoun, refers to Christ’s πίστις. My selective reading will, furthermore, illustrate how Paul deploys his claims about Christ’s πίστις within ethnic rhetoric about the Judean god and his benefits for Gentiles that are available through Paul’s Christ-cult. One need not accept all the details of this reading for the purposes of my argument, but rather its general orientation. A key aspect of this reading involves recognizing that Paul’s relevant discourse about Christ, πίστις, νόμος (“law”), ἔργων (νόμου) (“works/deeds [of the law]”), δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and δικαιοσύνη concerns not abstract divine blessings, power, benefits, and “salvation,” but rather the power, benefits, and “salvation” of the Judean god. For Paul in Romans, participation in this god’s blessings is a privilege of his people, the descendants of Abraham.²⁷ As I will illustrate below, Paul’s discourse about πίστις, νόμος, ἔργων (νόμου), δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and δικαιοσύνη occurs precisely in passages where he takes positions about the Judean god’s eschatological blessings, who participates in those blessings, and how the Judean god includes non-Judeans among the descendants of Abraham and thus among those who inherit and enjoy his ethnically-coded blessings.²⁸

²⁶ I take Christ’s faithfulness, especially when serving as a means of effecting the Judean god’s righteousing and other aspects of his eschatological rescue for Christ followers, as Christ’s faithful death and faithfulness in going to his death: Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 610–19, 641–42, 647–56; Hays, *Faith of Jesus Christ*, 161–62; and Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 213–26.

²⁷ I use the ambiguous term “the people” of the Judean god since Paul does, in certain qualified ways, equalize Judeans alongside Gentiles, even though he still fundamentally maintains this ethnic distinction. For discussion of how Paul envisions the relation of Judeans and Gentiles in Christ, and how Paul maintains this ethnic distinction, see Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 55, 117–35, 145–48.

²⁸ As scholars such as Johnson Hodge and Stowers have demonstrated, ethnic matters pertaining to Gentile Christ-initiates in relation to the Judean god get at the core of Paul’s self-representation and “mission,” and are the context for his discourse about πίστις, νόμος, ἔργων (νόμου), δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ and δικαιοσύνη: e.g., Johnson Hodge, “Apostle to the Gentiles;” eadem, *If Sons, Then Heirs*; Buell and Johnson Hodge, “The Rhetoric of Race and Ethnicity in Paul,” 235–51; and Stowers,

In Rom 3:21–26 Paul begins to unpack the positive content of what he hints at in 1:1–5 and 1:16–17. He addresses how the impartial Judean god can enact his saving righteousness and merciful faithfulness to Gentiles mastered by their passions (1:18–32) and to Judeans who are also “under sin” alongside Gentiles (3:9).²⁹ Paul takes a position about how the Judean god can do this apart from the law, such that he is righteousing Gentiles and including them in his eschatological rescue outside the law – the law that itself was supposedly this god’s means of righteousing his people and causing them to participate in ultimate blessings.³⁰ Crucially, Paul

Rereading of Romans. Though still inhabiting certain traditional theological concerns and presenting a largely de-ethnicized Paul, much recent “New Perspective” scholarship has foregrounded Paul’s “Jew and Gentile” concerns, arguing that they do not occupy an ancillary and merely background place in comparison with supposedly different and primary concerns of “salvation” and questions of generalized faith versus works: e.g., James D. G. Dunn, *Jesus, Paul, and the Law: Studies in Mark and Galatians* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1990) 89–264; and J. R. Daniel Kirk, *Unlocking Romans: Resurrection and the Justification of God* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2008) 1–13, 57–58. Numerous scholars who advocate more-traditional Protestant readings of Paul have contested such New Perspective work and reasserted the centrality of, for example, generalized faith versus works, while urging that “Jew and Gentile” matters are merely background or secondary: e.g., G. K. Beale, “The Overstated ‘New’ Perspective,” *BBR* 19 (2009) 85–94, at 90, 92–94; Douglas Moo, “Israel and the Law in Romans 5–11: Interaction with the New Perspective,” in *The Paradoxes of Paul* (ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O’Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid; vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Academic, 2004) 185–216, at 188; idem, *Romans*, 27–29, 243–44; and Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The “Lutheran” Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2004) 441–45. For my purposes, the upshot of work by scholars such as Johnson Hodge and Stowers (and, to a lesser extent, various New Perspective scholars) is that, as I will illustrate below, within the ethnic mechanics of Paul’s discourse(s) in Romans, the Judean god rescues only his people. As such, positions about and contestation over how to identify the Judean god’s people, Gentiles in relation to the Judean god’s promises to Israel, and how Gentiles may have access to the power and blessings of the Judean god are (if you will) “salvation” issues, not separate “ecclesiological,” “merely sociological,” “secondary,” or “background” concerns.

²⁹ Though Paul explains the Gentile situation of sin in terms of mastery by the passions and a malfunctioning mind due to the punishment of God (Rom 1:18–32), he does not so explain and intensify Judean faithlessness and sin: Stanley K. Stowers, “Paul’s Four Discourses about Sin,” in *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, O.P., and Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* (ed. Peter Spitaler; CBQMS 48; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 2011) 100–127, at 110–19, 121, 125–26; idem, *Rereading of Romans*, 83–100, 255–56, 273–84; and Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in the Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2008) 119–26. I have elsewhere attempted to elucidate Paul’s different underlying history or logic of Judean sin (“A Judean Claims that Judeans are ‘Under Sin’? Paul’s Judean-Eschatological Logic and Rom 3:9” [paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-Atlantic Region of the SBL, New Brunswick, N.J., March 15, 2012]).

³⁰ Scholars debate the extent to which our extant sources indicate that some Judean intellectuals and teachers held that non-Judeans must adopt some or all Judean ancestral customs (i.e., the law) in order to affiliate at varying levels with Judeans and/or to participate in the Judean god’s eschatological blessings – just as ancient Judean cultural-producers apparently took different and contesting positions on these matters. For scholarship that addresses these topics in relation to Paul, and that emphasizes the potential difference between required practices for Gentiles to affiliate at varying levels with Judeans versus positions in Judean sources about Gentile law observance in the eschaton, see, e.g., Terence Donaldson, *Judaism and the Gentiles: Jewish Patterns of Universalism* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor

asserts that the Judean god's saving righteousness is both revealed apart from the law and "testified to by the law and the prophets" (3:21b). Instead of being revealed through the law, this δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ is revealed διὰ the faithfulness of Jesus Christ into/for (εἰς) all the ones who are faithful (3:22) and it results in "everyone" being righteous (3:24a), though they all sinned (3:23).³¹ It is also revealed διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως (conventionally translated as "through the redemption") that is in (or by) Christ Jesus and διὰ the faithfulness ἐν his blood.³² The Judean god is thus both righteous and the righteouser of the one who is "out of" (ἐκ) the faithfulness of Jesus (τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ ; 3:26). As I will clarify below, Paul's language that God righteous τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ operates within certain notions of ethnicity and patrilineal-descent. Τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ is the one descended from the faithfulness of Jesus or the one who has his origin in the faithfulness of Jesus.³³ As Romans 4, Romans 8, and especially Galatians 3–4 make clear, Paul represents Christ establishing a way for Gentiles to be adopted into Abraham's lineage and thus to inherit the promises and blessings of Abraham's god. Thus, among many things, in Rom 3:21–26 Paul represents Christ's faithfulness (3:22, 25, 26) as the way the Judean god's saving righteousness is revealed such that he can surprisingly righteous even Gentiles apart from the law; as opposed to unleashing his just wrath against them because of their accumulated sins. Paul portrays Christ as a decisive figure whose actions cause others to participate in the Judean god's eschatological blessings apart from and in seeming contradiction to his own law – but in a way somehow testified to by the law and the prophets.³⁴

Though a new rhetorical unit may commence at Rom 3:27, within the logic of the letter 3:27–4:2 relates directly to the preceding section. I will note several points for the purposes of my limited and selective reading of 3:21–4:25. First, however one divides 3:27–4:2, the passage explicitly demonstrates the preceding discussion's

University Press, 2007); idem, *Paul and the Gentiles: Remapping the Apostle's Convictional World* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress, 1997); Paula Fredriksen, "Judaism, the Circumcision of Gentiles, and Apocalyptic Hope: Another Look at Galatians 1 and 2," *JTS* 42 (1991) 532–64; eadem, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," *NTS* 56 (2010) 232–52.

³¹ On taking δικαιοσύμειοι δωρεὰν τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι (3:24a) with the preceding clauses (3:22–23) and not with the following διὰ clause starting in 3:24b, see Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness*, 90–95.

³² Paul refers again to Christ's faithfulness with διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν τῷ αὐτοῦ αἵματι in Rom 3:25; Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 640–56; and Bruce W. Longenecker, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Romans 3:25: Neglected Evidence for the 'Faithfulness of Christ'?", *NTS* 39 (1993) 478–80. Campbell argues that an epanaphoric construction (Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness*, 93–95) of three successive διὰ clauses rhetorically structures the passage, with each one explicating how Νυνὶ δὲ χωρὶς νόμου δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ πεφανέρωται (3:21, 22): Campbell, *Rhetoric of Righteousness*, 83–101, 177–203.

³³ Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 79–91.

³⁴ Though the following differ between themselves, they approach Rom 3:21–26 with similar understandings of Paul's concerns, what he means by δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, and the decisiveness of Christ's faithfulness in Paul's logic: Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 639–714; idem, *Rhetoric of Righteousness*; Hays, "Logic of Romans 3"; idem, "Three Dramatic Roles: The Law in Romans 3–4," in *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (ed. James D. G. Dunn; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2001) 151–64; and Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 194–226.

embeddedness within issues of Gentile access to the blessings of the Judean god for Paul. He moves seamlessly between positions about πίστις, νόμος, (χωρίς) ἔργων (νόμου), and δικαιοῦν and also questions about that god's impartiality, how he righteouses Judeans and Gentiles, and how/whether to conceive of the Judean god as also the god of Gentiles in some way. Second, by excluding καύχησις in 3:27 and 4:2 Paul does not simply proscribe generalized boasting in one's own achievements.³⁵ He characterizes the Judean of 2:17–24 as a boaster in God and in the law (2:17, 23). Paul levels this charge in the midst of his explication of the Judean god's impartiality (2:1–3:20). Though Judeans occupy a privileged position, especially since their god gave them the law and will continue his faithfulness to them (3:1–3), both Judeans and Gentiles are ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν (“under sin”; 3:9) and God will judge them both. Given the actualization of the Judean god's eschatological saving righteousness in the faithfulness of Christ, Judeans' boast in the law and a special eschatological relationship with their god singularly defined by the law is excluded. This god, instead, righteouses by Christ's faithfulness. Third, just as in 3:21–26, here Paul represents Christ's faithfulness as the decisive factor in the Judean god's righteousing of Gentiles (and Judeans): πίστει (3:28), ἐκ πίστεως and διὰ τῆς πίστεως (3:30).³⁶

In Rom 3:31 Paul returns to a point he raised in 3:21 and frames the representation of Abraham he will give in Romans 4: νόμον οὖν καταργούμεν διὰ τῆς πίστεως; μὴ γένοιτο. ἀλλὰ νόμον ἰσχύνομεν (see translation below). Paul claims that his position that the Judean god now righteouses people apart from the law (i.e., that the Judean boasting of 2:17–24 and 3:27 are excluded), despite seeming to contradict the law, is actually authorized by the law itself. The following strategic sketch of Abraham in Romans 4 serves to validate Paul's claim of authorization by the sacred books of the Judeans. Examining how Paul depicts Abraham thus not only clarifies the issues Paul addresses in 3:21–31, but also illuminates the immediate context of 5:1 and its ἐκ πίστεως. As indicated above, interpreters have traditionally concluded that Paul presents Abraham in Romans 4 as a proto-example for Christ followers

³⁵ Pace Simon Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1–5* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002) 222–51; Moo, *Romans*, 246–47, 250; and Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 246–52, 253. Given that Paul apparently thinks he is still talking about ethnic issues pertaining to Gentiles in relation to the Judean god in 3:27–28 (see 3:29–30), Watson's attempts to dissociate Paul's discourse about καύχησις in 2:17–24 from that of 3:27, to distinguish Paul's concerns in 3:27–28 from 3:29–30, and to relocate Paul's concerns in 3:27 to the realm of general principles about boasting in “achievements” to the exclusion of boasting in “status” seem unfounded (*ibid.*, 246–52; 253 n. 68). Watson thus reverses the positions on καύχησις and 3:27–30 he took in the 1986 version of his book, though without dealing with his own prior arguments (*Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986] 132–35).

³⁶ For arguments that these instances of πίστις refer to Christ's faithfulness, see Stanley K. Stowers, “ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ and ΔΙΑ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans 3:30,” *JBL* 108 (1989) 665–74; *idem*, *Rereading of Romans*, 238–41.

of justification by faith and not works.³⁷ But does Paul in fact fashion Abraham this way in Romans 4?

What then shall we say? Have we found Justification by the Christ devotee's faith to be the structuring issue of our letter thus far? In Rom 3:21–31 Paul articulates Gentile inclusion in the Judean god's blessings through the faithfulness of Christ and dissociates the law from this god's righteousing of Gentiles. He dismisses Judean boasting associated with the law (2:17, 23; 3:27–30) and motions towards reconfiguring the interrelated significance of circumcision, the law, and even Judeanness itself when it comes to eschatological judgment (2:25–29). These immediate literary contextual emphases and Paul's assertion in 3:31 that the law validates his positions orient the reader to expect a representation of the law itself establishing how the Judean god may righteous people (especially Gentiles) apart from the law, specifically involving how the faithfulness of one person may cause others to be righteoused. My reading of Romans 4 will demonstrate how Paul strategically explicates the significance of Abraham there precisely in this expected way. Paul depicts him not as a proto-example for Christ followers of "Justification by Faith," but rather as the patriarchic head of a lineage specifically based upon and defined by his law-dissociated faithfulness. Abraham appears in Romans 4 as an ancestral representative figure who obtained and inherited his god's promises and thus brought about the inclusion of others, his descendants, in these ethnic promises. Given space constraints and the purpose of my selective reading of 3:21–4:25, the following comments suffice to illustrate both this approach to Abraham in Romans 4 and its relevance to understanding how Paul writes of πίστις in 5:1.

"What then shall we say? Have we found Abraham (to be) our forefather according to the flesh?" (Rom 4:1).³⁸ Is the nature of Abraham's paternity *κατὰ σάρκα*? For Paul this relates directly to the following conditional, "For if Abraham was righteoused from works, then he has a reason for boasting" (4:2a). Configuring Abraham's paternity as *κατὰ σάρκα* and Abraham being righteoused from works (of the law) are two sides of the same coin for Paul.³⁹ The nature of Abraham's

³⁷ This is still a common understanding of the significance of Abraham in Romans 4: e.g., Simon Gathercole, "Justified by Faith, Justified by his Blood: The Evidence of Romans 3:21–4:25," in *Paradoxes of Paul*, 2:147–84, at 164; idem, *Where is Boasting?*, 232–49; Moo, *Romans*, 255–64; and Thomas H. Tobin, "What Shall We Say that Abraham Found? The Controversy behind Romans 4," *HTR* 88 (1995) 437–52.

³⁸ See Richard B. Hays's suggested re-punctuation and translation of Rom 4:1 ("Have We Found Abraham to be Our Forefather According to the Flesh?: A Reconsideration of Rom 4:1," *NovT* 27 [1985] 76–98, at 76–81). It has met with much approval: e.g., Kirk, *Unlocking Romans*, 60. Even so, dissent remains: e.g., Dunn, *Romans*, 1:195–99; Jewett, *Romans*, 307–9; and Tobin, "What Shall We Say," 443.

³⁹ One should understand ἐξ ἔργων ἐδικαιώθη in 4:2a alongside how Paul discusses the topic in 3:20–31. He does not write of general "works" but of whether one is righteoused from works of the law. On 4:2 having works of the law in view, see Michael Cranford, "Abraham in Romans 4: The Father of All Who Believe," *NTS* 41 (1995) 71–88, at 77; Kirk, *Unlocking Romans*, 61–62; and Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 128.

paternity and how he was righteous determine the scope of his promise-inheriting descendants. Within the logic of Paul's meaning-making about Gentile Christ-initiates, Abraham, and the Judean god, if the law defines Abraham's paternity and thus those descended from him, then Paul's claims about Gentile inclusion apart from the law oppose the law-defined promises and inheritance between the Judean god and his people. Advocating Gentile inclusion apart from the law and, instead, through Christ's faithfulness would position Paul's gospel against the authority of the Judeans' sacred writings. Paul could not legitimate his positions about Christ, Christ's faithfulness, the law, and Gentile inclusion (and thus his Christ-cult for Gentiles) from this prestigious locus of authorization. Paul thus orients his representation of Abraham with questions about the law's relevance for how Abraham was righteous and the nature of his paternity.

The usual interpretive focus on generalized faith versus works as the main point of Rom 4:2–8 notwithstanding, this section serves primarily both to introduce Abraham and Abrahamic descent from the standpoint of Gen 15:6's faithfulness and righteousness language and to dissociate Abraham's faithfulness from the law.⁴⁰ This speaks directly to the concerns with which Paul orients his discussion of Abraham in Rom 4:1–2a. In 4:9–12 Paul further reveals his focus on the nature of Abraham's paternity by representing Abraham as the head of a lineage that includes Gentiles: "And he received the sign of circumcision as an attestation of the righteousness of his uncircumcised-trust, so that (εἰς) he may be the father of all the ones who trust while uncircumcised, so that (εἰς) righteousness may be counted to them also" (4:11). Abrahamic paternity, which can include Gentiles as Gentiles due to the law-dissociated nature of Abraham's faithfulness, determines who will be righteous.

Romans 4:16–17 offers another illustration of Paul's concern in this passage to establish the law-dissociated nature of Abraham's paternity for Gentiles, a paternity based upon his faithfulness. The significance of faithfulness (διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως) is to guarantee the promise to all Abraham's seed (παντὶ τῷ σπέρματι), "not only to the one from the law, but also to the one descended from the faithfulness of Abraham (τῷ ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραάμ), who is father of all of us." Of interest here, and paralleling Rom 3:26's τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ, the language of τῷ ἐκ πίστεως

⁴⁰ I acknowledge the controversial nature of my claims about Rom 4:2–8 and plan to treat the issue at length in a forthcoming study. For other discussions that, in differing ways, decenter the traditional believing vs. doing principle from being the primary point of Rom 4:2–8 and, instead, treat the passage in connection with Paul's ethnic concerns, see Cranford, "Abraham in Romans 4," 77–83; Kirk, *Unlocking Romans*, 60–65; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 225–31, 241–43; and N. T. Wright, "Paul and the Patriarch: The Role of Abraham in Romans 4," *JSNT* 35 (2013) 207–41. See, however, the numerous recent publications contesting any denial that the traditional concern of faith vs. general works constitutes the focus of these verses: e.g., A. Andrews Das, "Paul and Works of Obedience in Second Temple Judaism: Romans 4:4–5 as a 'New Perspective' Case Study," *CBQ* 71 (2009) 795–812; Gathercole, *Where is Boasting?*, 216–51; Seyoon Kim, *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002) 54–66; Moo, *Romans*, 262–64; and Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New*, 307–12.

Ἐβραῖμ resonates within certain ancient ethnic sensitivities for delineating descent and how descendants share in the characteristics of their ancestors.⁴¹ Paul here defines Abraham's law-dissociated Gentile descendants as those who are "descended from the faithfulness of Abraham," thus not only reflecting his concern in Romans 4 to construe Abraham as the patriarchic head of a lineage that can include Gentiles apart from the law, but also how Abraham's faithfulness is decisive for such inclusion. In 4:17 Paul substantiates his points in 4:16 with a marked reference to a Judean sacred writing: "just as it is written, 'I have made you the father of many nations.'" This further clarifies that his concern has been to configure Abraham as the head of a lineage that includes Gentiles.

In Rom 4:23–25 Paul sums up his discussion of Abraham, his faithfulness, and its relevance to the righteousing of others. Traditionally, interpreters have taken 4:23–24 to mean that just as faith was counted to Abraham as righteousness, so also will Christ followers' faith be counted to them as righteousness.⁴² However, in line with how I have explored Romans 4 up to this point, I consider Abraham's own πίστις to remain in view as decisive for the righteousing in question. Interpreting 4:24's οἷς μέλλει λογίξεσθαι alongside 4:9's use of this language (ἐλογίσθη τῷ Ἀβραάμ ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην) from Gen 15:6 illustrates how Paul has πίστις in view as the implied subject of λογίζομαι in Rom 4:24. Just as in 4:9, and the rest of Romans 4, in 4:24 Paul continues to write of Abraham's trust. In 4:23–24 Paul thus asserts that Gen 15:6's language about Abraham's trust concerns not just Abraham, but the others whom his trust will cause to be righteoused. As Hays puts it, "the pronouncement of Scripture applies not only to Abraham as an individual but also to others ('us') who are included *vicariously* in God's reckoning of righteousness."⁴³ In Rom 4:23–24 Paul thus continues to sketch Abraham as a decisive representative figure whose law-dissociated trust causes others to be righteoused, specifically "the ones who trust upon the one who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead." In Paul's interpretive grid Gen 15:6 thus ultimately witnesses to this Gentile-including (apart from the law) significance of Abraham and his πίστις. As such, this speaks to Paul's claim in Rom 3:31 that his gospel upholds the law: the law itself establishes how the Judean god may righteous people, especially Gentiles, apart from the law; specifically through the faithfulness of one person causing others to be righteoused.

My reading of Romans 4 coheres with recent scholarship that similarly understands Paul to present Abraham there as a proto-type of Christ and/or an ancestral representative figure, as opposed to primarily a proto-example for Christ

⁴¹ Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, then Heirs*, 79–91; see also Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 237–50; and idem, "What Is 'Pauline Participation in Christ'?", in *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders* (ed. Fabian Udoh; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008) 352–71, at 357–66.

⁴² See, e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:250; Dunn, *Romans*, 1:239–40.

⁴³ Hays, "Have We Found Abraham," 94 [italics in original].

followers of “righteousness by faith.”⁴⁴ As such scholars likewise explain, the point of Paul emphasizing Abraham’s law-dissociated paternity has to do with Paul’s advocating Gentile inclusion apart from adopting Judean ancestral customs (i.e., the law). To bring the relevance of such scholarship together with the emphases of my reading of Romans 4: within Paul’s meaning-making about Gentile Christ initiates and the Judean god’s eschatological scheme, Abraham’s law-dissociated paternity means that he can be the ancestor of both Judeans and Gentiles (e.g., 4:11–12, 16) and that, furthermore, his paternity comes from his faithfulness. Law-dissociated faithfulness defined how Abraham obtained the Judean god’s promises and blessings. Such faithfulness thus ultimately defines the characteristics of his (at least Gentile) descendants who participate in the blessings of these ethnic promises.⁴⁵ Putting this understanding of Abraham in Romans 4 together with the rest of my reading of 3:21–4:25, I suggest that with this Gentile inclusive law-authorized ethnic logic in Romans 4, Paul represents Abraham as a prototype or parallel of Christ. Abraham and his faithfulness prefigure, anticipate, and provide precedent for the significance Paul attributes to Christ and his faithfulness.⁴⁶ In 3:21–4:25 Paul thus represents the law itself establishing both the law-dissociated inclusion of Gentiles and the logic of one person’s faithfulness decisively effecting such ethnic results for others. In 4:25, the end of this section of Romans, Paul refocuses the hearer’s attention on the decisive figure he ultimately has in mind, whose faithfulness effects the righteousing of others: “Jesus our Lord, who was handed over for (διὰ) our transgressions and was raised for (διὰ) our righteousing.”

⁴⁴ See Hays’s seminal article for this reappraisal of Abraham in Romans 4: “Have We Found Abraham.” See also other publications adopting a similar approach: e.g., Cranford, “Abraham in Romans 4”; Pamela Eisenbaum, “A Remedy for Having Been Born of a Woman: Jesus, Gentiles, and Genealogy in Romans,” *JBL* 123 (2004) 671–702, at 686–95; Lloyd Gaston, “Abraham and the Righteousness of God,” *HBT* 2 (1980) 39–68, at 57–59; Desta Heliso, *Pistis and the Righteous One: A Study of Romans 1:17 against the Background of Scripture and Second Temple Jewish Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2007) 231–39; Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 80–84, 86–91; Joshua Jipp, “Rereading the Story of Abraham, Isaac, and ‘Us’ in Romans 4,” *JSNT* 32 (2009) 217–42; Kirk, *Unlocking Romans*, 59–83; Schenck, “2 Corinthians,” 534–35; Stowers, “Romans 3:30,” 671–74; idem, *Rereading of Romans*, 221–50; and Wright, “Role of Abraham.”

⁴⁵ As touched upon above, in some ancient ethnic sensitivities descendants are like their ancestors because they share in the characteristics of their ancestors—they are considered to have been “in” their ancestors (e.g., Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 19–43, 68, 93–107; and Stowers, “What is ‘Pauline Participation’,” 357–66). Thus Paul can depict Abraham as an ancestral representative figure, whose trust causes the righteousing of others and the inclusion of Gentiles, and as an exemplar of trust for his descendants. These ideas are not dichotomous for Paul (e.g., Hays, “Have We Found Abraham,” 94–95, though Hays does not draw upon such ancient ethnic ideas).

⁴⁶ E.g., Hays, “Have We Found Abraham,” 97–98; Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 90–91, 139–40; Jipp, “Rereading the Story,” 229–33, 237–39; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 199–202, 225–30, 243, 248, 252–56; and J. Ross Wagner, “The Christ, Servant of Jew and Gentile: A Fresh Approach to Romans 15:8–9,” *JBL* 116 (1997) 473–85, at 477 n. 21.

■ Reading ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Romans 5:1

With the above reading of Rom 3:21–4:25 in mind, I turn to 5:1 and its language about faith and righteousness: δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. However one interprets the specific force of οὖν in 5:1, it signals that Paul’s prior discussion informs δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως here.⁴⁷ Given my reading of 3:21–4:25 and its focus on the πίστις of Christ as the crucial factor in the righteousing of others, I propose the contextual plausibility of taking ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 as a reference to Christ’s own faithfulness. In this way Paul’s opening clause in 5:1 speaks of the same decisive πίστις for righteousing others that he has emphasized at length in the preceding literary context: the πίστις of Christ; the πίστις of a decisive representative figure. I thus propose the following reading of 5:1: “Therefore, having been righteoused from (Christ’s) faithfulness, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.”⁴⁸ This reading of 5:1, emphasizing the righteousing significance of Christ’s faithfulness, also aligns with how Paul several sentences later in 5:9 discusses the righteousing of Christ followers “by his blood” (δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ).⁴⁹ Christ’s rescuing death is, of course, exactly what many advocates of the subjective genitive consider his faithfulness to consist of.

On first glance this reading seems redundant, the very delegitimizing charge proponents of the subjective genitive have often directed against the objective genitive.⁵⁰ While it is tempting simply to note Paul’s ability to construct redundant sentences or to classify the redundancy with the positively charged label “emphasis,” Matlock rightly argues that such general claims do not constitute appropriate

⁴⁷ Many commentators stress that Rom 5:1 marks a new section, with the first clause encapsulating a primary point of the preceding section and connecting it to what follows: e.g., Cranfield, *Romans*, 1:257; Jewett, *Romans*, 348; and Wilckens, *Römer*, 1:288.

⁴⁸ My reading prefers the ἔχομεν variant instead of ἔχομεν. For a discussion of the textual issues and argument for the subjunctive, see Jewett, *Romans*, 344. Regardless, my overall point does not turn on this text-critical decision.

⁴⁹ Campbell likewise draws attention to this clause of 5:9 in his case for taking ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 as a reference to Christ’s faithfulness (*Deliverance of God*, 825). As indicated in n. 2 above, Campbell (*ibid.*, 823–25) is the one example I have found of someone arguing for this reading of ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1. Most of the rest of Campbell’s suggestive argument turns on claims about 1) coherence with his broader (to use his terminology) non-“Justification Theory” and, instead, “Apocalyptic” or “Liberative” reading of Paul, and 2) contextual fit with where Paul’s argument goes from 5:1 on through Romans 8. In this article I have offered more specific exegetical arguments, which focus on a concrete contextual framework from the immediately preceding passages in Romans, for reading ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 as a reference to Christ’s righteousing faithfulness. Such additional exegetical arguments are further necessitated by, for example, recent critiques of Campbell’s non-“Justification Theory” framework: e.g., R. Barry Matlock, “Zeal for Paul but Not According to Knowledge: Douglas Campbell’s War on ‘Justification Theory,’” *JSNT* 34 (2011) 115–49.

⁵⁰ Easter offers both a list of subjective genitive advocates who have made this argument and a brief discussion of it (“*Pistis Christou* Debate,” 38–39).

analyses of specific passages.⁵¹ Keeping Matlock's point in mind, several comments about my interpretation of the passage are in order. The repetition in my reading of 5:1 (i.e., through Christ's faithfulness; through our Lord Jesus Christ) does not hinder the competent reader's comprehension.⁵² Neither is this simply a repetition, since the specific way Paul refers to Christ differs between the first and second clauses. Furthermore, if one prefers the subjunctive ἔχωμεν in the second clause of 5:1, then the two clauses fit together as follows. With δικαιοθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως Paul reiterates a key point of his preceding discussion in 3:21–4:25, emphasizing the decisiveness of Christ's faithfulness for the righteousing of his followers. He then immediately uses this to ground his exhortation to Christ followers and re-emphasizes the means of enacting his exhortation: "through our Lord Jesus Christ." Redundancy and repetition thus do not mark this reading since Paul turns from reiterating the righteousing significance of Christ to exhorting Christ followers to an appropriate response. Paul has just spent 3:21–4:25 delineating Christ's representative import and how his faithfulness causes divine blessing to accrue to his followers, to "us." Since, then, "we" have been righteoused from Christ's faithfulness, Paul can exhort "us" to, among other things, have peace with God through Christ.⁵³

My reading of the immediate literary context also militates against the considerations one would adduce for arguing that δικαιοθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως has the Christ follower's faith in view. Paul does not exclusively make righteousness for the Christ follower turn upon his or her own faith. In Romans 4 Paul does not represent Abraham as primarily an example for Christ followers of δικαιοσύνη by means of their own faith. Given that some advocates of the objective genitive adduce the ἐκ πίστεως of 5:1 as evidence for their position, it is worth noting that even if the reader does not accept my case for Christ's faithfulness in 5:1, the

⁵¹ Matlock urges that scholars must justify claims of emphasis and repetition by inquiring "closely into the structure" of the passages in question. "Any assertion of 'redundancy' implicitly raises two, related, questions: whether there is a *pattern* to the repetition, and whether there is a *rationale* for it—whether there is any rhyme or reason either for the repetition" ("Rhetoric of πίστις," 177; italics in original).

⁵² Paul's possible "redundant" focus on Christ in each clause of 5:1 may require no more explanation than Paul's "repetition" in 5:9, where he writes δικαιοθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ and immediately follows with σωθησόμεθα δι' αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς.

⁵³ Though not a line of argument I can explore in detail here, Matthew Novenson draws attention to the potential relevance of 2 Kgdms 23:1 for the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate, with its "connection . . . between the virtue of πίστις and David's role as the χριστός" (*Christ Among the Messiahs: Christ Language in Paul and Messiah Language in Ancient Judaism* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012] 132). Novenson notes this association, the possibility of its reuse by later readers of Judean sacred writings in Greek, and how Rom 5:1 is a passage that shares this close contextual connection between πίστις (actually, πίστος in 2 Kgdms 23:1), χριστός, and κύριος seen in 2 Kgdms 23:1 (Ibid., 133, 133 n. 162). To the extent one finds this specific textual background plausible for Paul's language in Rom 5:1 (whether a "conscious" background or not, note Paul's Davidic association of Christ in 1:3; see also 15:12), a christological understanding of ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 gains plausibility.

language there cannot refer to the Christ follower's trust in Christ.⁵⁴ The nearest explicit contextual reference to the faith of Christ followers comes immediately prior to 5:1 in 4:24, where they trust not in Christ, but "upon the one who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead."

Nothing, therefore, in Rom 3:21–4:25 demands reading ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1 as the Christ devotees' faith. Though Paul has written about the πίστις of Christ followers prior to this point (e.g., 3:21–22, 4:11, 24), in each case the righteousness event for the trusting people turns on the πίστις of the representative or ancestral figure. For example, in 3:21–22 the righteousness of God is revealed through Christ's faithfulness unto all the trusting ones (διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας). In 4:24 Abraham's faithfulness will be counted "to the ones who trust in the one who raised Jesus our Lord" (οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγειραντα Ἰησοῦν τὸν κύριον ἡμῶν ἐκ νεκρῶν). Much more can be said about the relationship between the decisive or ancestral figure's πίστις and that of Christ-followers in these and other passages in Paul, in particular about the ethnic associations of Paul's claims about their respective πίστις. For now it suffices to point out that the Christ follower's πίστις does not effect the righteousness event in these passages. Instead it specifies the scope of those who participate and, it seems, constitutes their characteristic and appropriating response. My reading of 5:1 that emphasizes Christ's faithfulness thus does not necessarily "marginalize," "erase," or "diminish" Christ followers' πίστις.⁵⁵ It instead highlights that Paul sometimes situates Christ devotees' πίστις in relation to Christ's own πίστις, thus inviting further exploration of their relationships in Paul's discourse, not collapsing of the distinction between them or "erasing" one in favor of the other.⁵⁶

⁵⁴ See n. 22 above for examples of such advocates of the objective genitive.

⁵⁵ Dunson levels these charges at subjective-genitive readings of Romans ("Faith in Romans," 21, 25). It is worth noting that my brief comments about the significance of Christ followers' faith in Rom 3:21–22, 4:11, and 24–25 map onto Dunson's claims, albeit about other passages: "vitality important believing appropriation of salvation" (25); "personal believing response" (33); "faith is the vehicle through which the individual attains a righteousness" (38).

⁵⁶ To clarify, I am not claiming that one should take every opportunity to affirm the presence of both in Paul's letters; i.e., unlike some proponents of the subjective-genitive, I consider τῇ πίστει in Phil 3:9 still to refer to Christ's faithfulness just as does the preceding διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ (see Matlock's critique of subjective-genitive readings that posit that one refers to Christ's faithfulness and the other to that of his followers: "Rhetoric of πίστις," 177–84; idem, "Saving Faith," 73–78).

■ Coherence of a Christological⁵⁷ ΕΚ ΠΙΣΤΕΩΣ in Rom 5:1 with Other Passages in Paul

I conclude my case for the plausibility of reading of Rom 5:1's ἐκ πίστεως as a reference to Christ's faithfulness by briefly considering its coherence with broader contextual data in Romans as well as positions elsewhere in Paul's letters. Though also a contested issue, what is often taken as the "thesis statement" of Romans (1:16–17) introduces Paul's ἐκ πίστεως language and clarifies that it has Christ and his faithfulness in view as "The Righteous One who will live because of/from his faithfulness" (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν, καθὼς γέγραπται: ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται). Paul explicates his gospel in 1:16–17 in terms of Christ's faithfulness and resurrection. This links backwards to his extended opening in 1:1–5 with its stress on the gospel of, among other things, Christ's resurrection, and forwards to how he unpacks 1:16–17 in 3:21–26.⁵⁸ Paul's Christological ἐκ πίστεως in 1:16–17 thus relates to some of his primary emphases in Romans and, furthermore, is what he elaborates upon in 3:21–31. This further supports my reading of 3:21–4:25, which emphasizes the decisive place of Christ's faithfulness in the dynamics of the revelation of the Judean god's righteousness and his righteousing of people, especially Gentiles, thus strengthening the argument for a contextual selection of Christ's faithfulness as the referent of δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως in 5:1.

Also of note, 1:17's ἐκ πίστεως εἰς πίστιν situates Christ's πίστις in relation to the πίστις of Christ followers similarly to how my reading of 3:21–4:25 delineates the relationship between their respective πίστις.⁵⁹ Some have also argued that Paul's ἐκ πίστεως (and related διὰ πίστεως) language derives from and is controlled by how he treats Hab 2:4 in, for example, Rom 1:17.⁶⁰ This adds another consideration for assessing ἐκ πίστεως in 3:21–5:1, which occurs amidst Paul's discussions of Christ, faith, law, Gentiles, and righteousness. Ben Dunson puts the matter well,

⁵⁷ I use the label "christological" for convenience to designate interpretations of ἐκ πίστεως that take it as a reference to Christ's faithfulness, not to imply that such readings are "more Christ-centered" or "less man-centered" and thus supposedly more valid readings of Paul. As Matlock ("Detheologizing the Debate," 21–23; idem, "Even the Demons Believe," 309–14) and Watston ("By Faith (of Christ)," 159, 162–63) point out, that is disingenuous and anachronistic "theological" logic.

⁵⁸ For arguments that Paul uses Hab 2:4 in Rom 1:17 Christologically, discussion of some issues in this debate, relevant bibliography, and a reading of Rom 1:17 in connection with 1:1–5 and 3:21–26, see Young, "Romans 1.1–5."

⁵⁹ See 3:22: διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. For discussion of the possible nuances of εἰς in 1:17, see Young, "Romans 1.1–5," 281.

⁶⁰ Paul only uses ἐκ πίστεως in the two letters in which he deploys Hab 2:4, Galatians and Romans; διὰ πίστεως seems to be a variant of ἐκ πίστεως, though it also appears in Phil 3:9. For arguments that Paul's use of Hab 2:4 controls and thus clarifies his use of ἐκ πίστεως and that διὰ πίστεως serves as a variant of ἐκ πίστεως, see Campbell, "Romans 1:17"; Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 239–44; and idem, "By Faith (of Christ)." Stowers ("Romans 3:30") has argued that διὰ πίστεως refers to Christ's faithfulness and its results for the Gentiles, while ἐκ πίστεως can refer to how both Judeans and Gentiles share in the blessings of Abraham, though in different ways.

“ἐκ πίστεως . . . serves as the glue which holds Paul’s entire discourse of law, faith, and righteousness together in Romans (and Galatians).”⁶¹ On this understanding of Hab 2:4’s control of Paul’s important ἐκ πίστεως language, the Christological use of Hab 2:4 in Rom 1:17 then specifies a Christological sense for ἐκ πίστεως in Rom 5:1. Though other passages in Romans, particularly 9:30–10:21, deserve discussion, for the sake of space I will now offer several comments about Galatians.⁶²

In Gal 3:8 Paul writes about the righteousing of Gentiles ἐκ πίστεως as something foreseen in Judean sacred writings and pre-proclaimed to Abraham in the promise that all the nations would be blessed in him. As several subjective genitive proponents have argued, ἐκ πίστεως here refers to Christ’s faithfulness through which God righteouses Gentiles.⁶³ This passage (3:6–9) introduces and frames Paul’s excursus in 3:6–14, which addresses whether the Galatian Gentile Christ followers received the spirit in association with the law or not. Paul then, in 3:15–29, further unpacks the claims he makes in 3:6–14 with a discussion of the ethnic mechanics of how Christ’s faithfulness and Gentiles’ participation in Christ apart from the law can result in Abrahamic descent for Gentiles, and thus their becoming heirs according to the promise.⁶⁴ Of relevance for my discussion of Rom 3:21–4:25 and Christ’s faithfulness in Rom 5:1, in Gal 3:8 Paul thus explains the righteousing of Gentiles ἐκ πίστεως in relation to Abrahamic descent and to how Judean sacred writings authorize such law-dissociated Abrahamic descent for them. One finds the same constellation of concerns and ethnic rhetoric in Paul’s discussion of the righteousing of Christ followers ἐκ πίστεως in Rom 3:21–4:25, the orienting context for understanding δικαιοθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως in Rom 5:1. A Christological interpretation of ἐκ πίστεως in Rom 5:1 thus coheres with Paul’s claims about how the Judean god righteouses Gentiles in Gal 3:8.

In Gal 3:21–29 Paul takes several positions that cohere with my proposed reading of Rom 5:1. One may note, in particular, Gal 3:24, where Paul uses similar language to Rom 5:1 about faith and how “we” are righteoused: ἵνα ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοθῶμεν.

⁶¹ Dunson, “Faith in Romans,” 33. Of course, Dunson and I take opposing views in the πίστις Χριστοῦ debate.

⁶² I bring up 9:30–10:21 not only for its relevant clustering of faith (including ἐκ πίστεως), righteousness, and law language, but also since advocates of the objective genitive have recently published readings of parts of the passage whose specific points await detailed response from proponents of the subjective genitive: e.g., Dunson, “Faith in Romans,” 27–34; Matlock, “Rhetoric of πίστις,” 185–87; idem, “Saving Faith,” 79–81; and Watson, *Beyond the New Perspective*, 322–25. For a subjective-genitive treatment of aspects of the passage, see Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 781–807.

⁶³ Hung-Sik Choi, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5–6: Neglected Evidence for the Faithfulness of Christ,” *JBL* 124 (2005) 467–90, at 471–72; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 229–30.

⁶⁴ On this, see Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 80–86, 90–100; Stowers, *Rereading of Romans*, 229–30; and idem, “What is ‘Pauline Participation’,” 359–64. In Gal 3:15–29 Paul spells out these points in greater detail and differently than in Romans 4. Though I do not agree with all of J. L. Martyn’s points, especially his consistent de-ethnicizing of Paul’s claims about Christ’s significance and many of his mirror-readings, see Martyn’s discussion of the various differences between Paul’s deployment of Abraham in Galatians 3 and in Romans 4 (*Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul* [Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1997] 37–45, 161–75).

As some advocates of the subjective genitive have argued, ἐκ πίστεως here refers to Christ's faithfulness that effects the righteousing of "us."⁶⁵ In addition to broader arguments about Paul's use of ἐκ πίστεως, Paul's discussion in this context (Gal 3:23–26) of the coming of πίστις in terms of the coming of Christ also points to this Christological construal of πίστις, ἐκ πίστεως (3:24), and διὰ τῆς πίστεως (3:26).⁶⁶ Thus in 3:24 Paul can write that the significance of the coming of Christ is that "we might be righteoused from (Christ's) faithfulness." Similarly to Rom 3:21–4:25, Paul here configures the significance of Christ, his faithfulness, and its relevance to righteousing others in relation to the law and, furthermore, becoming law-dissociated descendants of Abraham who, precisely as his descendants, inherit the promise.⁶⁷ In Gal 3:22 Paul situates Christ followers' faith in relation to Christ's similarly to how my reading of Rom 3:21–5:1 elucidates such matters. The promise, which comes ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, is given to the ones who trust (τιὸς πιστεῦουσιν).⁶⁸ In this case Christ's faithfulness somehow effects the promise and determines how it comes to his followers, just as elsewhere the revelation of the Judean god's righteousness and his righteousing of others come διὰ/ἐκ Christ's faithfulness. At the same time, trust on the part of Christ followers delineates the scope of who receives the promise (ἡ ἐπαγγελία . . . δοθῆ τοῖς πιστεῦουσιν; 3:22). Such trust serves as, presumably, their response to what the Judean god has done for them in Christ.⁶⁹

■ Conclusion

While I do not claim to have offered definitive arguments for understanding Rom 5:1's δικαιοθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως in terms of Christ's righteousing faithfulness, I do propose that my article has established the plausibility of this reading. It makes sense in relation to both the flow of Paul's arguments in 3:21–4:25 and his ethnic logic about Christ, Gentile Christ-initiates, and Abrahamic descent. Indeed, in

⁶⁵ Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 866–67, 874–75, 879–86; Choi, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5–6," 475–78.

⁶⁶ For recent subjective-genitive arguments both about Gal 3:22 and the "coming of faith" language in 3:23–26, see Campbell, *Deliverance of God*, 867–75; idem, *Quest for Paul's Gospel*, 208–32; and Choi, "ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5–6," 472–79.

⁶⁷ See 3:6–4:7, esp. 3:29. I do not mean to erase the differences between how Paul discusses Christ, Abraham, faith, law, and Gentiles in Romans and Galatians. He relates and frames their significance somewhat differently in each letter (see also n. 64 above). In each letter, however, Paul still discusses the inclusion of people, especially Gentiles, into the Judean god's Christ-associated eschatological blessings using ethnic logic involving Christ, Abraham, and Abraham's promise inheriting lineage (on this see Johnson Hodge, *If Sons, Then Heirs*, 67–107; Stowers, *Rereading Romans*, 227–50).

⁶⁸ Matlock, however, has recently argued against the subjective-genitive reading of ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in Gal 3:22, urging that "the two πίστις/πιστεύω phrases [in 3:22] *must* be equivalent" ("Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul," 187–93, 192; italics in original).

⁶⁹ One could also examine how Gal 5:5–6 attests to similar positions about the phrase ἐκ πίστεως, as Christ's faithfulness, and righteousness for his followers, especially given Choi's recent arguments ("ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Galatians 5:5–6").

my reading δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως effectively encapsulates Paul's major points in 3:21–4:25: righteousness for Gentiles comes through Christ's πίστις, the faithfulness of a representative figure who causes others to participate in the Judean god's ethnically-coded eschatological blessings apart from the law. This coheres both with how the subjective-genitive approach opens up other exegetical possibilities for Paul's πίστις language and with how Paul's sketch of Abraham in Romans 4 also primes the reader to be thinking of righteousness coming from the πίστις of a representative figure. My reading draws further support from Paul's Christological use of Hab 2:4 at the beginning of Romans to frame his ἐκ πίστεως (and διὰ πίστεως) language, as well as how Paul discusses righteousness coming from (ἐκ) Christ's faithfulness in Galatians. Far from marginalizing or eliminating Christ followers' faith within Paul's writings, this article recognizes that Paul sometimes sets their faith in relation to Christ's decisive faithfulness, thus inviting further exploration of their relationship in his discourse. Finally, my discussion has emphasized the basic ethnic contours and significances of Paul's claims about Christ's πίστις in Rom 3:21–5:1.