

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Irish Biblical Studies* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_ibs-01.php

Liberation through God's Righteousness*

David Hill

"But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law, although the law and prophets bear witness to it, the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ to all who believe...." With these majestic words Paul commences what is probably the most theologically profound and crucially important pericope in the letter to the Romans (3.21-28). Every phrase, indeed every single word, carries weight and would bear investigation and exposition; we shall concentrate on one or two in the interests of advancing our exploration of similarities between "the righteousness of God" as handled by Paul and "the kingdom of God" in the teaching of Jesus. I hope that this way of looking at some major Pauline assertions will not be confining, but instructive and even liberating.

The pericope begins with the striking "But now". A clear contrast is intended. Over against past history something new has happened. And it was necessary for some initiative to be taken. For "all have sinned", everybody has been trapped by the power of sin: "for I have already charged that all men, both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin" (3.9) Those who cut themselves off from God are captured by an alien power. The sinful actions which Paul lists at the end of Romans 1 are not so much the crime in his view as the punishment for the crime. When man turns from God to sin - and three times in chapter 1 Paul describes this, man's basic sin: it is refusing to give glory to God, exchanging the truth about God for a lie, refusing to acknowledge God - he is left by God to wallow in sin and in the sins into which this sin leads him. And although pious, observant Jews may not be wallowing in these vices, they are nevertheless unable to shake themselves free from that basic sin of mankind - which may be summed up as self-centredness, the concern with one's own well-being. The Law may be given by God himself but it is incapable of saving anyone from himself: like man, it has been taken over by the alien power, sin and manipulated for its own ends. In this connection there is a very revealing point made in Romans 9.30-32: "What shall we say then?... that Israel who pursued the righteousness which is based on law did not succeed in fulfilling that law? Why?

Because they did not pursue it through faith, but as if it were based on works (Οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ ἔργων)."

What has gone wrong in Israel's case is not the pursuit of the law as intended by God to show them how they might be righteous and to point to God's own righteousness: no, what Paul finds fault with is the way in which Jews pursued the law. Instead of pursuing it ἐκ πίστεως, "on the basis of faith". they pursued it "as (if it were attainable) on the basis of works". Paul seems to be clearly implying that if only Israel had pursued it "on the basis of faith" instead of "as on the basis of works" they would have penetrated to the law's inner meaning and received the gift it pointed to. But what does Paul mean by the expression "pursue the law on the basis of faith"? Surely it was that recognition of and response to the claim of faith which God makes through the law, which includes submitting to the law's judgment of one's life, realizing that one is unable to obey it so adequately as to put God in one's debt, accepting the mercy and forgiveness offered by God, and, in reply to his grace, making a beginning of yielding oneself to him in gratitude and love and so of allowing oneself to be turned in the direction of obedience, of openness to him and to one's fellow man. But Israel, instead of responding to God's law with faith, has insisted on trying to get to grips with it on the basis of works, on trying to establish a claim on God - to be his creditor rather than his debtor. /1 But this attempt - an illusory quest - could only be a failure because it is the outworking of sin, the power of sin taking over the law itself in precisely the same way as it has taken over man: both man and law are drawn away from their true and intended relationship to God and are trapped by the magnetic power and structure of sin which can use even God's law as an instrument of rebellion against his will.

But now! "But now the righteousness of God has been revealed...." Now, because God's sovereignty over the world has been manifested, has made its epiphany in Jesus Christ, the situation has been changed, for Jews and for Gentiles, as well - and the transforming revelation is ΧΩΡΙΣ ΝΟΜΟΥ "apart from law". Let us consider the significance of that statement. It means that the whole business of the demonstration by God of his sovereign

righteousness has been removed out of the sphere of law: the proceedings are extra-legal; we are, I think, in the throne-room rather than the law-court. In relation to man and man's situation God acts not as administrator of the law, not as magistrate - for, if he did, he would have to condemn - but as king of his own kingdom issuing a free pardon. God's way of dealing with sinful men - the manifestation of his righteousness or sovereignty - is in terms of amnesty rather than acquittal, a regal rather than a judicial act. That is why I am very doubtful about the correctness of the NEB's rendering of Romans 4.5, in relation to God, as "he who acquits the guilty". You cannot acquit a man who is guilty; but you can refrain from charging him. And God does not acquit the guilty: he with sovereign authority over all legal processes, issues an amnesty or free pardon. But that does not compromise his own righteousness or God-ness: God must be δίκαιος as well as δίκαιός. But how can he be so? Perhaps the best way to answer that question is to set aside two quotations from Romans: first, the remarkable description of God in 4.5 as "the one who justifies the ungodly" (i.e. as doing the very thing that is forbidden in the law: Exod 23.7 LXX Οὐ δίκαιώσεως τὸν ἄσεβῆ), and the one from 3.26 "he (God) justifies him who has faith in Jesus". The justification of the ungodly does not apply to or comprehend "every sinful Tom, Dick and Harry" (Manson, 58), but rather those who, though sinful, yet stand in a certain relation to Jesus. This, however, would be quite arbitrary unless that relation to Jesus which Paul calls being ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ meant something with a definite bearing on sin and righteousness. To put the matter in a word, what is required in order that a justifying God may himself be just is that the justified sinner should be a repentant sinner. If that is so, then the supreme work of Christ in relation to justification must be that he makes it possible for sinful man truly to repent, to throw off old loyalties and ties in order to make a new submission of the will to God. And this for Judaism was something a man ought to do, but for Christianity it is something which man can do because Christ has made it possible. "God has exalted him at his right hand as Leader and Saviour, to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" (Acts 5.31). What before was command in the law and exhortation in the prophets is the gift of God in Christ and this gift is received,

appropriated by faith. In Paul's view, man is incapable of responding to a command to repent, in the full sense of the word: he is enslaved by sin and cannot free himself from the chains that bind him. Only by an act of God can he be liberated. And for Paul Christ is that liberator who makes possible the repentance - the change of disposition and direction - which is necessary if man is to be justified by a righteous God and justified $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon$. Let me make it clear that I am not setting some conditions on God's exercise of his justifying mercy: I am simply asserting that if God is to be God, to be $\delta\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, one who justifies sinners, those sinners must desire with their whole beings his grace and acceptance. Earlier in these lectures I observed that in the Gospels repentance and discipleship are presented in similar ways: I return to that point now simply to repeat that responsiveness - what is genuine biblical "repentance" $\tau^{\text{ev}}\text{subah}/\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron\iota\omicron$ - is the condition for experiencing the kingdom: likewise in Paul an attitude to, a relationship with, the Christ is the presupposition for the gracious act of God's sovereign righteousness, justification. In short, God will not, indeed cannot (if I may put it so), save those who do not want to be saved! But the repentant sinner, the justified sinner, is saved $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\upsilon$.

Now has that assertion, which is so obviously very important to Paul, any real relevance for us? Surely we are not likely to expect or seek justification, the actualization of God's rule and righteousness, in terms of "law": we know so much better. That blithe attitude may be dangerous. In the first place, it may rest on the assumption that "law" has to do, and for Paul had to do, with morality only - with ethics and the obviously related themes of conscience, guilt and sin. That this is how Paul has been interpreted for centuries by many in the West does not make it correct: /2 and the error will, no doubt, continue to be made, but - and this is the second point here - an adequate appreciation of "law" in Paul's writings will be missing. For Paul, as Jew, could not possibly detach the ritual from the ethical nor could he separate "law" in both senses from its total context, the covenant. Consequently, "law", $\nu\acute{o}\mu\omicron\varsigma$, is for the apostle power, $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$, which was part of salvation history and had even cosmic force - a power like "sin" and "death":

being under sin can be equated with being under the law in Romans 6.15-20. "Law" for Paul had dominion, a kind of lordship operative in the area we would roughly call "religion". It is "law" as power which is responsible for that syndrome of pious works and pious claims by which Israel tried to establish a claim on God - to be his creditor. It is "law" as power which created "the sphere within which the Jew tried to sunder himself from immorality and godlessness, viewed the history of his father's redemption as the guarantee of his own election and claimed God's grace as his personal privilege". /3 In short, the relevance of the Jewish nomism which Paul undermined with his declaration that the righteousness of God, the sovereignty of God over his world, has been revealed (in Jesus Christ) $\chi\omega\rho\iota\varsigma \nu\omicron\mu\omicron\upsilon$ is this: it represents the community and the religious endeavour of "good" people which treat God's promises as their own privileges and turn God's commandments into the instruments of self-sanctification. There is more than a hint of Jewish "nomism" in certain forms of Protestant theology and teaching (let him who hath ears to hear, hear!), but for Paul this kind of attitude to God is called "sin" because all the pious deeds and claims are an attempt to coerce God, to bring God into dependence on us, to make him our creditor. The Gospel, according to Paul, lays bare this sin and the part played by the power of law in producing it. For the gospel does not begin with subjective feelings of guilt and pangs of conscience over failure to observe a moral code: it begins with man "fallen from his true relationship to God", man the victim of the powers that hold sway in his world (sin, death, law), a situation which shows its most sinister form in his reliance on his own goodness and merit. "Good" people, especially if they are what we call "religious" as well, find that kind of affirmation offensive. We do so want to be or be thought a little better or more worthy than we are, but "sinners" we are, whether pious ones or impious. But, proclaims Paul, God justifies, God brings no charge against the impious or ungodly: they participate in the liberating amnesty when they stand in a certain relation to Jesus.

And on this, and here I would want to be very emphatic, there is no difference between what Paul is affirming in

his own particular theological language and what we have discovered about Jesus from the gospels. Unlike the Pharisees and the Qumran sectarians, Jesus did not set out to make the pious person even more pious. "They that are well have no need of a physician": Jesus set out to go to the tax-collectors and sinners, that is, into the world of the ungodly (from every point of view). The pious people, were, generally speaking, against him or misunderstood him and finally engineered his crucifixion, if what the evangelists tell us is true. The "good" people had "standards" and therefore they were either sorry for or opposed to Jesus who - in the name of God and with the authority of the "sent-man", a prophet - took his stand beside the lost, the godless, the immoral, the sinners, call them what you will. As I said before, the fact that he stood with them does not mean that he condoned their misdeeds: no, he recognizes their humanness, their intrinsic value and he is alert to the silent plea which their isolation from society makes. Renewal, restoration, transformation take place. The kingdom- the sovereignty of God, God exercising his kind of kingship - is experienced as grace, and the piety of self-sanctification writhes in fear and anger and kills "the friend of tax-collectors and sinners" in order to protect the system. But it was Jesus who was vindicated by God, and his resurrection was the sign of the divine approval, the divine "Yes" to what he had been and done: therefore the "system", the law which condemned Jesus (by announcing that anyone who hung on a tree was accursed in God's eyes) was wrong in its verdict - which, in Paul's language, is that the righteousness of God, God's sovereignty in action, has been demonstrated "apart from the law". Moreover, to say that God justifies the penitent sinner is to do no more than use a special vocabulary to affirm the ultimate rightness of what Jesus did in graciously moving towards those outcasts of his day whose very isolation was their desperate call for recognition and help. Why Paul used the particular theological language he did is something we shall consider in the course of the next lecture, but at this stage I want to examine more closely terms associated with "justification", namely "faith", "grace" and "in Christ".

It is relatively straightforward now to secure

agreement on the meaning of ΠΙΣΤΙΣ in Paul (and I think it very seldom requires translation by "faithfulness"), it does not primarily mean assent to truths or dogmas but "trust", "response", even "commitment": what is not so easy is to determine the place or role of faith, perhaps I should say the status of faith, in Paul's teaching on justification. There is a splendid paragraph in Manson's little book (On Paul and John, p63) which is as pungent in expression as it is probing in its intention.

"The Pauline doctrine of Justification by Faith has often been stated in such a way that it is stultified, because faith is turned into a Christian virtue. The believer merits salvation on the ground of his faith. In that case all that has happened is that the old doctrine of Justification by Works has been brought back in a new form. Instead of a multiplicity of good deeds, God is content to accept one - namely the act of faith. It is equally possible to fly to the other extreme and state the doctrine of justification by faith in such a way that the faith of man ceases to be of any real significance at all. Faith is, so to say, made part of the process of justification. In our anxiety to exclude the idea of merit we exclude all initiative whatsoever on the human side and treat man as a mere bottle to be filled with the water of life. On the one side salvation is commercialized, on the other side, it is mechanized; and if it is wrong to regard Christ as having opened a new shop where salvation may be purchased with the coinage of faith, it is equally wrong to regard him as the founder of a system turning out justified robots by mass production."

But if we are not justified because of our faith, and if the significance of faith cannot be reduced to vanishing point, how do we get the balance right? With characteristic simplicity Manson himself puts it like this: "Salvation is absolutely and entirely the gift of God. Nothing that man can do can contribute in the smallest way to the gift. All that man can do - and it is the only thing that nobody else, whether man or God, can do for him - is to take what God gives. That is what Paul means by faith." Taking what God gives, accepting what God offers, which is acceptance of us as we are. To say that faith is acceptance of the fact that I am

accepted is, I know, to use language borrowed from Paul Tillich but, when one recalls the attitude of Jesus to the social and religious outcasts of his day, when one tries to use meaningful terms to speak of "justification", is "acceptance" so very wide of the mark as a way of denoting both the gift and the response? With regard to the latter, I suppose it could be argued that to speak of "faith" does less than justice to the very important stress on "trusting" that there is in ΠΙΣΤΙΣ, a trust in God's trustworthiness that leads to faithfulness or obedience: but what if words like "putting your trust (in God or in Jesus)" just do not assist understanding? May it not be that the language of "acceptance" will clarify? To say to someone for whom the real questions of life are taking shape, "Can you accept the fact that you are accepted by God - without your having to strive to make yourself better or anything else?" may be to express the issue of faith in its most meaningful way. In addition, the idea of "acceptance" has within its scope for many applications. If I can accept the assurance that God accepts me as I am - not as I ought to be, not as I would like to be, but as I actually happen to be - then there is some chance that I can accept myself, and that is immensely liberating: for if I can accept myself, then I no longer need to achieve worth or value at the expense of other people; I no longer need to be grabbing, jealous, possessive. If I can accept myself, my need to assert myself, my need to assert myself tends to disappear, and so on. Yes: "acceptance", as an idea, has very great potential in Christian affirmation: all I am suggesting now is the helpfulness of "acceptance" for a basic, but profound, understanding of "faith": acceptance of the fact that I am accepted by God, that is three-fourths and more of "having faith" and, thus explained, we can see why faith is never facile. Accepting the fact that he was accepted by God amazed, indeed overwhelmed, Paul and the other saints and sinners: that I am accepted by God I can hardly believe (intellectually or emotionally) but it is true. That's a beginning, if not the goal, of faith. Salvation or renewal or transformation in terms of "acceptance by God": response or faith in terms of "acceptance of acceptance": I am thankful to see it in those gospel stories about Jesus and the outcasts and I

am thankful to find it at the heart of Paul's doctrine of salvation: man takes what God gives, man accepts what God offers, which is acceptance.

And what about "grace"? While the slogan "justification by faith" can give the wrong impression, namely that I am justified because of, or on the grounds of my faith, the fuller form, "justification by grace through faith" may be regarded as a redundancy by those who know what they mean when they say "justification is grace". Still, for lesser minds, it may be the better way of speaking, for it does put the emphasis where it belongs. On what grounds am I justified? Not on the grounds of my faith but on the grounds of grace, God's grace. That is where the initiative comes from, that is the quality of the divine action, that is the name of the divine righteousness which sovereignly manifests itself "apart from law" - $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$, the unmerited kindness of God, the loyal - and because it is utterly loyal, therefore wonderfully merciful - love of God. In a sense this grace of God is justification: without it, without its manifestation and operation in Jesus the Christ, there would be no attitude of God towards man, no "stance" vis-à-vis man for a possible response. Grace gives the gift, and in no small measure, grace is the gift. And that is as true in Paul's systematic presentation of the matter as it is in the attitude and activities of Jesus himself: he did not only demonstrate graciousness, he lived grace, grace which moved from the pious to the sinner and worked its miracle of transformation through acceptance. I recall once again those beautiful words from the Pastorals: "When the goodness, the kindness and the generosity of God appeared he saved us" (Tit 3.4): notice, "he saved us", not our faith. And from the previous chapter, "The grace of God appeared . . . bringing salvation to, or perhaps better, making salvation possible for all men" (Tit 2.11). "Justification is an act of God's free grace", so the Catechism says: whatever else may be said about its answer, it has got "grace" in the right place. The grace of God justifies, not our faith: God shows the kind of sovereignty he exercises, the $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$ θεοῦ is disclosed as being that of grace.

I come now to what is often called the "ἐν Χριστῷ

formula", though I have doubts as to whether Paul would ever have termed it a formula! Volumes have been written on these two words and volumes will be written on them, as scholars try to explain and expound the tremendous significance they bear in Paul. We are all familiar with their interpretation in terms of "Christ-mysticism": I would not want to deny that there is such a thing in Paul as "Christ-mysticism" - can we ever really explain our continuing relationship with Christ? - but as far as "in Christ" goes, it is clear that in Paul's usage it is not the kind of thing that is commonly meant by mysticism. The mystic - in the usual sense of the word - is one who by a certain type of spiritual discipline comes to a special kind of experience - an indescribable sense of communion with the ultimate divine essence, of being absorbed in the Absolute Reality. The characteristic of this is that the number of people who attain to it is small and that even among this tiny religious aristocracy the experience in question is a rare and short-lived thing. But for Paul it is clear that what he is saying with the words "in Christ" is not something confined to the spiritual elite but the normal "position" or "situation" (to use inadequate language) for all Christians.

I begin from Gal 2.17: "if while seeking to be justified in Christ....δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ: I presume Paul meant what he wrote: if he had wanted to say "by Christ" or "through Christ", he could have said it and, on other occasions, did; here, in what is probably his earliest reflection on "justification", he speaks of it as taking place "in Christ". In other words (not very adequate, I admit) "ἐν Χριστῷ" is the locus of justification. We have to remember that essential to Paul's whole understanding of justification (though rarely spelled out in his letters) is the idea of Jesus' justification by God. The new, resurrected, undying life of Christ was, in Paul's eyes (for it is the heart of his conversion) , the proof that God had vindicated Jesus, reversed the verdict which condemned him, and proclaimed that he was "righteous", in the right. On that vindication depends our vindication eventually (as we shall see) , and on it depends our justification, for we have to be in some kind of relation to the Jesus who

was declared righteous, if we too are to be proclaimed righteous. Earlier, in this connection, I spoke of the attitude of repentance and linked that with the calling to discipleship in the Gospels. Now I want to open it a little further. There is nothing really analogous to the phrase "in Christ" except the phrase with which Paul himself contrasts it, namely, the phrase "in Adam": as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive". It would seem that in Paul's view there are two spheres that intersect: there is the sphere of humanity "in Adam" which includes everyone; and there is the sphere of those who are "in Christ", who have been incorporated into Christ. Those who have been baptized into Christ have participated in his death and resurrection. What happened to him happens to them. They are crucified with him - but crucified in order that they may share his life (Gal 2.20), and this means that they share in the verdict of "righteous" or "accepted" pronounced on him at the resurrection. And because Christ shared the condition of being "in Adam", the new sphere, the new creation, the new humanity was created and continues to grow within the circle of the old. Those who are "in Christ" are those who are sharing in his justified and resurrected life but in order to do so they must first share in his death.

That's what we find so difficult to accept. We want the new life of joy and peace, we want the triumph; but first we must die with Christ. There is no crown without the cross: there is no Easter without Good Friday. I think George Matheson's words express it well:

O Cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee;
I lay in dust life's glory dead
And from the ground there blossoms red
Life that shall endless be.

And "laying in dust life's glories" is not a pious sentiment. It is as hard as it sounds. It is dying to the world's glories in which achievement, success, prestige rate high in the scale of values. To count these as refuse is Christ's way to real fulfilment and new life.

The metaphor "being baptized into Christ" (and in the long run all these metaphors are saying the same thing) is

illustrated in 1 Corinthians from the experience of the Israelites: they, says Paul, were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor 10). That is illuminating. Having exchanged their loyalty from the Egyptian Pharaoh to God's prophet and servant Moses, the people of Israel had to act out that loyalty by obediently following Moses even when his instructed path looked as if for disaster. Tested obedience was the mark of those following Moses. Doesn't it all recall - and begin to make sense of - sayings like "I have a baptism to be baptized with"....and "Can you (to eager and nonchalant friends) be baptized with the baptism wherewith I am baptized?" Jesus is plainly saying that he knows an apparently calamitous outcome lies ahead and he asks his followers, "Can you share it with me? Can you go through it with me?" In a certain sense they did, but that is not our concern here. What I am concerned to say is that what Jesus called his followers into, namely a relationship with himself that would last through persecution and suffering because it was founded on utter trust, is what Paul (in his systematic way) is affirming again as "baptism into Christ" or "justification in Christ". It is new life in a new context, in a new sphere. When we are ἐν Χριστῷ - and that seems to me to differ not at all in meaning from being a disciple, a μαθητῆς Ἰησοῦ - we are new men and women: we are experiencing a transforming friendship, we are, or at least are becoming, what God meant his people to be, we are justified, accepted. The locus of justification is "in Christ" and you get yourself there by being baptized into Christ. Baptism is the sign and occasion of our transferring loyalties from the Adamic regime to Christ's rule, of changing from one sphere to another. It demands sacrifice, self-surrender, the adopting of new standards and values "not of this world". By dying with Christ are we raised to new life, justified life - the life which, whatever this world's view of it may be - and it so contradicts our normal values as to look plain foolish (but is Mother Theresa a fool?) - we believe, and if we are really following we know, that this is the vindicated life, this is it, this is what we are here for and to do. I end with two very simple words of postscript. When I talked about Jesus' gracious movement towards the sinners and the religious and social

outcasts, I talked in the same lecture about his miracles, deeds of power over the chaotic and demonic, deeds which anticipated the new creation. Now I have been pointing out - at far too great length, I fear - that Paul's doctrine of justification is a systematic statement of what Jesus lived, and especially his acceptance of the rejected and unworthy. Paul says nothing, well hardly nothing, about miracles in his letters. He has time for only one - the miracle of "new creation". But does he need any more? If a man is in Christ, he is a new creation, whole, saved, "ransomed, healed, restored, forgiven". It is a miracle of grace. There is no credit to us for it, no merit. To be in that beautiful phrase "accepted in the beloved" is to be justified. Debtors to grace we are for the wonder of salvation.

And, finally, for your preaching. I find it a relief indeed I think life would be almost impossible if I did not have the relief of knowing that in this world, the sphere of Adam's pretty tyrannous rule, - in the world of dog-eat-dog, of cut-throat competitiveness, of selfishness, of petty pretentiousness, of dehumanizing ugliness, there is another possibility of life in another sphere in which the genuinely human (because they are spiritual, of God) values prevail, in which we are not tethered to quid pro quo, in which surrender of life brings fulfilment of life. Moreover there is only one condition for entry into this sphere, the Church, what someone has called "the sociological sphere of righteousness", which is that we realize our emptiness, that we know it is going to take a miracle to save us if we are to be saved at all, and that we turn in "wonder, love and praise" to the miracle-working grace of God and accept the fact that we are accepted, justified "in Christ". That is news almost too good to be true and too stupendous not to be true. That's why it is the gospel for all mankind and for individuals like you and me. To be "in Christ", to be justified by the righteousness of God, to be accepted as we are, like those despised tax-collectors and sinners in Jesus' ministry is indeed all of grace. Living in the new sphere, ἐν Χριστῷ, participating in the new humanity, demands obedience, the fruits of the Spirit, but I think that all could be summed up in a phrase much beloved by John Baillie, 'gratitude for grace'.

Notes

- * The sixth in Dr Hill's series of lectures entitled "Kingdom and Righteousness", delivered in the Union Theological College, Belfast in November 1980.
1. Cf. C.E.B. Cranfield, "Some Notes on Romans 9.30-33" in Jesus und Paulus (ed. Ellis and Grässer (Göttingen 1975), pp35-43; also his Romans (ICC, Vol 2, 1979), pp 503-520 and Interpretation XXXIV (1980), pp70ff.
 2. Cf. K. Stendahl's well-known essay, "The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West" in Harvard Theological Review LVI (1963), pp199-215; also in Paul among Jews and Gentiles (London 1977), pp78-96
 3. E. Käsemann, "Justification and Salvation-History in the Epistle to the Romans" in Perspectives on Paul (ET, London 1971), pp60-78: quotation from p72.
 4. T.W. Manson, On Paul and John, (Ed. M.Black, London 1963) p63.