

# Concordia Theological Quarterly



Volume 77:1-2

January/April 2013

## *Table of Contents*

---

<b>In Memoriam: Harold H. Zietlow (1926–2011)</b> .....	3
<b>Epistles before Gospels: An Axiom of New Testament Studies</b> David P. Scaer .....	5
<b>Moses in the Gospel of John</b> Christopher A. Maronde .....	23
<b>Rectify or Justify?</b> <b>A Response to J. Louis Martyn’s Interpretation of Paul’s Righteousness Language</b> Mark P. Surburg .....	45
<b>The Eucharistic Prayer and Justification</b> Roland F. Ziegler .....	79
<b>The Reception of Walther’s Theology in the Wisconsin Synod</b> Mark E. Braun .....	101
<b>Righteousness, Mystical Union, and Moral Formation in Christian Worship</b> Gifford A. Grobien .....	141
<b>Theological Observer</b> .....	165
God’s Word, Three Views, One Bible	
The Mission of the Church in an Age of Zombies	
One Nation under God: Thoughts Regarding “Patriotic Services”	

<b>Book Reviews</b> .....	184
<b>Books Received</b> .....	191

## **Rectify or Justify? A Response to J. Louis Martyn's Interpretation of Paul's Righteousness Language**

**Mark P. Surburg**

The article on justification stands at the center of the Lutheran Church's confession of the gospel. The *Book of Concord* explicitly states this in several places, such as when it says that justification is "the most important topic of Christian teaching which, rightly understood, illumines and magnifies the honor of Christ and brings the abundant consolation that devout consciences need" (Ap IV, 2).<sup>1</sup> This emphasis was rightly summarized in the expression that the article of justification is "the article on which the Church stands and falls" (*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*).

Robert Preus provides an important insight when he observes that the Lutheran Church uses the word "justification" in a broad sense when speaking about this article. He notes:

Luther and the Lutheran Confessions never considered justification narrowly as a mere formulation or definition. The justification of the sinner, whether considered as an article of faith or an event, cannot be separated from the grace of God, the redeeming work of Christ, the work of the Spirit through the means of grace and faith in Christ. The article of justification entails all these biblical motifs and cannot be presented or confessed in isolation from them.<sup>2</sup>

A biblical text, therefore, does not have to include the words "justify" or "justification" in order to be talking about the article of justification.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See also SA II, 1, 1-5; SD III, 6. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations of the Book of Concord are from *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000).

<sup>2</sup> Preus, *Justification and Rome*, (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House), 117, n. 6. See also p. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Preus goes on to say, "Because the Lutheran Confessions and Lutheran theology consistently understand the doctrine of justification in the broad sense as also embracing the doctrine of God's grace in Christ, the person and work of Christ, the means of grace, and the work of the Holy Spirit, they are able to find the doctrine of

At the same time, the article is called the article on justification because there are foundational texts for understanding the doctrine in which the Lutheran Confessions apply a narrow or exegetical definition to the word δικαιώω. Quoting Romans 2:13, the Apology says, "And 'to be justified' here does not mean for a righteous person to be made out of an ungodly one, but to be pronounced righteous in a forensic sense [*usu forensi*] as also in this text [Rom. 2:13]: '. . . the doers of the law will be justified'" (Ap IV, 252). The Apology also points to Romans 5:1 and concludes, "In this passage 'justify' is used in a forensic way [*forensi consuetudine*] to mean 'to absolve a guilty man and pronounce him righteous,' and to do so on account of someone else's righteousness, namely, Christ's, which is communicated to us through faith."<sup>4</sup> Thus the Lutheran Confessions clearly indicate that δικαιώω is to be understood in a forensic sense, as God the judge pronouncing the sinner to be righteous.<sup>5</sup>

---

justification in sections of Scripture and citations from the Church Fathers which do not mention the word 'justification' or even its cognates. We note this practice throughout Luther's works, particularly in his *Lectures on Genesis* and his *Sermons on the Gospel of John*. On the other hand, Lutheran theology can address the subject of justification without explicitly using the terms 'justify' or 'justification' by employing other equivalent or interchangeable themes such as 'save,' 'reconcile,' 'forgive,' and the like." *Justification and Rome*, 118, n. 6. So within the Lutheran Confessions' discussion of justification one also finds references to regeneration (Ap IV, 72,78); reconciliation (Ap IV, 158,182); mediation and propitiation (Ap IV, 40,80); sacrificial atonement (Ap IV, 53,179) and redemption (SC II, 4; LC II, 26-27). Edmund Schlink offers a similar conclusion in *Theology of the Lutheran Confessions*, trans. Paul Koehnke and Herbert J.A. Bouman (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961), 91, n. 11.

<sup>4</sup> Ap IV, 305. This text is in the quarto edition and not the octavo edition, and so the quotation is taken, with slight modification, from *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*, ed. Theodore G. Tappert (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959).

<sup>5</sup> A similar definition appears in the Formula of Concord where it first says, "Accordingly, we regard it as one and the same thing when Paul says we are 'justified by faith' (Rom. 3[:28]), or that faith is reckoned to us a righteousness (Rom. 4[:5]), or when he says that we become righteous through the obedience of the only mediator, Christ, or that 'through one person's righteousness, the righteousness of faith comes upon all people' (Rom. 5[:18])" (SD III, 12). It then goes on to provide the clarification, "Accordingly, the word 'justify' here means to pronounce righteous and free from sin and to count as freed from the eternal punishment of sin because of Christ's righteousness, which is 'reckoned to faith by God' (Phil. 3[:9]). This is the consistent use and meaning of this word in Holy Scripture in the Old and New Testaments." It then adds quotations of Proverbs 17:15, Isaiah 5:23, and Romans 8:33 (SD III, 17). See also: Ep. III, 7, 15; SD III, 62.

### I. "Rectification" or "Making Right What Has Gone Wrong"

Lutherans need not have δικαίω or δικαιοσύνη in order to find the article of justification present. But what if in fact δικαίω has nothing to do with the forensic declaration of the sinner as righteous? Such an interpretation of δικαίω is advocated by J. Louis Martyn in his Galatians commentary.<sup>6</sup> If correct, it would make the Lutheran understanding of justification highly questionable.<sup>7</sup>

While Paul's other letters are filled with explicit eschatological references to the return of Christ and the day of judgment, Galatians is remarkable in that it does not.<sup>8</sup> Martyn's work has been important in demonstrating that despite the absence of these kinds of future references, Galatians is still a work marked by apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>9</sup> He has called attention to the statement in 1:4 about being rescued from this present evil age (ἐξέληται ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦ ἐνεστώτος) and in 6:15 concerning the new creation (καινὴ κτίσις).<sup>10</sup> He has also noted the importance of ἀποκαλύπτω and ἀποκάλυψις that occur in 1:12, 1:15-16; 2:2; and 3:23.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>6</sup> J. Louis Martyn, *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York; Doubleday), 1997.

<sup>7</sup> Though Martyn's work focuses on Galatians, we will see that his presuppositions and methodology, along with the inherent similarity of the topics treated in Romans, make it virtually impossible to contain this interpretation of δικαίω to Galatians alone.

<sup>8</sup> On the return of Christ, see Rom 13:11-12; 1 Cor 1:7-8; 4:5; 11:26; 15:23; 16:22; Eph 4:30; Phil 1:6; 2:16; 3:20; 4:5; Col 3:4; 1 Thess 1:10; 3:13; 4:13-18; 5:1-4; 5:23; 2 Thess 1:7; 1:10; 2:1-2; 1 Tim 6:14-15; 2 Tim 4:1; 4:8 and Titus 2:13. On the day of judgment, see Rom 2:3, 5-13, 16; 3:6; 14:10, 12; 1 Cor 3:12-15; 4:5; 11:32; 2 Cor 5:10; Col 3:6; 1 Thess 1:10; 2 Thess 1:6-10; and 2 Tim 4:1, 8. Galatians does have oblique future eschatological references in 5:5, that we are awaiting (ἀπεκδεχόμεθα) the "hope of righteousness," and in 5:21, that those who carry out the works of the flesh will not inherit the kingdom of God (cf. 1 Cor 6:9 and that letter's corresponding statements about Christ's return and the day of judgment).

<sup>9</sup> On the background of the term "apocalyptic," see Richard E. Sturm, "Defining the Word 'Apocalyptic': A Problem in Biblical Criticism," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 17-48. Sturm's article is an immensely helpful summary of the history of research on "apocalyptic."

<sup>10</sup> Martyn comments: "Although Paul himself never speaks literally of 'the coming age,' his numerous references to 'the present age' (in addition to Gal 1:4, see Rom 12:2; 1 Cor 1:2; 2:6; 3:18; 2 Cor 4:4) reflect his assumption of eschatological dualism. In Paul's vocabulary the expression that stands opposite 'the present evil age' is 'the new creation' (Gal 6:15), yet another indication of apocalyptic thought, for it is a formulation reflecting the development of Jewish apocalyptic dualism in the time of exile (Isa 43:18-19)," *Galatians*, 98.

<sup>11</sup> "It is striking that at these four important junctures in Galatians Paul uses the noun *apokalypsis* and the verb *apokalypso*." Martyn, *Galatians*, 99.

However, for Martyn, the crucial point is not simply that apocalyptic eschatology is present. What matters most is *the kind of apocalyptic eschatology* Paul is using. In a critical footnote at the beginning of the excursus "Apocalyptic Theology in Galatians," Martyn writes, "We will shortly see that the distinction between two 'tracks' of Jewish apocalyptic is essential to the reading of Galatians. On this matter, consult the extraordinarily perceptive essay of de Boer, 'Apocalyptic Eschatology.'"<sup>12</sup> Drawing on the work of his doctoral student Martinus de Boer, Martyn states that, in *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*, anti-God powers have usurped control of the world and God must launch an invasive apocalyptic war against these evil powers. On the other hand, in *forensic cosmological eschatology*, human beings have chosen to disobey God and he has given the law as the answer to the problem, with the judgment of the last day occurring on the basis of whether an individual has engaged in law observance.

In *cosmological apocalyptic eschatology*, evil, anti-God powers have managed to commence their own rule over the world, leading human beings into idolatry and thus into slavery, producing a wrong situation that was not intended by God and that will not be tolerated by him. For in his own time God will inaugurate a victorious and liberating apocalyptic war against these evil powers, delivering his elect from their grasp and thus making right that which has gone wrong because of the powers' malignant machinations. In *forensic apocalyptic eschatology*, things have gone wrong because human beings have willfully rejected God, thereby bringing about death and the corruption and perversion of the world. Given this self-caused plight, God has graciously provided the Two Ways, the Way of death *and* the Way of life. Human beings are individually accountable before the bar of the Judge. But, by one's own decision, one can repent of one's sins, receive nomistic forgiveness, and be assured of eternal life. For at the last judgment the deserved sentence of death will be reversed for those who choose the path of Law observance, whereas that sentence will be permanently confirmed for those who do not.<sup>13</sup>

Martyn concludes, "A crucial issue is that of determining which of these two 'tracks' is dominant in a given source. In the course of the present commentary we will see that, whereas forensic apocalyptic eschatology is characteristic of the Teachers' theology, Paul's Galatians letter is fundamentally marked by cosmological apocalyptic eschatology."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 97, n. 51.

<sup>13</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 98, n. 51; emphasis original.

<sup>14</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 98, n. 51.

When understood in this way, God's invasion occurred by sending the Son and the Spirit into this world. "The genesis of Paul's apocalyptic—as we see it in Galatians—lies in the apostle's certainty that God has *invaded* the present evil age by sending Christ and his Spirit into it."<sup>15</sup> The crucial event in this cosmic war was the crucifixion of Jesus Christ.

The various ways that Paul speaks of Christ's death (and resurrection; 1:1) show that for him the motif of cosmic warfare is focused first of all on the cross, and it is from the cross that one perceives the contours of that warfare. There, in the thoroughly real event of Christ's crucifixion, God's war of liberation was commenced and decisively settled, making the cross the foundation of Paul's apocalyptic theology.<sup>16</sup>

This action reveals that humanity's problem is about more than just the need for forgiveness. Instead humanity and creation itself have been enslaved by the anti-God powers of the present evil age.

It is this apocalyptic vision, then, that has given Paul his perception of the nature of the human plight. God has invaded the world in order to bring it under his liberating control. From that deed of God a conclusion can be drawn, and the conclusion is decidedly apocalyptic: God would not have to carry out an invasion in order to merely forgive erring human beings. The root trouble lies deeper than human guilt, and it is more sinister. The whole of humanity—indeed, the whole of creation (3:22)—is in fact, trapped, enslaved under the power of the present evil age.<sup>17</sup>

Yet by this action the decisive war of liberation has begun and, in the present, there is an overlap between the present evil age and the new creation. Martyn insightfully summarizes this situation with a question:

All of the preceding motifs flow together in the question Paul causes to be the crucial issue in the entire letter. What time is it? One recalls that the matter of discerning the time lies at the heart of apocalyptic. What time is it? It is the time after the apocalypse of the faith of Christ, the time, therefore, of God's making things right by Christ's faith, the time of the presence of the Spirit of Christ, and thus the time in which

---

<sup>15</sup> Martyn, *Galatians* 99; emphasis original. Later, Martyn adds, "We have seen that Paul uses interchangeably the verbs 'to apocalypse' and 'to [cause to] come' (3:23), and this linguistic fact establishes a major point: redemption has come from outside the human orb. For Paul, to say that God *sent* his Son is to say that God *invaded* the cosmos in the person of Christ (cf. 3:23, 25)," *Galatians*, 407; emphasis original.

<sup>16</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 101.

<sup>17</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 105.

the invading Spirit has decisively commenced the war of liberation from the powers of the present evil age.<sup>18</sup>

Martyn contends that Paul is an example of cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, and not forensic apocalyptic eschatology like his opponents (“the Teachers” as Martyn calls them). This determines how Martyn interprets the verb δικαιώω. For the Teachers, the problem is that people have been unfaithful to God’s covenant by transgressing the commandments of the Law. God makes transgressing members of the people right through the forgiveness he has provided in the sacrificial death of Christ.<sup>19</sup>

Martyn contends that for Paul the issue is not merely about a forensic forgiveness of transgressions. When he translates δικαιώω and δικαιοσύνη, he uses the words “rectify” and “rectification.” He avoids the translations “justify” and “justification” because “they are at home either in the language of law—where ‘to justify’ implies the existence of a definable legal norm—or in the language of religion and morality—where ‘righteousness’ implies a definable religious norm. As we will see, Paul intends his term to be taken in neither of these linguistic realms.”<sup>20</sup> Instead, “The subject Paul addresses is that of God’s *making right what has gone wrong*.”<sup>21</sup>

It is crucial that we understand how Martyn arrives at this conclusion. While granting that the noun and the verb have “occasioned a veritable library of books and articles from the earliest interpreters of Paul to those of the present day,” it is striking to note that, when setting forth his translation of “rectify/rectification,” Martyn *does not interact with any of them* in his commentary.<sup>22</sup> This is because he believes he has no need. Having identified the textual signs that Galatians is piece of apocalyptic eschatology, and having concluded that Paul employs the “track” of cosmological apocalyptic eschatology, Martyn does not need to engage contrary arguments that are based on a forensic understanding of the word (i.e., “justify/justification”). They are simply wrong because they fail to understand that Paul’s theology is one of cosmological apocalyptic

---

<sup>18</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 104.

<sup>19</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 265–268.

<sup>20</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 250. He also notes they have the advantage of being cognates, like δικαιώω and δικαιοσύνη; *Galatians*, 249.

<sup>21</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 250; emphasis original. Within the LCMS, Martyn’s interpretation has been used by Arthur A. Just Jr., “The Faith of Christ: A Lutheran Appropriation of Richard Hays’s Proposal,” *CTQ* 70 (2006): 3–15.

<sup>22</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 249.



eschatology and not forensic apocalyptic eschatology (which is, in fact, the theology of Paul's opponents).

For Martyn, Galatians 3:13 and its verb ἐξαγοράζω (which is also found in 4:5) proves to be crucial in understanding what Paul really means by the verb δικαιόω in 2:16. Paul has just said in 3:10, "For as many as are from works of law are under a curse." Paul then supports this statement (using γὰρ) with a quotation of Deuteronomy 27:26, "Cursed (ἐπικατάρατος) is everyone who does not abide by everything written in the book of the law to do them." Paul's "proof" that those who are "of the works of the law" are under a curse turns out to be more than a little surprising, since Deuteronomy 27:26 makes the very opposite point: those who do *not* do the law are under a curse. As Martyn observes, "In the present verse Paul interprets Deuteronomy 27:26 in a way that is the precise opposite of the literal meaning."<sup>23</sup> The question then is how Paul could have thought that Deuteronomy 27:26 proves his conclusion, since the verse actually says the opposite of what he claims.

The work of E.P. Sanders leads Martyn to reject the traditional explanation in which the logical link between 3:10a and 3:10b is the unstated premise that no one is capable of obeying and fulfilling all of the things written in the book of the law.<sup>24</sup> Martyn's explanation is based on the difference between forensic and cosmological apocalyptic eschatology. He argues that for the Jewish-Christian forensic definition of rectification as forgiveness there are three actors: sinful human beings, Christ, and the God of the covenant. For Paul's cosmological view, however, there are four actors: human beings, Christ, God, and the anti-God powers. *The law with its power to curse is one of these anti-God powers.*<sup>25</sup>

Paul says in 3:19 that the law was ordered through angels (διαταγείς δι' ἀγγέλων). The presence of angels was a common theme in the literature

---

<sup>23</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 309.

<sup>24</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 310. In his covenantal nomism, Sanders argues that "The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in maintenance or re-establishment of the covenant relationship." *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1977), 422. Sanders concludes from this, "It would, in short, be extraordinarily un-Pharisaic and even un-Jewish of Paul to insist that obedience of the law, once undertaken, must be perfect. Such a position would directly imply that the means of atonement specified in Scripture itself were of no avail." *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1983), 28. A. Andrew Das has provided a powerful refutation of Sanders' argument in *Paul, the Law, and the Covenant* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2001), 145-170.

<sup>25</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 272.

of the time.<sup>26</sup> Their presence added to the glory and majesty of the giving of the law, but in no way denied that Yahweh was the source of the law. However, Martyn says that “Paul, by contrast, stands the tradition on its head, speaking of the angels as the active party who themselves instituted the Law, and saying that they did that in God’s absence!”<sup>27</sup> God is not the source of the law’s cursing Sinaitic voice; instead, it is one of the enslaving powers of the cosmos.<sup>28</sup> On the basis of this understanding, Martyn argues:

With the meaning “to deliver from slavery,” the verb *exagorazo* becomes, then, a synonym for the verb “to rectify,” “to make right,” supplying the definition that was lacking in 2:16 . . . . By employing this verb Paul thus reinforces the picture of the human scene he presupposes throughout the letter. To be a human being—whether Jew or Gentile—is to be a slave under the authority of malignant powers (2:4; 4:7; 5:1; cf. Phil 2:7).<sup>29</sup>

The shift from forensic to cosmological apocalyptic eschatology is crucial. Quoting de Boer’s words, Martyn says that in Galatians Paul is “circumscribing ‘the forensic apocalyptic theology of the . . . Teachers with a cosmological apocalyptic theology of his own.’”<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup> See, for example, *Jub.* 1.27–29; Acts 7:38, 53; Heb. 2:2; Philo, *Somm.* 1.140–144; Josephus, *Ant.* 15.136.

<sup>27</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 357.

<sup>28</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 325–326, 367–368.

<sup>29</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 317. Martyn writes earlier, “To be sure, building on Jewish-Christian atonement tradition, Paul still says that Christ died ‘for us’ (3:13). But now Christ’s death is seen to have happened in *collision* with the Law, and human beings are not said to need forgiveness, but rather deliverance from a genuine slavery that involves the Law. In this second rectification passage the Law proves to be not so much a norm which we have transgressed—although transgressions are included (3:19)—as a tyrant, insofar as it has placed us under the power of its curse. And by his death Christ is not said to have accomplished our forgiveness, but rather our redemption from slavery. With the apocalyptic shift to a scene in which there are real powers arrayed against God, rectification acquires, then, a new synonym, *exagorazo*, ‘to redeem by delivering from slavery’ (3:13; 4:5). And, as we have noted, one of the powers from whose tyranny Christ has delivered us is the Law in its role as the pronouncer of the curse on the whole of humanity.” *Galatians*, 273; emphasis original.

<sup>30</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 273. He goes on to add, “Rectification thus remains, for Paul, God’s act in the death of Christ. But now, having taken silent leave of the Jewish-Christian concern with forgiveness of nomistic transgressions, Paul sees in Christ’s death God’s liberating invasion of the territory of tyranny.” *Galatians*, 273.

## II. Martinus de Boer's "Two Tracks"

Martyn's interpretation of δικαίω and δικαιοσύνη is completely dependent on the paradigm that distinguishes the "two tracks" of forensic and cosmological apocalyptic eschatology. "A crucial issue," he writes, "is that of determining which of these two 'tracks' is dominant in a given source. In the course of the present commentary we will see that, whereas forensic apocalyptic eschatology is characteristic of the Teachers' theology, Paul's Galatians letter is fundamentally marked by cosmological apocalyptic eschatology."<sup>31</sup> It is necessary, therefore, to turn to the work of Martyn's student, Martinus de Boer, in order to evaluate its validity.

De Boer first proposed his paradigm in *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*, a published version of his dissertation written under J. Louis Martyn.<sup>32</sup> He provided a more developed treatment of it in his 1989 essay, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," which appeared in the Martyn festschrift and is quoted by Martyn in his Galatians commentary.<sup>33</sup> Subsequently, in 1998 the paradigm received a place in the reference tool, *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, within the essay, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology."<sup>34</sup>

De Boer argues that Jewish apocalyptic eschatology "took two distinct forms, or 'tracks', in the New Testament period" which he labels "cosmological apocalyptic eschatology" (track 1) and "forensic apocalyptic eschatology" (track 2).<sup>35</sup> He cautions against the impression that documents can simply be assigned to one of these tracks: "Rather, I present the two tracks as *heuristic models* that may be used as interpretive tools to understand the dynamics of the various texts, including of course the letters of Paul."<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> Martyn, *Galatians*, 98, n. 53.

<sup>32</sup> Martinus C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988).

<sup>33</sup> Martinus C. de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *Apocalyptic and the New Testament: Essays in Honor of J. Louis Martyn*, ed. Joel Marcus and Marion L. Soards (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989), 169-190.

<sup>34</sup> Martinus C. de Boer, "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," in *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. John J. Collins, vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*, ed. J.J. Collins, B. McGinn, and S. Stein (New York: Continuum, 1998), 345-383.

<sup>35</sup> de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 84-86; "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 172-175; "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," 358-359. In "Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology," de Boer also describes them as "distinct patterns," 358.

<sup>36</sup> de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 176; emphasis original. See also de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 85. Despite his caution, this is in fact what de Boer does.

De Boer elaborates that these heuristic models seek “to describe an internally coherent or consistent configuration of motifs.”<sup>37</sup> He notes that the two tracks “are found in nearly ‘pure’ form in *1 Enoch* 1-36 and the apocalypse of *2 Baruch*” and adds, “I have outlined the two tracks on the basis of these two works.”<sup>38</sup>

In cosmological apocalyptic eschatology (track 1), “‘This age’ is characterized by the fact that evil angelic powers have, in some primeval time (namely, the time of Noah) come to rule over the earth.”<sup>39</sup> The angelic fall is mentioned in much of the literature on the basis of Genesis 6:1-6.<sup>40</sup> As demonstrated in the Book of the Watchers (*1 En* 1-36), these fallen angels became the source of sin and evil in the world when they imparted improper knowledge to humanity (*1 En* 9:1, 6-9; 10:7-9; 15:8-16:2; 19:1-2).<sup>41</sup> By acting in this fashion, the fallen angels brought cosmic disorder (*1 En* 15:3, 9-10) into the world<sup>42</sup> and usurped God’s sovereign rights.<sup>43</sup>

De Boer concludes that “when ‘this age’ is perceived in this way, in terms of subjection to suprahuman angelic powers, it is understandable that the last judgment, the juncture at which ‘this age’ is replaced by ‘the age to come’, is depicted as a cosmic confrontation, a war, between God and the Watchers”—a scene depicted in *1 Enoch* 1:4-5.<sup>44</sup> Only God can defeat the demonic powers and he alone can re-establish his sovereignty over the world.<sup>45</sup> The arena of battle for the eschatological war is the “physical universe that God created to be the human habitat.”<sup>46</sup> The final victory by

---

It is significant that the language of “heuristic model” drops out in the later “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology.”

<sup>37</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 181; see also, *The Defeat of Death*, 85. Again, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology” contains no such explication of these “distinct patterns.”

<sup>38</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 176; emphasis original.

<sup>39</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 174; see also, *The Defeat of Death* 85, and “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 358.

<sup>40</sup> de Boer cites: *1 En.* 6-19; 64:1-2; 69:4-5; 86:1-6; 106:13-17; *Jub.* 4:15, 22; 5:1-8; 10:4-5; *T. Reub.* 5:6-7; *T. Naph.* 3:5; *CD* 2:17-3:1; *2 Bar.* 56:12-15; *LAB* 34:1-5; *Wis* 2:23-24. See “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175; *The Defeat of Death*, 85; de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 358).

<sup>41</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 174.

<sup>42</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 174.

<sup>43</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 358.

<sup>44</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175. He writes in *The Defeat of Death*, “God will invade the world under the dominion of the evil angelic power and defeat them in a cosmic war,” 85.

<sup>45</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 359.

<sup>46</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175.

God will defeat and banish the demonic forces (1 *En* chs. 16, 19), and the righteous elect will live on a purified earth (cf. 1 *En* 1:9; 5:7; 10:17–22).<sup>47</sup>

On the other hand, forensic apocalyptic eschatology (track 2) is a modified version of track 1. Here, “the notion of evil cosmological forces is absent (cf. the *Psalms of Solomon*), recedes into the background (cf. *Wisdom of Solomon*; *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* [L.A.B., Pseudo-Philo]; 4 *Ezra*; 2 *Baruch*), or is even explicitly rejected (cf. 1 *En* 91–105).”<sup>48</sup> Humanity is responsible for sin as it follows the pattern of its first parents Adam and Eve, and this perspective emphasizes the “fall” of Adam and/or Eve.<sup>49</sup> Track 2 places emphasis on free will, decision, and personal accountability. In forensic apocalyptic eschatology, God has provided the law as a remedy for the human situation, and “a person’s posture toward this Law determines one’s ultimate destiny.”<sup>50</sup> Given this understanding, “The final judgment is not a cosmic war against cosmological, angelic powers but a courtroom scene in which all humanity appears before the bar of the Judge.”<sup>51</sup> In de Boer’s opinion, the evidence indicates that this track “overtook and displaced track 1 completely after the disaster of 70 CE (cf. 4 *Ezra*, 2 *Baruch*).”<sup>52</sup>

While identifying these two tracks, de Boer also acknowledges: “Other documents indicate that the two tracks can, like those of a railway, run side by side, crisscross, or overlap in various ways, even in the same document.”<sup>53</sup> The Dead Sea Scrolls are the principal example of this:

---

<sup>47</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175.

<sup>48</sup> de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 86; see also, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 181; “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 359.

<sup>49</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 359; see also, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175; de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 87. On these pages, de Boer cites the following examples: 4 *Ezra* 2:5–7, 20–21; 4:30–31; 7:118–119; 2 *Bar* 17:2–3; 23:4; 48:42–43; 54:14, 19; 1 *En* 69:6; *Jub* 3.17–25; 4:29–30; *LAB* 13:8–9; *Wis* 10:11.

<sup>50</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 181; see also, de Boer, *The Defeat of Death*, 86; de Boer, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 359.

<sup>51</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic,” 176; see also, *The Defeat of Death*, 86; “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 359. He writes, “At the Last Judgment, which is conceptualized as a courtroom in which all humanity will be held accountable, God will reward those who have acknowledged his claim and chosen the Law with eschatological or eternal life, while he will punish those who have not with eschatological or eternal death.” *The Defeat of Death*, 86–87.

<sup>52</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 182.

<sup>53</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 177; see also, *The Defeat of Death*, 85. In “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” he describes “a blend of the two patterns,” 360.

In particular the Dead Sea Scrolls exhibit this feature as they combine “both cosmological subjection and willful [*sic*] human transgression, both election and human control of personal destiny, both predestination and exhortation to observe the Law . . . both God’s eschatological war against Belial and his cohorts and God’s judgment of human beings on the basis of their ‘works’ or deeds (see e.g., 1QS 1-4; 1QM; CD).<sup>54</sup>

De Boer also includes *Jubilees* and *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs* in this category.<sup>55</sup> Unfortunately, De Boer never unpacks the implications this has for his paradigm.<sup>56</sup>

### III. Testing the Track: Book of the Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36)

De Boer’s paradigm maintains that in cosmological apocalyptic eschatology the last judgment—the juncture at which “this age” is replaced by “the age to come”—is depicted as a cosmic confrontation, a war, between God and the Watchers as depicted in *1 En* 1:4-5.<sup>57</sup> It further maintains that this differs from forensic apocalyptic eschatology where the judgment is “a courtroom scene in which all humanity appears before the bar of the Judge” which “emphasizes personal accountability.”<sup>58</sup> However, when we test this against the Book of the Watchers (*1 En* 1-36)—the work that De Boer considers to be the most pure example of the cosmological track—we find that this paradigm completely ignores the fact that the Book of the Watchers is dominated by forensic judgment and that there is no cosmic war present.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 177; see also, “Paul and Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 360.

<sup>55</sup> This is not surprising given the often noted affinities between these works; see John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998), 84, 140.

<sup>56</sup> If works such as those at Qumran, *Jubilees*, and *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* are mixed, and many other documents are not “pure,” how can we speak of internally coherent or consistent configurations of motifs? When is a document “not pure” but still an example of a particular track, and when is it “mixed”? De Boer is not simply identifying cosmological and forensic *motifs* as they arise (often side by side) in different works, but rather he seeks to *label* texts as “cosmological” or “forensic”—a designation that is meant to identify the theological outlook of a *work*. This is precisely how both De Boer and Martyn use the paradigm as they deal with Paul.

<sup>57</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175.

<sup>58</sup> de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 176.

<sup>59</sup> “Nevertheless, the two tracks *are* found in nearly ‘pure’ form in *1 Enoch* 1-36 and the apocalypse of *2 Baruch* and I have outlined the two tracks on the basis of these two works.” de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 176; emphasis original.

When the Book of the Watchers is considered on its own terms, three important points emerge. First, God's judgment directed against the angelic powers and human beings is a forensic judgment, not a "cosmic war." Second, this judgment is directed at both the angelic powers who have introduced sin *and* the human beings who actually engage in sin. The forensic judgment of *both groups* takes place on the basis of a divine standard set by God (both groups are held accountable for behavior that violates God's will). Third, the shift to the new creation occurs after the final forensic judgment (when God sits on the throne).

Contrary to de Boer's paradigm, God's judgment against both angelic powers and humans is forensic, and *there is no cosmic war*. De Boer fails to recognize this because he does not see the importance of God's throne in *1 Enoch*. This throne imagery must be understood within the broader context of its Old Testament background, and more specifically within the context of Daniel 7. In the Hebrew Bible, a king's throne is the forensic setting, such as when Solomon builds a hall of the throne (אֹלָמֹת הַכִּסֵּא) in his palace and judges there (יִשְׁפֹּט־שָׁמָּה) in his hall of judgment or justice (אֵלֹהִים יִשְׁפֹּט; 1 Kgs 7:7).<sup>60</sup> Since Yahweh is described with the imagery of "king" (Ps 5:2; 10:16; 24:7-8; 47:2), it is not surprising to find him seated on a throne surrounded by the heavenly court (1 Ki 22:19; 2 Chr 18:18; Isa 6:1-3).<sup>61</sup> Likewise the Hebrew Bible describes him sitting on a throne judging (Ps 9:4/MT 9:5; "you have sat on the throne judging" [יָשְׁבֶתָ לְכִסֵּא שׁוֹפֵט]; 9:7/MT 9:8; "his throne for judgment" [לְמִשְׁפַּט כִּסְאוֹ]). This forensic context is evident again in Daniel 7:9-10 when the Ancient of Days sits on the throne (כִּרְסִי־הוּא), surrounded by the heavenly court, and the books (of judgment) are opened.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>60</sup> In Psalm 122:5 Jerusalem is described as the place where thrones are set for judgment (בְּכִסְאוֹת לְמִשְׁפָּט) and Proverbs 20:8 refers to a king who sits on a throne of judgment (מִלְכֵךְ יוֹשֵׁב עַל-כִּסֵּא-דִין). As Michael E. Stone notes, "In the Hebrew Bible, the judgment seat is often specifically connected with the king's judicial function." *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, ed. Frank Moore Cross (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 220.

<sup>61</sup> Otto Schmitz comments: "That the OT conception of the throne of God takes its imagery from the earthly throne is shown by the intentional juxtaposition of the two in 1 K. 22:10, 19 (cf. 2 Ch. 18:9, 18)," "θρόνος" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ed. Gerhard Kittel; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 3:162. He concludes, "As with an earthly ruler, so with God, the throne is a symbol of judicial power," 163. In this setting, the divine council serves a judicial role; see Patrick D. Miller, Jr., *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 67-68.

<sup>62</sup> Martha Himmelfarb comments, "Daniel 7 maintains the association of the heavenly council with judgment that appears in 1 Kings 22, Isaiah 6, and Psalm 82. It

In chapter 14, Enoch ascends into heaven in a vision and there he sees a “high throne” (14:18) and describes how “from underneath the high throne there flowed out rivers of burning fire” (14:19).<sup>63</sup> “He who is great in glory” is seated on the throne (14:20) and “ten thousand times ten thousand (stood) before him” (14:22). The parallels with Daniel’s vision of the heavenly court (Dan 7:9–10) are unmistakable.<sup>64</sup> During his heavenly tour, Enoch sees seven mountains and reports that “the middle one reached to heaven, like the throne of the Lord” (18:8). Later Enoch again sees these

---

explicitly treats the divine council as a court: “The court sat in judgment and the books were opened’ (v 10).” *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 17. In Dan 7:10, “The books in question are the records for judgment. The motif of a heavenly record is well attested in the Hebrew Bible: Ps 56:9; Isa 65:6; Mal 3:16.” John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, ed. Frank Moore Cross (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 303; see also Louis F. Hartman and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel: A New Translation with Notes and Commentary* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1978), 218.

<sup>63</sup> All translations of *1 Enoch* are taken from, Michael A. Knibb, *Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, vol. 2 of *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch: A New Edition in the Light of the Aramaic Dead Sea Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978).

<sup>64</sup> The exact nature of the relationship is determined by one’s view of Daniel. The predominate view in scholarship is that the final version of Daniel is a second century BC production associated with the Maccabean revolt (167–164 BC); see Collins, *Daniel*, 1–38, for a thorough explanation of this position. Finds at Qumran included fragments of the Book of Watchers that were dated to the first half of the second century BC. Collins reports about the Astronomical Book and the Book of Watchers that, “Since the compositions are presumably somewhat older than the earliest fragments, and since the Book of Watchers shows evidence of multiple stages of composition, it is probable that both these works were extant in some form already in the third century B.C.E.” *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 44. Working on the assumption that the Book of Watchers preceded Daniel, scholars have maximized similarities between *1 Enoch* 14 and Ezekiel 1, while minimizing those between *1 Enoch* 14 and Daniel 7, and have concluded that Dan 7 is dependent on *1 Enoch* 14. Helge S. Kvanvig, “Henoch und der Menschensohn: Das Verhältnis von Hen 14 zu Dan 7,” *Studia Theologica* 8 (1984): 101–133, is the study often cited in support of this; see, for example, George W.E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*, ed. Klaus Baltzer (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 254. Collins’ approach is much more evenhanded, and he acknowledges the unique similarity between *1 Enoch* 14 and Daniel 7. He concludes that, “the specificity of parallels, however, requires at the least a common tradition of speculation about the divine throne. Direct literary influence cannot be ruled out, even if it cannot be decisively proven. Since the publication of the Qumran fragments of *1 Enoch*, the Book of the Watchers, in which the passage cited appears, is acknowledged to be older than the Book of Daniel. If Dan 7:9–10 is cited from an older source, however, the direction of influence cannot be established. We must be content to say that these texts are closely related.” *Daniel*, 300. The forensic character of *1 Enoch* 14 is clear. Those who believe that Daniel is a sixth-century BC text used by the author of *1 Enoch* 14 will find the latter’s forensic character to be stronger still.



mountains (24:3) and Michael explains to him, "This high mountain which you saw, whose summit is like the throne of the Lord, is the throne where the Holy and Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King, will sit when he comes down to visit the earth for good" (25:3). Here the seventh mountain, "which 18:8 described in general terms as 'God's throne,' is identified as the throne on which God will sit at the time of the eschatological judgment."<sup>65</sup>

The central image of God in *1 Enoch* as a whole is that of king. The throne plays a significant role in this. As Nickelsburg observes, "That the Enochic authors think of God principally as king is also evident in the description of God seated on a throne in the heavenly palace (14:8-23) and having a mountain-size throne on which to sit when he descends to visit earth (18:8; 24:3; 25:3)."<sup>66</sup> This is critical for our topic because "The exercise of judgment was a major prerogative and function of kings in antiquity, and for the Enochic authors, enacting judgment was the major function of the heavenly King."<sup>67</sup> As we have seen in the Old Testament background, a king on the throne judging is the classic scene of *forensic* judgment.

God's dealings with the Watchers are paradigmatic for the final judgment, and so they, too, are forensic in character. The earth in 7:6 and the souls of men in 9:3 bring accusations/make a suit before God, language that reflects "an Aramaic technical term for bringing a suit in court."<sup>68</sup> In 13:4-7, the Watchers send Enoch to intercede for them with God. The first report of God's response announced in 13:8 and delivered by Enoch in 13:10 uses language that belongs to judicial and legal settings.<sup>69</sup> The words recited by Enoch to the Watchers are found in 14:1-16:4, and within this 14:1-7 summarizes God's decree against the Watchers (their petition is denied). Himmelfarb notes that "1 Enoch 14 is also concerned with judgment by the heavenly court. Enoch ascends to plead before the divine judge on behalf of the Watchers, and at the end of the vision the sentence

---

<sup>65</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 314. He goes on to add, "Thus the final judgment, referred to in 22:4, 11, 13, is brought into the discussion here. The verb ἐπισκέπτομαι ('to visit'), used of God's judgment, is traditional, but occurs only here in 1 Enoch . . . . The goodness of God's judgment is from the viewpoint of the righteous, whose blessings will be recounted in 25:4d-6. Cf. also 1:8 and 5:6-9, where this side of the judgment is described," *1 Enoch* 1, 314.

<sup>66</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 43.

<sup>67</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 48.

<sup>68</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 187; see also Matthew Black, *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch: A New English Translation with Commentary and Textual Notes* (Leiden: Brill, 1985), 167.

<sup>69</sup> See Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 249-250.

of the Watchers is read out once more.<sup>70</sup> The language of making suit also occurs in 22:6, 7, and 12. In regard to Abel (22:7), Meira Z. Kensky comments, “1 Enoch 22:5–7 understands these cries very literally: as forensic petitions, making lawsuits, crying out for vengeance.”<sup>71</sup> She concludes regarding the material in chapter 22, “Thus the Book of Watchers, though not really including a full courtroom scene such as we see in later literature, does include the narration of an extended juridical process that culminates in the judicial sentence handed down in God’s throneroom.”<sup>72</sup>

Forensic judgment is clearly present in the Book of the Watchers. What is conspicuously absent is de Boer’s “cosmic war.”<sup>73</sup> 1 Enoch 1:3–9 describes the theophany of God as he comes from his dwelling and marches upon Sinai (1:3–4). The theophany is based heavily on texts drawn from the Old Testament, such as Numbers 24, Psalm 78, Micah 1, Exodus 19, Habakkuk 3, and Jeremiah 25.<sup>74</sup> With its description of “camp” (1:3) and “10,000 holy ones accompanying God” (1:9) set alongside the awesome theophanic description (the mountains shake and the hills melt like wax; 1:6), the text is a clear example of the Divine Warrior motif.<sup>75</sup> In the face of this arrival, the Watchers shake in fear (1:5).

The Divine Warrior motif is present as the text describes the reaction of creation, humanity, and the Watchers in the face of God’s arrival.<sup>76</sup> However, the question remains: in the context of the Book of the Watchers as a whole, is a cosmic war against the Watchers present in 1:3–9? The answer

---

<sup>70</sup> Himmelfarb, *Ascent to Heaven*, 18.

<sup>71</sup> Meira Z. Kensky, *Trying Man, Trying God: The Divine Courtroom in Early Jewish and Christian Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 132.

<sup>72</sup> Kensky, *Trying Man, Trying God*, 133.

<sup>73</sup> “When ‘this age’ is perceived in this way, in terms of subjection to suprahuman angelic powers, it is understandable that the last judgment, the juncture at which ‘this age’ is replaced with by ‘the age to come,’ is depicted as a cosmic confrontation, a war, *between God and the Watchers*. Thus we read in 1 Enoch 1:4–5, ‘The God of the universe . . . will come forth from his dwelling. And from there he will march upon Mount Sinai and appear in his camp emerging from heaven with a mighty power. And everyone shall be afraid, and Watchers shall quiver.’ de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 175, emphasis added.

<sup>74</sup> Lars Hartmann, *Asking for a Meaning: A Study of 1 Enoch 1–5* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1979), 24–26. Hartman provides a thorough analysis of the Old Testament scriptures from which this text draws.

<sup>75</sup> Vanderkam provides a description of the military language employed (J. Vanderkam, “The Theophany of Enoch I 3b–7, 9,” *Vetus Testamentum* 23 (1973): 138–139.

<sup>76</sup> Nickelsburg comments, “In vv 3c–7 the author has developed a terrifying scenario of cosmic dissolution as the angry warrior God storms onto the earth to execute universal judgment.” 1 Enoch 1, 147.

is no, for de Boer's position ignores the entire thrust of chapters 10–22. In chapter 10, prior to the deluge, God commands the angel Raphael to bind the Watcher Azazel and thrust him in the darkness under sharp rocks:

Bind Azazel by his hand and his feet, and throw him into the darkness. And split open the desert which is in Dudael, and throw him there. And throw on him jagged and sharp stones, and cover him with darkness; and let him stay there forever, and cover his face, that he may not see light, and that on the great day of judgment he may be hurled into the fire. (*1 En* 10:4–6)<sup>77</sup>

In a similar manner, Michael binds Semyaz and the others and places them beneath the rocks of the ground (10:11–12). This action against the Watchers, their imprisonment until the final day of judgment, serves as a prototype of the final eschatological judgment.<sup>78</sup> Enoch's ascent and heavenly tour confirm this when he sees the prison house for the disobedient stars and the place where the spirits of the angels are kept until the day of judgment (chs. 18–19, 21), as well as the locations where dead humans await the judgment (ch. 22).

The Book of the Watchers offers comfort as it looks forward to completion of what is already in place and what has already taken place. The Watchers who shake in fear at God's theophany (1:5) have *already* been judged and rendered impotent.<sup>79</sup> The final consummation of chapter one awaits, but the process has already begun. Sacchi describes the Book of the Watchers as "the atmosphere of the already and not yet."<sup>80</sup> The Divine Warrior motif in 1:3–9 does not indicate the presence of cosmic war. Instead, it dramatically portrays the fact that the almighty God has arrived

---

<sup>77</sup> Nickelsburg comments that, "Like a criminal, Asael is to be arrested and fettered (Acts 21:11) and cast in fetters into a dark prison (Acts 12:7; 16:24–27; Josephus *Ant.* 19.6.1), thus rendering him inoperative and harmless to the world that Raphael will now heal." *1 Enoch* 1, 221.

<sup>78</sup> Collins, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 56; Christoph Münchow, *Ethik und Eschatologie: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der frühjüdischen Apokalypik mit einem Ausblick auf das Neue Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981), 21.

<sup>79</sup> This fact becomes very clear when the Watchers must ask Enoch to intercede with God *for them* (15:2). Maxwell J. Davidson notes that "[t]his ironic twist emphasizes the depths to which the angels have fallen." *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 54. See also Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 171.

<sup>80</sup> Paolo Sacchi, *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*, trans. William J. Short (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 54.

and brings the final day of judgment. Hartman comments, "When it is said (1:9) that God comes 'with ten thousands of His holy ones', this seems to be a picture of the same triumphant heavenly power: the divine court and the victorious divine warrior's host represent the overwhelming, other-worldly majesty which at last makes its sway manifest."<sup>81</sup>

This forensic judgment is directed at both the angelic powers and people, and takes place on the basis of a divine standard set by God (both groups are held accountable for behavior that violates God's will). The Book of the Watchers begins by announcing that "there will be a judgment on all" (1:7). The universality of the judgment is emphasized by the repetition of the word "all" in 1:3-9, and the text describes judgment against both groups.<sup>82</sup>

It is clear that the Watchers are carrying out actions that violate the standard set by God, because Semyaz himself describes what they are doing as a "great sin" (6:3).<sup>83</sup> These are actions for which the Watchers ask Enoch to make petition to God *for forgiveness* (13:4, 6).<sup>84</sup> What is narrated in chapters 6-8 is reported to God in 9:6-9 by Michael, Gabriel, Suriel, and Uriel as actions that are clearly evil. The Watchers have sinned by revealing sins to humanity (9:8). They are actions that prompt the souls of people who have died to bring suit to God (9:3, 10).

Even more important as we consider de Boer's paradigm is the fact that humans are explicitly held accountable for violating a standard set by

<sup>81</sup> Hartman, *Asking for a Meaning*, 129. If cosmic war were present, it could only be against the spirits of the slain giants mentioned briefly in 15:8-16:3 and 19:1 who would be included in the "all will be afraid" of 1:5. De Boer is correct in that the subjugation of these evil spirits must ultimately be implied by 1:1-9, but this is in no way an emphasis of 1:1-9 or of the rest of the Book of the Watchers. John Collins does not consider *1 En* 1:1-9 to be an example of cosmic war (personal communication at the 2001 Society of Biblical Literature meeting in Denver, and email to author, January 29, 2003).

<sup>82</sup> "The universality God's judgment is underscored by the repetition of the word 'all,' which appears eleven times, in every subunit that describes the context, cause, or result of God's appearance." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 143. Black comments on 1:7, "'All' to be judged and destroyed includes the watchers who fell from heaven and their illegitimate offspring as well as mankind." *The Book of Enoch*, 108. Judgment against angels is found in 1:3-9; 10:4-7; 10:11-14; 12:6; 13:1-7; 13:9-14:7; 16:1; 19:1; 21:7-10, and against people in 1:3-9; 22:3-13; 25:4; 27:1-3.

<sup>83</sup> "With this verse the sinful character of the proposed deed is explicit, as is the watchers' consciousness of this fact." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 176. God calls it sin when he sends Enoch to the Watchers to announce that there will be no "forgiveness of sin" (12:6).

<sup>84</sup> This is hardly the action of a group against whom God needs to wage a "cosmic war."

God. Human beings are directly identified as the object of God's judgment from the start as 1:9 says that God is going "to contend with *all flesh* concerning everything which the sinners and impious have done and wrought."<sup>85</sup> In 2:1 the command is given to "contemplate" and then 2:1–5:3 contains an extended discussion of the obedient ordering of creation. Next 5:4 says, "But you have not persevered, nor observed the law of the Lord. But you have transgressed, and have spoken proud and hard words with your unclean mouth against his majesty."<sup>86</sup> Collins concludes regarding this passage:

The most obvious 'law of the Lord' in chaps. 2–5 is not the law of Moses, which was unknown in the fictive time of Enoch, but the law of nature. The sinfulness of the wicked is demonstrated in contrast to the orderliness of nature, not by special revelation of Sinai. To be sure, there is no suggestion that Sinai is at variance with the laws of nature, but the ultimate authority is older than Moses and applies not only to Israel but to all humanity.<sup>87</sup>

The separation of the souls of the dead in the heavenly prison (22:3–13) based on their actions and level of prior punishment also demonstrates this.

Finally, the shift to the new creation in the Book of the Watchers does not occur as the result of a "cosmic war," but rather after the final forensic judgment when God sits on the throne. In the early part of the work, the eschatological typology of the author shifts from the binding of the Watchers and destruction of the Giants in 10:1–16a during the days of Noah to the restoration of the postdiluvian world in 10:16b–22, a description that parallels the future new creation.<sup>88</sup> The full depiction of the new creation (a beautiful and fragrant tree—the tree of life; 24:4–5; 25:4–7) only takes place

---

<sup>85</sup> Emphasis added.

<sup>86</sup> "The unnamed addresses of the second plural verbs that began at 2:1 are identified as the sinners whose judgment has been announced in 1:9." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 157.

<sup>87</sup> Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination*, 49. In a similar manner Nickelsburg comments, "Pervading 1 Enoch's understanding of law, and reflecting its roots in the sapiential tradition, is a sense of cosmic order . . . . In obedience to their Creator, heaven and earth and the seasons work with complete regularity, and the luminaries do not change their paths or transgress their order. Conversely, human disobedience is perversion and turning aside from God's order (5:4). Similarly, the indictment against the watchers in 15:1–6 depicts their sin as a perversion of God's created order." *1 Enoch* 1, 51.

<sup>88</sup> "Similarly, the renewal of the human race and the postdiluvian world are a paradigm for the renewal or re-creation of the world after the coming judgment." Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 224.

after Enoch sees the eschatological mountain throne (24:3) and has Michael tell him it is God's throne when he visits the earth (25:3). Then Enoch sees the blessed Jerusalem (26:1-6) and the final place of judgment, Gehenna (27:1-5). *1 Enoch* 25:3 depicts the throne of God's final eschatological judgment and thus 25:4 indicates that "the coming judgment will constitute a dividing point between the present time, when the fruit of this tree is forbidden, and the future, when it will be given to the righteous."<sup>89</sup> At this juncture, it is important to note the link between forensic judgment at the throne of God and the cosmological new creation. We will see that in Paul, too, the throne-centered forensic judgment of human beings is central, but that inherently this is accompanied by a cosmological outcome.

#### IV. Forensic Judgment: New Testament and Paul

An examination of the Book of the Watchers reveals that the paradigm employed by Martyn and de Boer imposes a false dichotomy between "cosmological" and "forensic" apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>90</sup> While it is true that there are documents where fallen angelic powers are present and documents where they are not, the dividing line between those documents does not involve the question of whether forensic judgment is present. It is, in truth, common to both of them.<sup>91</sup>

This is not surprising because the Old Testament repeats the expectation that Yahweh, the King who sits on a throne, will come to judge the world. Psalms 96:13 and 98:9 both declare that Yahweh comes "to judge

---

<sup>89</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch* 1, 314.

<sup>90</sup> A consideration of The Similitudes of Enoch (*1 En* 37-71), which de Boer considers to be an example of cosmological apocalyptic eschatology (*The Defeat of Death*, 54-56, 85-86), reveals precisely the same problems: first, judgment is directed against angelic powers and human beings that is forensic (against angelic powers: *1 En* 55:4; against people: *1 En* 45:1-6; 61:8-9; 62:1-10), and there is no "cosmic war" (angels bound waiting judgment: *1 En* 54:5; 64:1-2; 67:4, 12-13). Second, both angelic powers (*1 En* 54:6; 64:2; 67:4, 7; 69:4-15) and people (*1 En* 38:1-3; 41:2; 45:2, 6; 46:4, 7-8; 48:10; 63:1, 7; 67:8) are held accountable and judged because of sin. Third, the shift to the new creation occurs after the final forensic judgment (*1 En* 45:3-6; 51:1-5).

<sup>91</sup>For examples of forensic judgment in works where fallen angelic powers are present, see, in addition to material surveyed in Book of Watchers in *1 En* 1-36, the following: Similitudes of Enoch (*1 En* 37-71) *1 En* 41:1; 45:3; 47:3; 49:2-4; 55:4; 60:1-6; 61:8-9; 62:2-9; 63:8; Book of Dreams (*1 En* 83-90) 90:20-27; *Jub.* 5:12-16; *2 En* 44:4-5; 52:15; 53:2-3; *L.A.B.* 3:10. For examples of forensic judgment in works where fallen angelic powers are absent, see the following: Epistle of Enoch (*1 En* 91-107) *1 En* 95:5; 96:4, 7; 98:6-8; 100:7; 104:7; *4 Ezra* 3:34-36; 7:32-34; 12:31-34; 14:35; *2 Bar* 14:12-13; 24:1-2; 48:39-40; 83:1-3; *Pss. Sol.* 2:32-35; 5:4; 15:12-13.

the earth; he will judge the world in righteousness.”<sup>92</sup> In fact Psalm 96:13 emphatically says, “for he is coming, for he is coming.”<sup>93</sup> Both statements provide the reason (כי) that creation is to rejoice (96:11–12; 98:7–8), and, in turn, these statements about the reaction of creation are introduced by a statement that says that Yahweh is king (96:10; 98:6).<sup>94</sup> 1 Chronicles 16:33 also declares, “for he comes to judge the earth,” and the language in 1 Chronicles 16:23–33 (including the references to nature rejoicing and Yahweh reigning) is virtually identical to Psalm 96:1–13. The statement in Psalms 96:13 and 98:9 that “he will judge the world in righteousness” is significant because the same phrase is found within Psalm 9:8 (MT 9:9): “He judges the world with righteousness; he judges the peoples with uprightness.”<sup>95</sup> Here, the preceding verse says, “But Yahweh sits enthroned forever; he has established his throne for judgment” (Ps 9:7; MT 9:8).<sup>96</sup> These texts build on the Old Testament material we have already considered about Yahweh, king, throne, and judgment, and led later readers to conclude that Yahweh the king who sits on the throne will come to judge the world and the peoples (cf. 1 En 25:3).

This idea is reinforced in Joel 3:1–16 (MT 4:1–16). After the statement about the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit in 2:28–32 (MT 3:1–5), Yahweh announces that he will gather all the nations and bring them down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat (“Yahweh judges”; 3:2; MT 4:2). He goes on to say, “Let the nations stir themselves up and come up to the Valley of Jehoshaphat; for there I will sit to judge (אֲשֶׁב לְשֹׁפֵט) all the surrounding nations” (3:12; MT 4:12).<sup>97</sup> When one considers that the event is described as “the day of the Lord” (יּוֹם יְהוָה; 3:14; MT 4:14) and that 3:18 (MT 4:18) contains imagery of a restored creation (cf. Ezek 47:1–12; Zech 14:8), it is not hard to see how Second Temple Judaism and early

<sup>92</sup> כי בא לשפוט הארץ ושפטתה כל בצדק (96:13; 98:9). 96:13 goes on to add “and the peoples in his faithfulness” (ועמים באמונתו), while 98:9 adds “and the peoples with equity” (ועמים במישורים). Unless otherwise noted, all translations are from the ESV.

<sup>93</sup> כי בא כי בא

<sup>94</sup> 96:10, “Say among the nations, ‘Yahweh reigns! (יהוה מלך). Yes, the world is established, it shall never be moved; he will judge the peoples with equity (ידין עמים במישורים).’” 98:6, “With trumpets and the sound of the horn make a joyful noise before the King (לפני המלך), Yahweh!” (ESV modified).

<sup>95</sup> והוא ישפטתה כל בצדק ידין לאמים במישורים

<sup>96</sup> ESV modified. Literally, MT 9:8 has “will sit” (ישב), but the earlier statement in 9:4 (MT 9:5), “you have sat on the throne (ישבת לכתא), giving righteous judgment,” makes it clear that Yahweh is sitting on the throne.

<sup>97</sup> Yahweh sits on the throne to judge (see the previous footnote about the language in Ps. 9).

Christianity developed the expectations found in apocalyptic eschatology.<sup>98</sup> The throne vision of judgment in Daniel 7:9–10 and the vision of “one like a son of man” in 7:13–14 also played a significant role in creating the expectation of eschatological forensic judgment.<sup>99</sup>

In this Old Testament material we see a continuation of the theme seen at the end the examination of the Book of the Watchers. Texts such as Psalm 96:10–13, Psalm 98:4–9, 1 Chronicles 16:29–33, and Joel 3:9–18 all focus on the forensic judgment of human beings by God, yet they do so in a way that also includes a cosmological perspective. God’s forensic judgment is the center of an action that impacts all of creation.

A survey of the New Testament apart from Paul’s letters quickly reveals that the early Christians expected forensic judgment. Both Matthew 25:31–46 and Revelation 20:11–15 depict the throne (Matt 25:31; Rev 20:11) and judgment based on what individuals have done (Matt 25:34–46; Rev 20:13).<sup>100</sup> Daniel 7 provides the background for the forensic judgment by the Son of Man in Matthew 16:27 and John 5:26–29, where judgment is again based on deeds.<sup>101</sup> The Paul of Acts says that Jesus has been appointed as “judge of the living and the dead” (Acts 10:42) and that God “will judge the world in righteousness” through him—a phrase that signals forensic judgment.<sup>102</sup> 1 Peter 1:17 and 4:5 describe forensic judg-

---

<sup>98</sup> Old Testament eschatology is not yet apocalyptic eschatology but it establishes the themes that will take the form of eschatological expectation we find in Second Temple Judaism and the New Testament. On this, see Donald E. Gowan, *Eschatology in the Old Testament*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986); Charles L. Holman, *Till Jesus Comes: Origins of Christian Apocalyptic Expectation* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1996).

<sup>99</sup> See 1 En 46:1–5; 48:1–8; 62:1–9; Matt 16:27; 25:31–46; John 5:26–29.

<sup>100</sup> Jeffrey A. Gibbs points out that Matt 25:31–46 “is a direct description of the judgment scene with only minor parabolic features,” *Jerusalem and Parousia: Jesus’ Eschatological Discourse in Matthew’s Gospel* (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 2000), 214. See also Matt 12:36–42 which describes a forensic setting, and Rev 22:12.

<sup>101</sup> Gibbs’ caution is a necessary one: “It is clear that certain passages in Matthew’s Gospel in which Jesus calls himself ‘the Son of Man’ do make reference to the vision of Daniel 7. Interaction with Daniel 7 will be required in order to understand those texts as the implied reader would understand them. It is not, however, the presence of the mere phrase ‘the Son of Man’ in those texts that establishes the connection with Daniel 7, but rather additional markers that so function.” *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 61. Those features are amply present in Matthew 16:27 with the mention of “in the glory of his Father with his angels” and repaying everyone according to their deeds. Likewise John 5:26–29 mentions giving of authority, judging, (5:26), resurrection (5:28–29), and judgment according to deeds (5:29).

<sup>102</sup> Acts 17:31 has μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ. The only places where κρίνω occurs with τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ in the Septuagint are Psalms 9:9; 95:13; and 97:9, where Psalm 9:8 says that God has prepared his throne in judgment



ment, since 1:17 says that the Father judges impartially according to each one's work, and 4:5 warns that people "will give an account to him who is ready to judge the living and the dead" (cf. Acts 10:42).<sup>103</sup> Jude 15 says that God will convict (ἐλέγξει) people for their deeds and words.<sup>104</sup>

Martyn and de Boer both think that in Galatians Paul is "circumscribing 'the forensic apocalyptic theology of the . . . Teachers with a cosmological apocalyptic theology of his own.'"<sup>105</sup> De Boer applies the same approach to Romans, where he argues that the forensic motifs are present only because of Paul's conversation partners.<sup>106</sup> Such an understanding would put Paul at odds with the early Christian tradition we have just surveyed.

However, an examination of the undisputed Pauline letters does not support this claim. We can set aside Romans 2:1–16, because de Boer agrees that it is forensic—he just does not believe Paul really understands things in this way.<sup>107</sup> The place to start, therefore, is 2 Corinthians 5:10. There Paul brings his discussion about whether a Christian is in the body or with the Lord (5:1–8) to a close by saying that no matter what his or her situation is, a Christian desires to be pleasing to God (5:9). In 5:10, Paul provides the reason for this: "For (γὰρ) we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ (τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ), so that each one may

---

(ἡτοιμάσεν ἐν κρίσει τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ)—the very passages we have just looked at in the Old Testament background of forensic judgment.

<sup>103</sup> 1 Peter 1:17 (τὸν ἀπροσωπολήπτως κρίνοντα κατὰ τὸ ἐκάστου ἔργον); 4:5 (οἱ ἀποδώσουσιν λόγον τῷ ἐτοίμως ἔχοντι κρίναι ζῶντος καὶ νεκρούς).

<sup>104</sup> This background and the traditional Jewish Christian character of James suggests that "the judge" (ὁ κριτής) in James 5:9 should be understood forensically. Likewise the affinities between John and 1 John suggest that the "day of judgment" (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως) in 1 John 4:17 should be understood this way as well.

<sup>105</sup> Martyn quoting de Boer, *Galatians*, 273.

<sup>106</sup> "Why are motifs proper to track 2 present at all? The answer, we may properly assume, has something to do with what J. Louis Martyn likes to call Paul's 'conversation partners.'" de Boer, *Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, 182. "Paul's christologically determined apocalyptic eschatology is of the cosmological variety, though in Romans he is in conversation with those (probably both Jews and Christians) who adhere to the forensic type. To some extent, he adopts forensic categories and motifs though he frequently redefines or circumscribes their import cosmologically." de Boer *Defeat of Death*, 183.

<sup>107</sup> Key verses here include 2:6, "He will render to each one according to his works" (ὃς ἀποδώσει ἐκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ) and 2:11, "For God shows no partiality (προσωποληψία)." For a discussion of this important theme in Rom 2, see Jouette M. Bassler, *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1982).

receive (ἵνα κομίσηται) what is due for what he has done in the body, whether good or evil."<sup>108</sup>

This text is important for two reasons. First, in the context of 2 Corinthians it is not possible to argue that Paul has introduced this explicitly forensic statement because of "conversation partners." Paul is the one who has chosen to introduce it because it is a belief he shares with the Corinthians. Second, since Paul refers to "new creation" (καινή κτίσις) in 5:17, he shows that he has no difficulty using forensic and cosmological categories side by side. This should not be surprising, since we have seen in the Book of the Watchers and the pertinent Old Testament material that God's forensic judgment of human beings is the center of a larger whole that in its total impact includes creation—the latter is a natural complement of the former. What is different is that in Paul's christologically-focused apocalyptic eschatology, the new creation has already begun in the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Paul's use of βῆμα in 2 Corinthians 5:10 leads us next to Romans 14:10b, following Paul's urging of Christians not to judge one another about food and days (14:1–10a). Paul provides the reason the Romans should not do this when he says, "For (γὰρ) we will all stand before the judgment seat of God (τῷ βήματι τοῦ θεοῦ)." He substantiates this claim in 14:11 with a quotation from Isaiah 45:23, and concludes with the inference in 14:12, "So then (ἄρα) each of us will give an account of himself to God (λόγον δώσει τῷ θεῷ)."<sup>109</sup>

There are two important points to recognize here. First, the parallel with 2 Corinthians 5:10 means that it is not possible to say Paul is only using this explicitly forensic statement in Romans because of his "conversation partners."<sup>110</sup> Second, the manner in which Paul cites an Old Testament text (Isa

---

<sup>108</sup> The βῆμα was the tribunal or judgment seat on which a Roman official sat when rendering judicial decisions; see Frederick William Danker, ed., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 175.3. Thus Paul's language transposes the near eastern idiom of "throne," with its forensic connotations, into that of the Roman world (see also Matt 27:19; John 19:13; Acts 18:12, 16–17; 25:6, 10, 17).

<sup>109</sup> "For it is written, 'As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God'" (Rom 14:11). See James D.G. Dunn's helpful comments about the form of the quotation in *Romans 9–16* (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 809–810. On the textual issue, see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd. ed. (New York: American Bible Society, 1994), 469.

<sup>110</sup> De Boer maintains that "Rom 5.12–21 marks a shift from predominately forensic terminology and motifs to predominately cosmological ones." *Defeat of Death*, 152; emphasis original. He goes on to say, "Thus, while such texts as 8.1 and 8.33–34 indicate

45:23) that neither in its wording nor in its context mentions the divine throne, in order to demonstrate that Christians will be appear before the judgment seat of God, shows that the forensic judgment seat of God is a basic assumption that helps to order his thought about Scripture.

The significance of the final forensic judgment for Christian behavior in the present age appears again in 1 Corinthians 4:5, where Paul says that Christians are not to think that they can judge the ministry of others (or even their own; 4:3–5) before the time (μὴ πρὸ καιροῦ τι κρίνετε; 4:5a). There can be no true evaluation “before the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness (φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκοτός) and will disclose the purposes of the heart. Then each one will receive his commendation from God” (4:5b). The references to the return of Christ, judging (κρίνετε; 4:5a), and “secret things” (τὰ κρυπτὰ) reveal a thought parallel with the statement in Romans 2:16 about forensic judgment: “God judges the secrets (κρίνει ὁ θεὸς τὰ κρυπτὰ) of men by Christ Jesus.”<sup>111</sup> Here again the context of 1 Corinthians does not allow one to say that Paul has introduced forensic judgment because of his “conversation partners.”

De Boer grants that Romans 8:33–34 is forensic, though of course he attempts to minimize the importance of this fact.<sup>112</sup> Yet freed by the evi-

---

that forensic categories have hardly been given up or left behind, the structure and progression of Paul’s arguments in Romans 1–8 suggest that cosmological categories and motifs circumscribe and, to a large extent, overtake forensic categories and motifs.” *Defeat of Death*, 153. De Boer’s need to stretch this argument throughout the whole letter is not compelling. More damaging for his position is the fact that de Boer never explains how 2 Corinthians 5:10 and Romans 14:10 relate to his interpretation. In fact, I can find no evidence that either verse is even cited in the book (see “Index of Biblical References,” *The Defeat of Death*, 271–272). Kensky summarizes the situation well when she writes, “Here the reference to the judgment seat of God is a clear way in which Paul employs the language of the divine courtroom as an assumption that he shares with his audience. It is the acknowledged existence of such a βῆμα that Paul thinks will convince the Romans to cease and desist from judging each other, knowing that they will be judged by God in the end. If this assumption were not a shared one, this argument would not work.” *Trying Man, Trying God*, 183.

<sup>111</sup> “One’s self-estimate and the estimate of one’s fellow Christians do not matter ultimately. Only Christ’s judgment counts. No one should be judged before judgment day, and then only the Lord will assume the role of judge.” Ben Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 139. The fact that Paul can say God will judge through Christ Jesus (διὰ Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ) explains why Paul can ascribe the judgment seat to both God (Rom 14:10) and Christ (2 Cor 5:10).

<sup>112</sup> “Who shall bring any charge against God’s elect? It is God who justifies. Who is to condemn? Christ Jesus is the one who died—more than that, who was raised—who is at the right hand of God, who indeed is interceding for us” (Rom 8:33–34).

dence considered thus far, we can appreciate it as yet another example of the forensic judgment that is central to Paul's thought.<sup>113</sup> Equally important, the proximity of 8:18–23 demonstrates once again that Paul finds it very natural to set forensic and cosmological categories side by side. Finally, those who believe that Paul is the author of the disputed letters (as the present writer does) will find there additional evidence for Paul's forensic worldview.<sup>114</sup>

The evidence from Paul's letters surveyed here makes it clear that Paul focuses on God's forensic judgment of human beings. However, Romans 8:18–23, 33–34 (cf. 14:10) and 2 Corinthians 5:10, 17 demonstrate that, like the Book of the Watchers and the Old Testament, this forensic focus does not stand in opposition to cosmological outcomes. Instead the cosmological is the natural complement of the forensic. We will see why this must be so in the final section of this article as we examine God's righteousness (δικαιοσύνη).<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> The significance of 8:34 for our topic should not escape our attention. Paul says in 8:34b that Christ is "at the right hand of God" (ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ), an obvious reference to Psalm 110:1 (LXX 109:1), which was "perhaps the most extensively employed text in early Christian apologetic," according to Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 52. The verse itself (which uses ἐκ δεξιῶν μοῦ) is found in Matt 22:44; Mark 12:36; Luke 20:42; Acts 2:34; Heb 1:13 (cf. 1 Cor 15:25). An allusion to Ps 110:1 (LXX 109:1) occurs in Paul and elsewhere in the New Testament in statements using ἐν δεξιᾷ: Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet 3:22. The reference point for "at the right hand" is the throne (see 1 Kgs 2:19) of God (see 1 Kgs 22:19; 2 Chr 18:18)—a point made explicit in Heb 8:1 and 12:2. We see here again that the conception of both God the Father and Christ were firmly fixed in relation to the throne of God with all of its forensic significance.

<sup>114</sup> In 2 Tim 4:8, Paul calls Christ "the righteous judge" (ὁ δίκαιος κριτής)—a description that is the perfect complement to 2 Cor 5:10 where he is the one who sits on the judgment seat. In both Eph 6:8–9 and Col 3:25 Paul uses the verb κομίζω ("receive"; Col 3:25; Eph 6:8) to say that slaves (as well as masters in Eph 6:8–9) will receive the outcome of what they have done and remind them that God shows no partiality (προσωποληψία; Col 3:25; Eph 6:9). Since κομίζω is only used in these three passages, and προσωποληψία only occurs in Rom 2:11; Eph 6:9; and Col 3:25, the reference to forensic judgment is clear.

<sup>115</sup> The rejection of de Boer's paradigm in which "the last judgment, the juncture at which 'this age' is replaced by 'the age to come', is depicted as a cosmic confrontation, a war," does not entail the denial of spiritual conflict in Paul's thought; de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 175. Colossians 2:14–15 indicates that Paul can understand the cross as the place of Christ's triumph over evil cosmic powers. Yet the "now" of Christ's victory never removes the finality that arrives at the end of the "not yet" when Christ returns and forensic judgment takes place. The concomitant presence of martial and forensic is not surprising. Paul D. Hanson has emphasized the importance the Divine Warrior had for the development of the apocalyptic genre and

## V. δικαιώω—To Declare Righteous

Now that the forensic grounding of Paul's apocalyptic theology has been demonstrated, in conclusion we can succinctly show the legitimacy of the Lutheran understanding of δικαιώω by drawing upon the work of Stephen Westerholm<sup>116</sup> and Mark Seifrid.<sup>117</sup> Recognizing the same translation problems noted by Martyn in the δίκαιος cognates, for the sake of discussion Westerholm uses the terms "dikaios," "dikaiosness," and "dikaiosify" (passive: "to be dikaiosified") to indicate the Greek words δίκαιος, δικαιοσύνη, and δικαιώω.

First, Westerholm describes what he calls "ordinary dikaiosness"—that is, the dikaios language as it normally functions in the Old Testament and Paul. He notes that, "Dikaiosness . . . is what one ought to do and what one has if one has done it; it is required of all human beings."<sup>118</sup> This is determined by noting the contrast between dikaiosness (and its cognates) and

---

apocalyptic eschatology in *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 292–294, as indeed the Divine Warrior and his heavenly council were important in the development of earlier prophetic material. Miller points out: "Other examples could be cited, but it is sufficient to say that the conception of the divine assembly around the throne of Yahweh formed a basic element in the Israelite understanding of prophecy." *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, 68. The imagery of Yahweh's heavenly council could take on both a martial and forensic coloring, because Yahweh was both warrior and judge; see Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), 105; Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, 67. Nowhere does this become more evident than in Joel 3:9–12 (MT 4:9–12), which depicts a war on the Day of the Lord and then Yahweh taking his seat (presumably, as we have seen, on the throne) to judge (3:12; MT 4:12). In Miller's words, "Here is strong indication of the close connection between the imagery of Yahweh as warrior and Yahweh as judge of the nations." *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel*, 138. The defeat of those forces opposed to God culminates in his forensic judgment from the throne.

<sup>116</sup> Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004).

<sup>117</sup> Mark A. Seifrid, "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures and Early Judaism," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 1—The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, ed. D.A. Carson, Peter T. O' Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 415–442; "Paul's Use of Righteousness Language Against Its Hellenistic Background," in *Justification and Variegated Nomism: Volume 2—The Paradoxes of Paul*, ed. D.A. Carson, Peter T. O' Brien and Mark A. Seifrid; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 39–74; *Christ, our Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Justification* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000).

<sup>118</sup> Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 272.

sin (and its synonyms).<sup>119</sup> Westerholm points out that for Paul, what “one ought to do” has been established by God in his ordering of creation.<sup>120</sup> It is therefore not surprising to learn that the צַדִּיק word group that he draws upon from the Old Testament is closely associated with a norm.<sup>121</sup>

In turn, “One is dikaios . . . when one does dikaiosness—when, in other words, one lives as one ought and does what one should.”<sup>122</sup> Finally, “To be dikaiosified . . . is, in effect, to be given the treatment appropriate to one who is dikaios; in a legal context it means to be declared innocent of wrongdoing, or acquitted. When the last judgment is in view, it means to have one’s dikaiosness (rectitude) acknowledged by God.”<sup>123</sup> These three

---

<sup>119</sup> So for example in the Septuagint, Ps 44:8, “you loved dikaiosness and hated lawlessness” (ἠγάπησας δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἐμίσησας ἀνομίαν); Ez 18:26 “when the dikaios one turns away from his dikaiosness and commits a trespass” (ἐν τῷ ἀποστέψαι τὸν δίκαιον ἐκ τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ καὶ ποιῆσῃ παράπτωμα; see also Deut 9:5; 2 Sam 22:21–22; Ps 14:2; Prov 8:8; 11:6; 14:34; 15:9; Isa 33:15; Ezek 18:21, 24; 33:14, 19). Seifrid emphasizes that, “If we are to understand the language of righteousness in Paul’s letters rightly, we must interpret its central elements as echoes of biblical usage.” “Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language,” 57. The same understanding is found in Paul as he sets dikaiosness in opposition to sin (ἁμαρτία Rom 6:13, 18–20) and lawlessness (ἀνομία, 2 Cor 6:14; see also 2 Tim 2:22).

<sup>120</sup> Referring to the most obvious example of this in Rom 1:18–32 he comments, “We are born into a world not of our own making, and incur thereby, and in the course of living, obligations that we may shirk or defy but that no human fiat can set aside.” *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 266. As creatures, humans must worship God (Rom 1:19–21, 25) and human use of sexuality must respect the ordering God has provided (Rom 1:26–27). Paul goes on to argue that God can justly judge all people because they all by nature know this ordering (Rom 2:14–15).

<sup>121</sup> Seifrid is very sensitive to the importance of context for lexical semantics. Yet he strongly states that “the application of righteousness terminology to various inanimate objects, its association with ‘uprightness’ and ‘truth’, its connection with retribution in forensic settings, and its relation to parallel conceptions of ‘righteousness’ in other cultures in the Ancient Near East all render dubious any attempt to dissociate the terminology from the concept of a norm.” “Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language,” 43.

<sup>122</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 272. Ezek 18:5 says that the man is dikaios who does (ὁ ποιῶν) dikaiosness. The same understanding is stated in a negative form when Paul says in Rom 3:10 that no one is dikaios and then goes on in the rest of the catena (3:11–18) to list the sins they commit (the person is not dikaios who is not doing dikaiosness; see also 1 Tim 1:9).

<sup>123</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 272–273. Within judicial contexts in the Septuagint, δικαίω means “to find to be dikaios,” or “to declare innocent,” “to acquit.” The Old Testament emphasizes that judgment must dikaiosify those who have the status of being dikaios (Deut 25:1, δικαίωσων τὸν δίκαιον) and it forbids judgment from dikaiosifying the ungodly (Exod 23:7, οὐ δικαίωσεις τὸν ἄσεβη; see also Isa 5:23). The same meaning is found in Paul, who after stating the principle that God renders to each according to his works (Rom 2:6) goes on to say in 2:13, “For it is not the hearers of

uses are illustrated by Solomon's prayer that God will τοῦ δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον δοῦναι αὐτῷ κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνη αὐτοῦ.<sup>124</sup>

This "ordinary dikaiosness" provides the foundation for understanding the "extraordinary dikaiosness" that is found in Paul.<sup>125</sup> In Romans 5:8, Paul says that while we were yet sinners (ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν) Christ died for us. Then he adds in 5:9 that dikaiosified now (δικαιωθέντες νῦν) by his blood we will be saved through him from the wrath of God. In ordinary dikaiosness, to dikaiosify a sinner is a violation of God's will (Deut 25:1; Exod 23:7). Yet after describing Christ's role in this process in Romans 3:24–25, Paul explicitly states in 3:26 that God is dikaios as he dikaiosifies (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιῶντα). It becomes clear that because of Christ's saving death, God is dikaios when he judges sinners who have faith in Christ to be dikaios (something that in ordinary dikaiosness they are *not*).<sup>126</sup> Because of Christ's death (and resurrection) in Romans 5:17, Paul speaks of the gift of dikaiosness (τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης), that is, because of Christ the believer possesses what one has for doing what one ought—even though he or she has not done it of their own.<sup>127</sup>

---

the law who are dikaios before God, but the doers of the law who will be dikaiosified" (ESV modified). Those who do what God commands are dikaios and this will be acknowledged by God as such (they will be dikaiosified). The same understanding is found in Gal 3:12 when Paul quotes Lev 18:5, "The one who does them shall live by them." The one who does what God commands will have life, that is, will be acknowledged by God as dikaios.

<sup>124</sup> 3 Kgdms 8:32 (cf. 2 Chron 6:23). Westerholm cites this example and indicates that in more normal English it means to "find innocent of any wrongdoing the upright person, and so render to him according to his uprightness" *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 265–266.

<sup>125</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 273.

<sup>126</sup> In the same way, Paul says in Rom 5:19 that while through the disobedience of the one man the many were made to be sinners (ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν), through the obedience of Christ (his death on the cross) the many will be made dikaios (δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται). Note that in the "now and not yet" of Paul's christologically-focused apocalyptic eschatology he can describe the Christian as dikaiosified *now* (5:9), while also affirming that the believer will be dikaiosified at the final eschatological judgment (5:19).

<sup>127</sup> See Westerholm's treatment in *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 273–283. He writes, "The necessary point of continuity between Paul's extraordinary and his ordinary usages of the terminology is found in the verb; for Paul, too, it means 'treat as one ought to treat the dikaios,' 'acquit.' Paul's extraordinary usage of the noun and adjective may be said to take their cue from this meaning of the verb: δικαιοσύνη now means not rectitude but the (paradoxically just) acquittal of the heretofore sinful; δίκαιος now means not the upright but the one so acquitted. To adapt our encapsulation of ordinary

Finally, there are texts in Paul that refer to God's dikaiosness. Just as Romans 5:17 speaks of the gift of extraordinary dikaiosness, Philippians 3:9 refers to the righteousness which is from God (τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην) and sets this in contrast to a "righteousness of my own that comes from the law." The same understanding makes good sense in Romans 10:3 where Paul contrasts God's dikaiosness (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην) with the effort by the Jews to establish their own dikaiosness.<sup>128</sup> Traditionally, Lutherans have seen this gift of extraordinary dikaiosness from God as being expressed in the phrase, "dikaiosness of God" (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ; Rom 1:17).<sup>129</sup>

More recent work has called attention to the background that Psalm 98:2 provides to Romans 1:16-17 and the manner in which this calls the traditional interpretation into question.<sup>130</sup> Because of the parallel between "salvation" and "righteousness" in Psalm 98:2 (and elsewhere),<sup>131</sup> it has become axiomatic among many Pauline scholars that salvation is essentially a synonym for the dikaiosness of God, and that the latter phrase is to be understood as "covenant faithfulness."<sup>132</sup>

---

usage to the extraordinary, we may speak of acquitting (δικαιοῦν) the wicked, thereby granting them the gift of acquittal (δικαιοσύνη) and thus making them acquitted (δίκαιοι)," 277. Naturally, the recurring "it was reckoned as dikaiosness" (ἐλογίσθη εἰς δικαιοσύνην) in Romans 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 22 expresses the same idea.

<sup>128</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 285.

<sup>129</sup> In the 1519 treatise, "Two Kinds of Righteousness," Luther writes: "Through faith in Christ, therefore, Christ's righteousness becomes our righteousness and all that he has becomes ours; rather, he himself becomes ours. Therefore the Apostle calls it 'the righteousness of God' in Rom. 1 [:17]" Martin Luther, *Luther's Works*, American Edition, 55 vols., ed. Jaroslav Jan Pelikan, Hilton C. Oswald, and Helmut T. Lehmann (Philadelphia: Fortress Press; St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1955-1986), 31:298.

<sup>130</sup> In Romans 1:16, Paul describes the Gospel as the power of God for salvation (εἰς σωτηρίαν), and then in 1:17 he says that this is so because the dikaiosness of God (δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ) is revealed in it. This bears an obvious relationship to LXX Psalm 97:2 which says, "The Lord has made known his salvation (τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ); he has revealed his righteousness (δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ) before the nations." In the psalm, "salvation" is parallel to "righteousness" as it speaks of God's saving action (LXX Ps 97:1-3) in a way that makes it difficult to defend the interpretation that "dikaiosness of God" in Rom 1:17 refers *specifically* to a righteousness that God gives to the individual.

<sup>131</sup> Psalm 71:15; Isaiah 46:13; 51:5-6, 8; 59:17; 61:10; 62:1.

<sup>132</sup> Dunn's comment is typical: "God is 'righteous' when he fulfills the obligations he took upon himself to be Israel's God, that is, to rescue Israel and punish Israel's enemies (e.g., Exod 9:27; 1 Sam 12:7; Dan 9:16; Mic 6:5)—'righteousness' as 'covenant faithfulness' ([Rom] 3:3-5, 25; 10:3; also 9:6 and 15:8). Particularly in the Psalms and Second Isaiah the logic of covenant grace is followed through with the result that righteousness and salvation become virtually synonymous: the righteousness of God as



However, Seifrid has convincingly demonstrated that in the Old Testament dikaiosness is a matter of *creational theology* and not specifically covenantal.<sup>133</sup> God is the King who has ordered his creation, and because of sin and injustice he will carry out a vindicating action to restore the just and proper order.<sup>134</sup> This action is not limited to Israel but, as seen in texts like Psalm 98, includes all people and the whole creation.<sup>135</sup> Although the emphasis falls on the way this dikaiosness brings salvation to the oppressed, it inherently involves judgment on those who pervert and oppose God's order.<sup>136</sup> Yet this action does not only deal with people. It also

---

God's act to restore his own and to sustain them within the covenant." Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 41.

<sup>133</sup> Seifrid observes that בִּירַת and צִדִּיק rarely occur near each other. While covenant (בִּירַת) occurs 283 times and צִדִּיק terminology occurs 524 times, "yet in only seven passages do the terms come into any significant semantic contact." "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," 423. He goes on to note, "In biblical terms one generally does not 'act righteously or unrighteously' with respect to a covenant. Rather, one 'keeps,' 'remembers,' 'establishes,' a covenant, or the like. Or, conversely, one 'breaks,' 'transgresses,' 'forsakes,' 'despises,' 'forgets, or 'profanes' it." Seifrid concludes, "All 'covenant-keeping' is righteous behavior, but not all righteous behavior is 'covenant-keeping.'" "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," 424. Furthermore, Seifrid points out that texts like Psalm 7:1-18 and Psalm 11:1-7, in which God is a righteous judge who also brings wrath, prevent us from reducing the concept of dikaiosness to "salvation." "Paul's Use of Righteousness Language," 42-43. This finds confirmation in the fact the Septuagint translators do not translate the צִדִּיק -terms with σωτηρία or words based on the σωτ-root; see "Paul's Use of Righteousness Language," 51-52. There are other problems as well with the notion that dikaiosness in Paul is "covenant faithfulness"; see Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 286-296.

<sup>134</sup> Seifrid calls attention to the association dikaiosness has with "ruling and judging." The צִדִּיק root and שָׁפַט root occur within five words of each other in 142 contexts. "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," 425. His study reveals that the feminine noun צִדִּיקָה refers to a righteous act/vindicating judgment or state that results from it (probably functioning as a nominalization of the *hip' l* stem of the verb), while the masculine צִדִּיק signifies the more abstract concept of "right order" or "that which is morally right." "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," 428.

<sup>135</sup> "Naturally, he acts in faithfulness towards his people, contends with their enemies, and executes judgment on their behalf. Yet his acts of 'justification' do not represent mere 'salvation' for Israel, or even merely 'salvation.' They constitute the establishment of justice in the world which Yahweh made and governs . . . . The nations are to anticipate that Yahweh will bring about justice for them, even as he has done it for Israel." "Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures," 441. See also Seifrid's helpful discussion in *Christ, our Righteousness*, 38-45.

<sup>136</sup> Seifrid suggests that the frequency of salvific associations "stems in part from the concreteness which characterizes much of the biblical usage: promises of God's intervention to 'right' the wrongs in this fallen world stand at the center of the biblical

vindicates or “justifies” God *as God* over against disobedient and rebellious creatures.<sup>137</sup>

The creational theology of God’s righteousness explains why cosmological outcomes accompany and complement the forensic judgment in Paul’s writings. God’s eschatological action restores the just and proper order for humanity and creation. The primary focus in Paul’s letters rests upon human beings, because they alone were created in God’s image (Gen 1:27) and were given stewardship over creation as God’s representatives (Gen 1:28, 2:15). This judgment of human beings occurs in a forensic way at the judgment seat (βῆμα; Rom 14:10; 2 Cor 5:10). But at the same time the enactment of God’s righteousness—his justifying work—inherently includes a cosmological dimension. It makes all things very good once again (Gen 1:31).<sup>138</sup>

This background helps us to understand that the dikaiosness of God in Romans 1:16 includes the traditional Lutheran understanding, but also involves more than just acquittal based on the gift of extraordinary dikaiosness from God. It is the saving action by which through Christ God shows himself to be dikaios (Rom 3:26), even as he gives the gift of dikaiosness to sinners who have faith in Christ (Rom 3:23–25). It is also the action by which he is vindicated *as God* who judges sinners (Rom 3:4).<sup>139</sup> Westerholm is correct when he concludes regarding Romans 1:17,

---

interest. This perspective does not exclude divine recompense of the wicked, it rather presupposes it.” “Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 430.

<sup>137</sup> This is seen in texts like Isa 1:27–29 and 5:14–17, where God’s dikaiosness prompts people to repent or be humbled, and exalts God. It is also seen in texts like Exod 9:27; Lams 1:18; Neh 9:33; Dan 9:7, 14, 16, where sinners who have been overcome by God must acknowledge that he is dikaios; see Seifrid, “Righteousness Language in the Hebrew Scriptures,” 430; “Paul’s Use of Righteousness Language,” 44; *Christ, our Righteousness*, 43–45.

<sup>138</sup> We have seen that the model of “two tracks” used by Martyn and de Boer to privilege the cosmological over the forensic in Paul’s thought is not valid. The fact that there is a cosmological/creational aspect to Paul’s understanding of righteousness/justification is itself still a valid point. This emphasis in Martyn continues the line of thought developed by Ernst Käsemann, “The ‘Righteousness of God’ in Paul,” in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), 168–182. In different ways, Peter Stuhlmacher has also noted the creational setting of righteousness language in Paul in *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments 1: Grundlegung, Von Jesus zu Paulus*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1997), 327–341.

<sup>139</sup> “As we have argued elsewhere, it is clear from these contexts that when Paul speaks of the ‘righteousness of God’ he does not refer to an abstract divine attribute, but the event of God’s justification over against fallen humanity, which paradoxically is also

Hence, if δικαιοσύνη is not simply God's gift of acquittal here, we must say it is *that salvific activity by which God's commitment to uphold the right is vindicated at the same time as sinners* (those guilty of the *undikaio*sness of 1:18) *who believe the gospel become dikaios* (in accordance with Habakkuk's dictum). This may seem overloaded, but each aspect of the clarification is amply attested in the chapters that follow, and Paul clearly means 1:17 to serve as a heading for his subsequent argument.<sup>140</sup>

Therefore we can conclude that when explained in the manner described above, "righteous" and "righteousness" serve as very suitable renderings of δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη. With Westerholm, we can agree that "declare righteous" is an accurate translation of δικαίωω.<sup>141</sup> Since this is what Lutherans mean by "to justify," they are completely accurate and true to Paul when they use this word to translate δικαίωω within the framework of forensic eschatological judgment.<sup>142</sup>

---

the justification of the fallen human being." Seifrid, "Paul's Use of Righteousness Language," 55.

<sup>140</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 285–286; emphasis original. He goes on to add, "In short, both ways of understanding the term (as God's gift of acquittal, or as the salvific act by which God's support of the moral order is shown at the same time as sinners are acquitted) are true to Paul's thought; we need not here decide between them in ambiguous cases." *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 286; emphasis original.

<sup>141</sup> Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul*, 286.

<sup>142</sup> By identifying justification as the central article of the faith, Lutherans have not simply privileged one biblical metaphor over others. Instead they have focused upon the culminating eschatological event of God's saving work in Christ—the forensic judgment of the Last Day. This event provided the goal for Paul (Rom 14:10; 2 Cor 5:10; 2 Tim 4:8). It did for the Confessors as well, who wrote, "By means of God's grace we, too, intend to persist in this same confession until our blessed end and to appear before the judgment seat of our Lord Jesus Christ with a joyful and undaunted heart and conscience." Preface to the Book of Concord, 16.