

“The Meaning of Christ and Pauline Theology”

Contents

1. Introduction
2. Expression and Meaning
3. Δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως as One of Many Expressions in Paul
4. The Meaning of Christ

1. Introduction

In 2 Peter 3.16 we find perhaps the earliest witness to the struggles of the early church in Pauline interpretation in the wake of Paul’s missionary work and his literary legacy: ἐν [ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς Παυλοῦ] ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.¹ Since at least as early as the time of 2 Peter, the task of understanding Paul has been one full of unresolved tensions and disputes among those who claimed to have understood Paul’s theology. This unresolved unrest has not changed in two thousand years. In fact, contemporary interpreters critically analyze even the concept of “Pauline theology.”

Recent summary works by the members of the Society of Biblical Literature’s Pauline Theology Group (such as James D. G. Dunn’s “In Quest of Paul’s Theology: Retrospect and Prospect” and Paul W. Meyer’s “Pauline Theology: Some Thoughts for a Pause in Its Pursuit”)² make clear the lack of precision and clarity when it comes to terms as seemingly simple as “Pauline theology.” The frustration has reached such a high degree, that one member of that group, Steven Kraftchick, suggested a moratorium on further papers “until questions of definition and procedure are more fully agreed on.”³

¹ “There are some things in [Paul’s letters] hard to understand, which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction, as they do the other scriptures.”

² James D. G. Dunn’s paper can be found in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1995 Seminar Paper* (ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 704–21. Paul Meyer’s paper can be found in the same volume on pp. 688–703.

³ Steven J. Kraftchick, “Seeking a More Fluid Model: A Response to Jouette M. Bassler,” in *1 & 2 Corinthians* (ed. David M. Hay; vol. 2 of *Pauline Theology*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 34. Cf. Wrede, who, even though he considered Paul to have taken the first elementary steps toward theological thought, doubted whether the term “theology” was appropriate for describing what we find in Paul’s letters: “Moderne Vorstellungen muß man ausdrücklich verbannen, wenn man Paulus einen Theologen nennt. Er besaß keine

With regard to the meaning of Christ in Pauline theology, some may note a discrepancy between the meaning of Christ *in* Paul, that is, as we find it in Paul's mere seven letters, and the meaning of Christ *for* Paul, that is, the meaning Christ had for Paul's entire life, including the letters but obviously encompassing much more. These two can conceivably be different. What Christ meant for Paul is probably more comprehensive than what we find in Paul, that is, in the New Testament letters of Paul. All we can conjecture is based on the textual evidence, hence the meaning of Christ *for* Paul as it is mediated *in* Paul's letters. To know the meaning of Christ *for* Paul would necessitate an interview with Paul that spans all of his life from his earliest memories. And even then we would have to assess the development of Paul the individual as he was molded by his ever-changing historical contexts. That sort of knowledge lies beyond our ken. In that regard, Kraftchick's somewhat pessimistic note in the aforementioned paper is quite understandable:

Regardless of the methods of inquiry we have adopted, the full recovery of Paul's thought has remained beyond our collective grasp. The complexity of this process may find its origin not in the vagaries of the letters or the murkiness of their historical origin but in the complexity of the human being who wrote them. Lamentably we have few avenues of access open to us which reveal that person.⁴

theologische Gelehrsamkeit in unserm Sinne und hat auch mit unsern Dogmatikern und Ethikern geringe Ähnlichkeit. Niemals hat er ein System seiner Lehre entwickeln wollen, selbst im Römerbriefe nicht. Er schreibt immer als Missionar, Organisator und Volksredner, entwickelt seine Gedanken auf gegebenen Anlaß hin, und immer nur nach einzelnen Seiten. So könnte man überhaupt irre werden, ob "Theologie" hier der rechte Name ist. Aber er ist nicht zu entbehren" (*Paulus* [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1907], 47 ["When we call Paul a theologian we must expressly exclude modern associations of the word. He possessed no theological learning in our sense, and has very little affinity with our dogmatic and ethical writers. He never attempts—not even in the letter to the Romans—to unfold a system of doctrine. He writes always as a missionary, an organizer, a speaker to the people, is guided in the setting forth of his thoughts by the occasion given, and treats only of particular sides of his subject. We might well doubt, therefore, whether 'theology' is here the right word to use: but it cannot be avoided." (Translation from *Paul* [trans. Edward Lummis; Lexington: American Theological Library Association, 1962], 74)). Wrede reminded interpreters that they should move their attention away from the expressions to the experiences which arose in the development of the Christian religion as the means of understanding the expressions. For that reason he issued a warning against detailed, dogmatic examinations of words and concepts, and against those who believed that figuring out the meanings of the terms individually meant getting at the meaning of the text. Cf. Heikki Räisänen's opening words in *Paul and the Law*: "Paul never defines the content of the term νόμος" (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 16). Likewise is the significance of the fact—especially in the light of debates about the ambiguity of the expression πίστις Χριστοῦ—that Paul never bothers to define as crucial a concept as πίστις.

⁴ Kraftchick, "Seeking a More Fluid Model," 34. Note the similarities Kraftchick's comment has with

I mention this issue (i.e., *in* vs. *for*) at the outset, although its ramifications run throughout this paper, not only to register my own awareness of the topic's complexity, but also to signal a suggestion that emerges from Wilhelm Dilthey's (1833–1911) view of *Erlebnis* (lived-experience) and *Nacherleben* (re-experiencing), especially with regard to written texts. As he explores hermeneutical issues, Dilthey points out and accentuates the capacity of human beings to understand others or the expressions (literature, art, music, etc.) of others that they encounter. Following Dilthey's approach to interpretation, then, I do not separate so sharply what Christ meant *for* Paul from what Christ means *in* the expressions we find in the extant letters of Paul. The distinction between the person Paul and his expressions, though instructive for our own analyses of the texts, need not keep us from affirming the common ground upon which Paul and we stand (the world, life, time, space, etc.), thereby allowing us to understand Paul, at least to the extent that the letters permit.

Even when scholars most familiar with Paul's writings run up against seeming impassés, they cannot ignore their almost intuitive grasp of the sense or thrust of what Paul means to say by what he wrote. After all, it is the presupposition of all interpretation that we *can* in fact understand others' works. That means that we share with Paul some fundamental structures in experiencing life and in giving expression to our experiences. Thus admitting the constraints of searching for the meaning of Christ *in* Paul, that is, in his letters, I would, however, dare hope that by getting at the meaning of Christ *in* Paul we will also be able to understand the meaning that Christ had *for* Paul.

2. Expression and meaning

In exploring the meaning of Christ in Paul, I have found Dilthey's *Lebensphilosophie* to be a helpful theoretical framework. According to Dilthey's tripartite interrelations of *Erlebnis* (lived-experience), *Ausdruck* (expression), and *Verstehen* (understanding), I

Albert Schweitzer's conclusions concerning the quest for the historical Jesus in *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1906), 397: "[Jesus] does not stay; He passes by our time and returns to His own. What surprised and dismayed the theology of the last forty years was that, despite all forced and arbitrary interpretations, it could not keep Him in our time, but had to let Him go." (*The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede* [trans. William Montgomery; New York: Macmillan, 1968], 399).

understand Paul's letters as expressions of his lived-experience, most significantly his experience of Christ, which, as all interpreters would agree, became for him the center and power in his life, determining his understanding of all his experiences, past and present.

I also make use of Dilthey's concept of an *erworbener seelischer Zusammenhang* (acquired psychic nexus) to understand Paul in terms of an ever-developing nexus of acquired experiences in dynamic contact with his world. Perceived and experienced, the *objektiver Geist* (objective spirit), or the historical world, provides the conditions and data for the developing psychic nexus of an individual, such as Paul (e.g., language and social conventions). The concepts of the acquired psychic nexus and *objektiver Geist* are especially important in understanding his thinking as coherent in the face of the variety and flexibility of his language (e.g., apocalyptic, Stoic) and the lack of systematic coherence on the discursive level of his expressions. My contention is that the forensic language of justification (δικαιοσύνη, δικαιόω) is one that Paul found readily at hand at opportune moments to bring to expression his experience of Christ.

Not only does the language of justification belong to the level of expression, but so do the equally significant concepts of νόμος and πίστις. Part of the interpretative problem for us is that Paul never defines such terms in his letters. Instead, he uses them freely in various places at varying frequency, depending on the situation at hand.⁵ These three concepts, δικαιοσύνη, νόμος, and πίστις, interrelate and appear closely together mainly in Romans (Rom 3–4; 10) and Galatians (Gal 2–3) and have been the subject of numerous books and articles, although without any satisfactory consensus. Upon closer scrutiny, we can discover that these three terms are particularly related to the Jew-Gentile issue in the early church, most notably discussed in Galatians and Romans.

Recent works on Paul and the law reveal the perennial problem of Pauline interpretation with regard to the use of such terms and concepts in Paul.⁶ For example, in Romans Paul can write οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ

⁵ Cf. Wrede; see footnote 3.

⁶ E.g., Ed P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983) and Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (Rom 2.13: For it is not the hearers of the law who are righteous in God's sight, but the doers of the law who will be justified) and then shortly thereafter confuse the issue by claiming that ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (Rom 3.20: “no human being will be justified in his sight” by deeds prescribed by the law, for through the law comes the knowledge of sin). E. P. Sanders views Rom 1.18–2.29 as an expendable anomaly, thus downplaying the palpable tension in Paul's claims. But the real reason for Sanders's position is that the passage does not fit nicely into his own interpretation of νόμος. On the other hand, Heikki Räisänen is more honest and blunt to admit that “contradictions and tensions have to be *accepted* as *constant* features of Paul's theology of the law.”⁷

My proposal is that we return again, with more precision, to the hermeneutical distinction espoused by various scholars in the past, most notably Rudolf Bultmann, viz., between expression and meaning. With this fundamental hermeneutical apprehension comes the freedom to permit Paul to speak using his own language as he wishes, instead of our tendency to project our theological agenda into Paul's text. We will also benefit from the freedom from the search for a coherent center on the level of the text, i.e., in the letters themselves. No single expression on the textual level—not even J. Christiaan Beker's suggestion of apocalyptic as the coherent center⁸—can exhaust the meaning of Christ. The coherence of Paul's gospel is his experience of Christ itself, constantly active in his life and free to search out new ways of bringing that experience to expression.

3. Δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως as One of Many Expressions in Paul

In the light of the above, I would like to suggest, even if too briefly, a few theses for consideration. First is that the so-called doctrine of justification (*Rechtfertigungslehre*) is not the center of Paul but one of many expressions of his experience of Christ. Secondly, Paul's statements about δικαιοσύνη, especially in Romans and Galatians, are means for expressing

⁷ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 11.

⁸ J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

the meaning of Christ in terms of the problem of Jew-Gentile relations. Paul uses δικαιοσύνη language to argue that the separate missions to the Jews and the Gentiles are parallel and equally valid. That the Gentiles are justified as Gentiles, and should not become Jews through circumcision is the meaning of Christ that Paul brings to expression with regard to the Jew-Gentile issue. Finally, if my contention is correct, then not only should the concept of justification relinquish its privileged status as Paul's central doctrine (*pace* Martin Luther), at least among the Protestants, but there are also serious consequences for interpreting any and all claims on the level of the text. All of Paul's statements in all the letters must be understood with respect to Paul's continuing experience of Christ and with respect to the concrete situations at hand that call for particular expressions of the meaning of Christ.

As I mentioned already, the three terms δικαιοσύνη, νόμος, and πίστις are particularly related to the Jew-Gentile issue in Paul's letters, most notably in Romans and Galatians. But for many interpreters, this concrete, historical reality has taken a back seat since the doctrinal disputes of the sixteenth century. It is mostly under the enduring influence of Martin Luther and other Reformers that we still tend to see Paul's emphasis on δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως as the coherent center of Paul. In the twentieth century, Ernst Käsemann once again focused on δικαιοσύνη (τῶν ἀσεβῶν) as Paul's central teaching and key to the rest of Paul's thought.

Against such a strong tide of Protestant interpretation of Paul, Joseph Fitzmeyer cautions that the focus on δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως as a supposed center compromises our apprehension of the larger, richer tapestry of Pauline letters that contain multifaceted understandings and expressions of what he would consider the center of Paul, viz., christocentric soteriology.⁹ Fitzmeyer thinks that two extremes should be avoided with regard to the center in Paul. On the one hand, Albert Schweitzer's position does not do justice to the prominence of the theme of justification since his focus on mystical experience of Christ relegates justification to the margins of Pauline thought. On the other hand, Käsemann's

⁹ Conference on "Rereading Paul Together," University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1-2 Feb 2002). At the same conference Margaret Mitchell argued that the center of Paul's theology was the death and resurrection of Christ.

claim of justification of the ungodly as the center of Pauline theology bypasses other significant expressions in Paul's letters. That is to say, both Schweitzer and Käsemann fail to appreciate the multifaceted expressions of soteriology that we find in Paul.

In the light of the variety of centers that have been proposed by previous scholarship, my contention is that a center is not to be found on the textual level in the form of a proposition or doctrine in the dogmatic sense.¹⁰ Rather, the letters bear witness to a dynamic process of continual theologizing in which the apostle Paul engages his readers in any way that would convince them to recognize ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (Gal 2.5, 14)¹¹ with respect to their particular and peculiar situation.

4. The Meaning of Christ

It can be argued that for Paul the meaning of Christ had to do with individual salvation (e.g., Rom 10.9–10; Gal 1.15–16; 2.19–20; 5.21; Phil 2.12; 1 Thess 1.9–10). On the other hand, from the very same letters, we can argue instead that the meaning of Christ concerns cosmic salvation (e.g., Rom 5.12–21; 8.19–23). Neither of these understandings of the meaning of Christ for Paul is wrong; but neither can, on its own, exhaust the meaning of Christ for Paul. Both the individual dimension and the cosmic dimension are important in Paul. The important thing to remember, however, is that the letters are letters; i.e., they serve a practical purpose in a concrete situation. In that sense, then, Paul's statements about justification can be and must be read in the context of the particular situations in which he finds the language of justification as helpful in communicating the meaning of Christ. So, for example, the meaning of Christ is communicated to the Galatians through statements about justification aimed at the concrete problem of circumcision among believers in Galatia.

¹⁰ Wrede insisted on a liberation of New Testament interpretation not only from canonical boundaries, but also from what he referred to as the "method of doctrinal concepts" ("The Task and Methods of 'New Testament Theology,'" in *The Nature of New Testament Theology* [Naperville: Allenson, 1973], 73). He criticized the way in which many Pauline interpreters analyzed concepts like πίστις or σάραξ as if Paul had "developed his concepts systematically and applied them precisely and with full awareness of their content and range of meaning" (77).

¹¹ Cf. ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ in 2 Cor 11.10.

In that particular case, where Gentiles wished to undergo circumcision, Paul used justification language to argue that the Gentiles are justified as Gentiles and therefore should not become Jews through circumcision. The meaning of Christ that Paul brings to expression in Galatians is that Jews in Christ and Gentiles who follow Jewish tradition have no soteriological privilege or advantage. That is to say, Gentiles who remain Gentiles are just as righteous in Christ as Jews, a view that apparently did not win the day in Antioch according to Paul's report in Gal 2.11–14. Paul was certainly a prominent figure, especially in the Gentile mission field, but according to the Antioch incident, his views do not seem to have been popular among the Jerusalem leadership.

Both in Romans and Galatians Paul emphasizes the same meaning of Christ for Jews and Gentiles, using in both letters the figure of Abraham to present his argument (Rom 4; Gal 3.6–29), although in a slightly different manner. The practical message for believers in Rome as well as in Galatia is the same: whether Jew or Gentile, in Christ there is no privilege, no advantage or disadvantage when it comes to justification before God. If that is the case, *δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως* is another way of proclaiming what Paul formulates in concrete socio-political categories in Gal 3.28: οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλληγ, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. If this is the truth of the gospel in Christ, then the thrust of Paul's letters to the Galatians and Romans has not so much to do with a dogmatic explication of justification, but rather with the practical problem of Gentiles' and Jews' coexisting in Christ. Furthermore, this understanding of the meaning of Christ leaves a great assignment of reconciliation still to be completed by the contemporary church, in which claims of soteriological privilege are still a regrettable reality.

“그리스도의 의미와 바울신학” “The Meaning of Christ and Pauline Theology”

차례

1. 시작하는 말
2. 표현과 의미 (Expression and Meaning)
3. Δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως: 바울의 여러 표현 중 하나
4. 그리스도의 의미 (The Meaning of Christ)

1. 시작하는 말

베드로후서 3.16에 기록 된것은 바울사도의 선교와 쓴 편지들 후에 초기교회가 바울서신해석을 문제로 삼았다는 증거다: ἐν [ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς Παυλοῦ] ἐστὶν δυσνόητά τινα, ἃ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ ἀστήρικτοι στρεβλοῦσιν ὡς καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς γραφὰς πρὸς τὴν ἰδίαν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν.¹² 그때부터 지금까지 바울에 대한 충분한 이해가 이루어지지 않았다. 현재 해석자들은 “바울신학”이란 개념까지도 비판적으로 분석하고 있다.

최근 Society of Biblical Literature 의 바울신학 연구분과의 회원들의 의견들도 바울신학의 정의에 대해서 분명한 주장을 결하고 있는 것을 볼 수 있다.¹³ 그래서 Steven Kraftchick 학자는 어휘와 정의에 대해서 충분한 합의가 있을때까지는 더 이상에 주장을 펴지 말자고 했다.¹⁴

¹² “[바울이 쓴 편지에는] 알기 어려운 것이 더러 있어서, 무식하거나 믿음이 굳세지 못한 사람은, 다른 성경을 잘못 해석하듯이 그것을 잘못 해석해서, 마침내 스스로 파멸에 이르고 말 것입니다.”

¹³ James D. G. Dunn’s paper can be found in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1995 Seminar Paper* (ed. Eugene H. Lovering, Jr.; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), 704–21. Paul Meyer’s paper can be found in the same volume on pp. 688–703.

¹⁴ Steven J. Kraftchick, “Seeking a More Fluid Model: A Response to Jouette M. Bassler,” in *1 & 2 Corinthians* (ed. David M. Hay; vol. 2 of *Pauline Theology*; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 34. Cf. Wrede, who, even though he considered Paul to have taken the first elementary steps toward theological thought, doubted whether the term “theology” was appropriate for describing what we find in Paul’s letters: “Moderne Vorstellungen muß man ausdrücklich verbannen, wenn man Paulus einen Theologen nennt. Er besaß keine theologische Gelehrsamkeit in unserm Sinne und hat auch mit unsern Dogmatikern und Ethikern geringe Ähnlichkeit. Niemals hat er ein System seiner Lehre entwickeln wollen, selbst im Römerbriefe nicht. Er schreibt immer als Missionar, Organisator und Volksredner, entwickelt seine Gedanken auf gegebenen Anlaß hin, und immer nur nach einzelnen Seiten. So könnte man überhaupt irre werden, ob “Theologie” hier der rechte Name ist. Aber er ist nicht zu entbehren”(Paulus [Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1907], 47 (“When we call Paul a theologian we must expressly exclude modern associations of the word. He possessed no theological learning in our sense, and has very little affinity with our dogmatic and ethical writers. He never attempts—not

바울신학에서 그리스도의 의미를 따질 때 *the meaning of Christ in Paul* 과 *the meaning of Christ for Paul* 을 다룰 수 있다. 바울을 직접 만나 볼 수 없는 우리는 바울이 가졌던 그리스도의 의미를 그의 편지들을 통해서만 알 수 있다. 그럼에도 불구하고 Wilhelm Dilthey 의 생의 철학(Lebensphilosophie) 을 통하여 바울서신을 살펴 보면 우리가 바울이 가졌던 그리스도의 의미의 상당한 이해에 도달 할 수 있다.

아무리 학자들이 해석으로 결론을 못 내리는 문제가 많아도 우리는 바울이 의미하는 바를 파악할 수 있다. 그 이유는 우리는 다른 사람이 쓴 것을 읽고 이해 할 수 있다는 것이 해석의 기본적인 전제가 되기 때문이다. 이것은 우리가 인생의 경험을 통해서 기본적인 것들을 바울과 나눌 수 있다는 것을 의미한다. 바울서신에 있는 그리스도의 의미를 찾을 때 어떤 제한이 있는 것을 인정하지만 우리는 바울서신에 있는 그리스도의 의미를 추구 해 나갈 때 바울 자신이 가졌던 그리스도의 의미를 찾을 수 있다는 확신을 가질 수 있다.

2. 표현과 의미 (Expression and Meaning)

Dilthey 에게 배우는 여러가지 중에 바울해석에 합당한 것이 많은데 한 가지 중요한 것은 경험 (Erlebnis) 과 표현(Ausdruck) 을 구별 해야 한 다는 이론이다. 내가 주장 하는 것은, 바울의 δικαιοσύνη 라는 법적인 표현은 바울이 그의 전생을 통한 그리스도의 경험을 나타 내는 것들 중의 하나일 뿐이라는 것이다.

즉 δικαιοσύνη 만 아니라 바울신학에서 중요한 의미를 가지고 있는 νόμος 와 πίστις 도 그리스도의 경험을 표현하는 주제어들이다. 바울해석에서 큰 문제는 바울사도가 이런 주제어들을 그의 편지 안에서 한정하지 않았기 때문이다. 바울은

even in the letter to the Romans—to unfold a system of doctrine. He writes always as a missionary, an organizer, a speaker to the people, is guided in the setting forth of his thoughts by the occasion given, and treats only of particular sides of his subject. We might well doubt, therefore, whether ‘theology’ is here the right word to use: but it cannot be avoided.” [Translation from *Paul* (trans. Edward Lummis; Lexington: American Theological Library Association, 1962), 74]. Wrede reminded interpreters that they should move their attention away from the expressions to the experiences which arose in the development of the Christian religion as the means of understanding the expressions. For that reason he issued a warning against detailed, dogmatic examinations of words and concepts, and against those who believed that figuring out the meanings of the terms individually meant getting at the meaning of the text. Cf. Heikki Räisänen’s opening words in *Paul and the Law*: “Paul never defines the content of the term νόμος” (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983, 16). Likewise is the significance of the fact—especially in the light of debates about the ambiguity of the expression πίστις Χριστοῦ—that Paul never bothers to define as crucial a concept as πίστις.

구체적인 상황에 따라 필요할 때만 유리한 주제어들을 자유롭게 쓴다.¹⁵ Δικαιοσύνη 와 νόμος 와 πίστις 는 서로 상관성을 가짐으로 로마서와 갈라디아서에서 가깝게 나타나며 많은 학자들의 주제가 되어왔다. 자세히 보면 이 세 주제어는 초기교회에 있었던 유대인-이방인 관계문제를 따질 때 바울이 사용한 표현들이다.

근년에 발표된 바울학자들의 책들과 논문들을 보면 끊이지 않는 이런 해석문제들을 연구하는 모습을 볼 수 있다.¹⁶ 예를 든다면 바울이 로마서 2.13에 οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἄκροαταὶ νόμου δίκαιοι παρὰ [τῷ] θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται (하느님 앞에서는 율법을 듣는 사람이 의로운 사람이 아닙니다. 오직 율법을 실천하는 사람이라야 의롭게 될 것이기 때문입니다.) 라고 쓴 바로 후에 3.20에는 오해하고 혼동하기 쉽게 ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται πᾶσα σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (율법을 지킴으로써 하느님 앞에서 의롭다고 인정받을 사람은 아무도 없습니다. 율법으로는 죄를 인식할 뿐입니다.) 라고 썼다. 그래서 E. P. Sanders 는 롬 1.19-2.29을 이례적이라고 이해하며 부기 (appendix) 에서 따로 다룬다. 그러나 더 실제적인 이유는 그 율법의 개념이 Sanders 의 율법의 개념과 일치하지 않기 때문이다. 그와 대비하여 Heikki Räisänen 은 솔직히 말하며 “대립과 긴장은 율법에 대한 바울신학에서 계속적으로 수용되어야 한다” 고 했다.¹⁷

내가 제안하는 것은 과거의 학자들이, 그 중 특별히 Rudolf Bultmann 이 강조한 바 표현과 의미를 구별하자는 것이다. 그렇게 해서, 우리의 입장에서 바울의 신학을 만들어내는 것보다도 바울로 하여금 그 자신의 말을 자유롭게 하게 하는 것이 옳은 해석법이라고 생각한다. 본문으로는 어떠한 하나의 표현이—J. Christiaan Beker 이 중심점으로 삼는 목시사상도¹⁸—그리스도의 의미를 다 나타낼 수 없다. 바울의 복음의 coherence (Mitte) 는 그의 역동적인 그리스도 경험 자체이고 언제나 자유롭게 여러 상황을 따라 표현방식을 찾을 수 있는 것이다.

¹⁵ Cf. Wrede; see footnote 3.

¹⁶ E.g., Ed P. Sanders, *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983) and Heikki Räisänen, *Paul and the Law* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983).

¹⁷ Räisänen, *Paul and the Law*, 11: “contradictions and tensions have to be *accepted* as *constant* features of Paul’s theology of the law.”

¹⁸ J. Christiaan Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

3. Δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως: 바울의 여러 표현 중 하나

이러한 생각을 하며 나는 몇 가지 논제를 우리의 토론을 위하여 제의한다. 첫째로는 개신교회의 전통적인 이신칭의 (以信稱義) 교리가 바울신학의 중심이 아니고 그리스도의 경험의 여러 표현들 중의 하나라는 것이다. 둘째로는 바울이 로마서와 갈라디아서에서 δικαιοσύνη에 관하여 말하는 것은 그리스도의 의미를 그 당시에 있었던 유대인-이방인 문제를 따지며 사용한 하나의 표현이다. 그 때에 유대인들과 이방인들에게 따로 있었던 선교운동들이 동시에, 또 동등하게 유효한 선교라고 할 때에 쓴 주제어들 중의 하나다. 하느님은 이방인들을 이방인으로, 할례를 통하여 유대인이 안된 상태로 의롭게 한다는 말이다. 셋째로는 내가 제안하는 것이 옳은 경우에는, 이신칭의 교리나 δικαιοσύνη에 관한 말들이 Luther 이래로 가졌던 바울신학에서의 특별한 위치를 유보하여야 하고, 또 바울이 쓴 본문에 있는 모든 표현들을 다시 새롭게 해석해야 한다는 것이다.

앞에 말한 것처럼 δικαιοσύνη와 νόμος와 πίστις는 유대인-이방인 관계문제를 따질 때 많이 사용하는 그리스도의 경험을 표현하는 주제어인데, Luther 이래로 그 실제적이고 역사적인 사실을 16세기의 교리의 관심 때문에 새롭게 이해하기 어렵게 되었다. 특별히 개신교 전통에 들어 있는 많은 학자들과 목사들은 Käsemann을 따라 δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως를¹⁹ 바울신학의 중심점으로 생각하고 있다.

Joseph Fitzmeyer은 이 개신교의 이신칭의 교리의 중요성을 의문시하며 바울이 쓰는 다른 여러 표현들도 옳게 평가할 수 있어야 한다고 강조한다. Fitzmeyer의 의견은 바울신학의 중심은 그리스도 중심의 구원론 (christocentric soteriology)이라고 주장하고, δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως는 바울신학의 중심적인 논제도 아니고 주변적인 논제도 아니라고 생각한다.²⁰ 나도 Fitzmeyer의 견해에 동조하며 δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως가 중요하지만 가장 중요한 것은 아니라고 생각한다.

우리가 주장해야 하는 것은 바울신학의 중심은 본문의 차원에서 교리의 형식으로 찾을 수 없다는 것이다.²¹ 그것보다는 오히려 바울서신은 바울의 독자들에게

¹⁹ Käsemann: δικαιοσύνη τῶν ἀσεβῶν (Rom 4.5; 5.6).

²⁰ Conference on "Rereading Paul Together," University of Notre Dame (Notre Dame, Indiana, 1-2 Feb 2002). At the same conference Margaret Mitchell argued that the center of Paul's theology was the death and resurrection of Christ.

²¹ Wrede insisted on a liberation of New Testament interpretation not only from canonical boundaries, but

어떠한 표현으로든지 복음의 진리를 (갈 2.5, 14: ἡ ἀλήθεια τοῦ εὐαγγελίου)²² 확신하도록 그들의 특수한 상황에 맞추어 계속해서 역동적으로 신학적인 증언을 하는 모습을 나타 내는 것이라고 생각한다.

4. 그리스도의 의미 (The Meaning of Christ)

바울서신에는 개인적 구원론도 있고 (예: 롬 10.9-10; 갈 1.15-16; 2.19-20; 5.21; 빌 2.12; 살전 1.9-10) 우주적 구원론도 있지만 (예: 롬 5.12-21; 8.19-23) 그 둘 중의 하나만으로 그리스도의 의미를 이해할 수 없다. 둘 다 중요하지만 무엇보다도 선행되어야 할 것은 바울의 편지는 우선 편지 자체로서 이해 해야 된다고 하는 것이다. 바울의 편지들은 구체적인 상황에 실천적인 목적을 가지고 있다는 것이다. 바울의 δικαιοσύνη의 선포는 특별한 상황에 맞추어서 필요를 따라 쓴 것이다. 예를 들면 갈라디아서에서는 갈라디아 교인들의 할례문제를 해결하기 위하여 δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως를 다룬 것이다.

바울은 갈라디아 교인들이 할례를 받기 원했을 때 할례를 통하여 유대인이 되지 않기를 경고하기 위하여 δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως를 다루는 편지를 보냈다. 갈라디아서에서 나타나는 그리스도의 의미는 하느님이 이방인들을 이방인으로, 할례를 통하여 유대인이 안된 상태로 의롭게 한다는 것이다. 유대인이나 이방인이나 간에 그리스도 사건으로 말미암아 하느님 앞에서는 어떠한 특권의 유무의 차이가 없이 의롭게 된다는 것을 가르친 것이다. 유대인이나 이방인이나 간에 의롭게 되는 것은 그리스도의/를 믿음으로 말미암아 되는 것이라고 주장한 것이다. 그러나 바울은 초기교회의 대인물이었지만 대인기는 끌지 못 했다. 갈 2.11-14에 보면 안디옥에서 자기의 뜻대로 공감을 불러 일으키지 못한 답답한 바울을 볼 수 있다.

바울은 로마서와 갈라디아서에서는 아브라함을 들어 유대인이거나 이방인에게 똑같은 그리스도의 의미를 강조했다. 그리스도 안에는 아무도 특권이 없다고 했다. 그렇다면 δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως는 바울이 갈 3.28에서 구체적인 여러 사회정치적인

also from what he referred to as the “method of doctrinal concepts” (“The Task and Methods of ‘New Testament Theology’,” in *The Nature of New Testament Theology* [Naperville: Allenson, 1973], 73). He criticized the way in which many Pauline interpreters analyzed concepts like πίστις or σώρις as if Paul had “developed his concepts systematically and applied them precisely and with full awareness of their content and range of meaning” (77).

²² Cf. ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ in 2 Cor 11.10.

범주 안에서 형성하고 선포한 다른 하나의 표현방법이다: οὐκ ἐνὶ Ἰουδαίῳ οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἐνὶ δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἐνὶ ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἓστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (유대 사람이나 그리스 사람이나, 종이나 자유인이나, 남자나 여자나 차별이 없습니다. 그것은 여러분이 그리스도 예수 안에서 다 하나이기 때문입니다). 그것은 이신칭의 교리에 대한 말이 아니라 유대인과 이방인이 그리스도 안에서 공존하는 문제를 실제적으로 다룬 것이다. 그러므로 오늘날 우리들의 과제는 이러한 그리스도의 의미를 이해하여 그 어떤 구원론적 특권도 일부의 그리스도인에게 한정하지 않고 화해와 일치의 큰 테두리 안에서 이해해야 된다고 하는 것이다.