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Πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ at Paul. (p. 419)
By P. G. Kittel in Altencelle at Celle.

In 1891, Joh. Haussleiter published a small treatise under the title: "The faith of Jesus Christ and the Christian faith, a contribution of the Epistle to the Romans." Unfortunately, it has not received the attention it deserves, either in the camp of traditional theology, which it intended to serve, or among modern theologians, whose wishes it accommodated. The reason for this fact may remain undecided; in any case, Haussleiter's basic idea of emphasizing the faith of Christ as distinct from the faith in Christ seems worthy of careful consideration, since I have come to results quite independently of him from the Letters to the Galatians, despite some differences in detail, that are strikingly similar to his own.

Not everything that interests us about the expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ should concern us, but our investigation should focus on the question of whether the genitive is to be understood subjectively or objectively. In and of itself, the probability of both views is the same; at first, there are no grammatical doubts; just as few factual ones, for just as there is faith in Christ, so undoubtedly Jesus also possessed faith for his person.

Our investigation will have to deal mainly with the letters to the Romans and Galatians since the rest offer only too little material. For the sake of convenience, the first two will be treated separately, while a third section will summarize what is worthy of consideration in the latter.

A. Letter to the Romans. (p. 420)

The substantive πίστις occurs 40 times in this letter, 32 of them on its own, which means without further definition. Only 8 times is a genitive dependent on it, which is undoubtedly 6 times a Genetivus Subiectivus. Cape. 4.5. 12. 16 is the faith of Abraham, 1:8 and 12 that of the Roman Christians or the apostle, 3:3 the faithfulness of God who fulfills his promises. Only twice, 3.22 and 26, does the matter initially remain undecided, even though it can be asserted that, in view of the overwhelming
preponderance of the other passages, the objective version seems almost impossible from the outset.

Before we take a closer look at those, the use of the verb πιστεύειν = πίστιν ἔχειν should be noted. The same thing is found altogether 20 times, of which 9 times absolute, viz. 1.16; 3:22; 4:11 & 18; 10, 4. 10. 14b; 13, 11; 15, 13. Then it says 10, 16: believe the sermon, and 6, 8: we believe that we will live with him, while 3, 2 λόγια θεοῦ ἐπιστεύθησαν can be completely disregarded because here πιστεύειν has a singular meaning. In the remaining passages, apart from 9.33b, which reveals itself to be a later addition, it must be asserted that faith is directed towards God and his deeds. This is generally admitted in 4:3: Abraham trusted God (τῷ θεῷ), 4:5: Abraham believed in him who justifies the ungodly (ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα), 4:17: Abraham trusted God (τῷ θεῷ). 4, 24: Christians believe in him who raised Jesus (ἐπὶ τὸν ἐγείραντα), 10, 19: you believe that God raised Jesus. Apart from 9, 33b, this assertion is denied in 10, 11, and 14a.

As far as 9.33b is concerned, Weisse and Michelsen have already deleted it because it does not identify itself as a new citation. But Schläger's reasoning in the "Theol. Tijdschrift", vol. 32 and 33, namely that its content does not fit at all with 9, 33a; for one cannot trust in a stone of contention and offense. But he explains the addition from memory (p. 421) to 1 Petr. 2, 6; I would like to add: from this memory in connection with the thought of the identical quote that follows a few verses later. In the same (10, 11) it seems to me necessary that the πιστεύειν be based on God, because the Lord mentioned in the following verse, who is rich for all who call on him, is none other than God. [Compare e.g., 3, 22 ff. (οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν διαστολὴ τοῦ δωρεὰν τῇ ἀντοῖς χάριτι), where God is presented as the rich giver of grace for all.] It can also be pointed out that in the preceding v. 9 πιστεύειν about difference from ὡμολογεῖν, since Jesus has as an object, that is directed towards God. The relation of the πιστεύειν to Christ becomes all the more impossible, however, if one completely deletes with Schläger v. 9 and 10 the later added explanation of ῥήμα τῆς πίστεως (v. 8). For it is unmistakable that there are thoughts in them that are un-Pauline; it is particularly strange that the apostle should have valued confession with the mouth so highly in distinct from believing in the heart. But if one has to connect πιστεύειν with God in this whole context, then another possibility is also excluded in v. 14a, and it is God in whom Israel has not trusted properly.

Based on the overview given at the beginning, it is clear that only 2 passages, 3,22 and 26, require a more detailed examination. For this purpose, however, it is extremely important to pay attention first of all to the subjective version of the genitive ᾨπει Χριστοῦ regarding the whole range of ideas of the apostle. It is an established fact that the justification of the sinner through faith in Christ Jesus is the dominant thought in Romans. Under this assumption, the subjective interpretation would be subject to serious doubts. However, the opposite opinion rests not least on the passages in question. So the question will be whether, apart from them, in the
letter to the Romans, faith in Christ Jesus is so clearly described as the way to the justification of the sinner that no other view can arise alongside it.

According to 4:3 Abraham trusted God; as it says in vv. 19 and 20, he did not doubt that God could fulfill his promise, even where there was no hope of fulfillment; in particular, he believed that he could remain dead. This πίστις was reckoned to him by God as righteousness (vs. 3 and 22). It is not said, however, that the object of faith, which was present in this particular case, was also decisive for the justification of the sinner, but only asserted that the believing mind of Abraham was necessary for it. Therefore he is called a father of all believers, of all those who seek and find their justification not ἐξ ἔργων, but ἐκ πίστεως. The particular object of faith which justifies the sinner is clearly stated in vv. 5 ff. For the sinner must possess the unshakable confidence that God will justify without works, i.e., forgive or not impute to him what is unlawful. As the Old Testament quote in v. 7 proves, this way of righteousness by faith was known to the pious of the Old Covenant. Even if Paul does not expressly emphasize that he was trodden by them, on the other hand he in no way denies the possibility of gaining justification for him, who has not the slightest connection to Christ and his work. In other words: without faith one is not justified, but it can happen without special faith in Christ.

It should also be noted that where the object of faith is specified for believers in the post-Christian period, reference is made to God who raised Jesus from the dead (v. 24 of the same chapter). However, this is undoubtedly not to be understood in the sense that the belief in God's omnipotence, which is manifest in it, justifies the sinner. The resurrection of Jesus is only mentioned because, according to the apostle's view, God ensured mankind's justification through it; through them, he showed Jesus his highest esteem and gave his generation the guarantee of his gracious will. Accordingly quite obviously, justification does not come about through faith in Jesus, but rather through faith in God.

The thoughts of the 5th chapter do not lead to any other result. For sin and death came into the world through Adam, but righteousness and life through Christ. Once mankind was under the dominion of God's wrath as a result of the παράπτωμα and παρακοή of Adam. On the other hand, the δικαιώμα (recte factum) and ὑπακοή of Christ brought forth the dominion of divine grace. His obedience, which culminated in his death, made the “man of Jesus Christ” (v. 15) pleasing to God (ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνῶς = because of the goodwill of the One) and moved God to change his gracious disposition towards all people for their glorious one representatives to give free rein to their will. But Christ's obedience - we may add - was rooted in his trust in God, in his πίστις, just as Adam's disobedience arose from mistrust of God, from his ἀπίστια. Indeed πίστις and ὑπακοή appear as closely related terms; compare ὑπακοή πίστεως (1, 5) or ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν καταγγέλλεται ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ (1, 8) next ἡ ὑμῶν ὑπακοή εἰς πάντας ἄφικε τῷ (16, 19). In any case, according to the apostle's opinion, through
Christ's obedience only God's gracious grace should have been imparted to the sinful human race, i.e. Christ is indeed the mediator of our salvation, but therefore not yet the object of our faith.

Very characteristic of the apostle's view is the opening of chapter 5, which I think gives an apt and exhaustive presentation of his main ideas on justification. It reads: “We are justified by faith (NB not by faith in Christ), and consequently have peace with God; but all this through our Lord Jesus Christ.” Accordingly, the importance of Jesus for our salvation does not consist in the fact that he is the object of our faith, but rather the mediator of our salvation, probably also the mediator of our faith in salvation. But this in no way contradicts Paul's well-known view that Jesus is the κύριος.

After God has made him so through the resurrection, it is important to honor him as such, i.e. to seek God's salvation following him or under his guidance.

Based on these statements, we can finally assert that doubts about the subjective interpretation of the genitive Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in question cannot be derived from the range of ideas in the Epistle to the Romans, but rather everything speaks in its favor. In fact, it becomes the only possibility for us at 3, 22, and 26 for the following reasons:

1. The first impression that the simple reader must have, speaks against the objective version, especially since v. 3 of the same chapter also speaks in an unequivocal way of a πίστις θεοῦ (subjective). The apostle would have expressed himself almost incomprehensibly for the reader if he had meant a faith in Jesus. For neither through the explanations in the preceding nor through those in the following chapters did he suggest such an understanding. Nowhere in the whole letter did he state unequivocally that one must believe in Jesus in order to be justified, which is all the more striking since the doctrine of justification is acknowledged to be the central concept of the letter, and Paul made every effort to define this concept to specify exactly.

2. Evidently ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ in v. 26 must not be interpreted differently than διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in v. 22. Now in 4, 16 there is an expression completely similar to the first, namely ἐκ πίστεως Ἀβραὰμ; yes, on closer inspection, both expressions are not only completely equivalent, but also completely synonymous. Believers in Abraham and believers in Christ are interchangeable terms, since both are equally justified. If one does not want to assert that Paul is speaking of a belief in Abraham, one must also admit that he did not mean to speak of a belief in Christ when he used the corresponding expression.

3. The verb of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is πεφανέρωται. The perfect tense indicates that, in contrast to ἀποκαλύπτεται in 1:17, we are dealing here with a unique and completed historical fact, even if its effect is enduring. Because of the unique πεφανέρωται, the ἀποκαλύπτεται is always possible in the gospel. In our place, the apostle first enters this present with the
words εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας. But if it is certain that πεφανέρωται aims at an event of the past, then the objective version of the genitive in question is absolutely impossible. Because according to the apostle's opinion, divine righteousness (an attribute of man, as the connection with v. 20 in particular proves) did not first appear through faith in Christ or through the first disciples who believed in him, but it was done by Christ himself, and by his own faith. Otherwise one would have to expect that the disciples’ faith in Christ would have been confirmed by some manifest event as divine righteousness from God, even as Christ himself was presented as God's righteous man in the world. One tries to refute this entire proof by pointing out that in v. 22 it is not the term πεφανέρωται that is taken up again, but δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ from v. 21. Even if it doesn't say: πεφανέρωται δὲ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, the verb of v. 21 still remains in force in the following verse, and δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ has been placed next to πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ with the intention of making it quite clear that the former in which the latter appeared.

4. It will not be denied that δικιομενοι … διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (v. 24) bears a clear relation to δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. If, however, ἀπολυτρώσεως denotes something in which Christ was active, then this can also be assumed for the parallel term πίστις, especially since, as mentioned earlier, the verb πεφανέρωται, which belongs to πίστις, points to the past.

5. In the objective version, in v. 22, one misses the words ἐπὶ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, after εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας, since διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ did not clearly express the apostle's opinion (p. 426) for anyone. With the subjective interpretation, however, everything is in the best order, so that no word is too much or too little.

6. It cannot be denied that in the whole section 3, 21-26 Christ is presented only as the mediator of the salvation intended by God for mankind. Therefore it would be strange if he were to be designated as the object of our justifying faith and not God, whose grace is described in v. 24 as justifying.

7. Finally, Haussleitter's explanation certainly deserves all attention: "The only two passages (Rom. 8, 11 and 3:, 26), in which this name (Ἰησοῦς) stands alone, show it in a concise sense; as in 8:11 Jesus designates the Lord in his historical appearance, the 'man' Jesus, so also in 3:26. The apostle chooses the expression πίστις Ἰησοῦ to leave no doubt whatsoever that he means faith, Jesus worked himself in the days of his flesh. The expression πίστις Χριστοῦ would have been ambiguous. Since the conception of the genitive as Genetivus Subjectivus is always the most obvious one, and the apostle does not hesitate to use the proper name Χριστὸς in phrases like διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ (7, 4) or Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε (14,9 and 15), that expression should also have been understood in our sense, but it need not have been understood in this way. Things are different with πίστις Ἰησοῦ. The expression had to be understood by careful readers of the letter as 'the faith of Jesus.'" The interpretation of the expression in v. 26 is however, as has been emphasized earlier, also decisive for v. 22, although it is not Ἰησοῦ here, but Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is called.
With this, I believe I have proved sufficiently that the Epistle to the Romans not only permits the translation “faith of Jesus Christ” but actually demands it. 

πίστις always appears as an activity that has God as its object and was preeminently peculiar to Christ.

---------------

B. Letter to the Galatians.

In this letter the word πίστευειν occurs 3 times, once on its own (3, 22), once in connection with τῷ θεῷ (3, 6) and once with εἰς (2, 16).

This overview initially allows a safe conclusion in favor of one or the other view. We must, therefore, proceed immediately to the individual investigations.

We begin with 2.16, in which one finds the firmest support for objective interpretation. The question is whether this is really justified. First of all, the contrast of the parallel parts of the sentence ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου is to be understood in the same way. If the genitive νόμου is subjective, as is certain, it is at least the most obvious way to grasp Χριστοῦ in the same way. So Haßleiter also asks this in the foreword to the above-mentioned treatise: "The contrast (οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου) seems to indicate that Christ is designated here as the author, as the standardizing principle of the Christian faith, in contrast to how the law is the author of the works." On the other hand, one now emphatically points to the words: ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν and he wants to paraphrase and thus determine the type of genitive from the most precise that and claims that it is quite clear that they want to paraphrase the term πίστες Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and thus determine the type of genitive most precisely. It is, however, very premature to translate εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν πιστεύειν without further ado: "believe in Christ Jesus", even though it must be admitted that this translation e.g. In the Gospel of John is unavoidable. It first needs to be shown that πιστεύειν εἰς, where Christ is the object in the same way as God, also occurs elsewhere in Paul, and that he specifically justifies the sinner, as he would have to do based on the present passage, and that he considers something else necessary than the πίστις towards God. Neither can be proven either from the letter to the Romans, as we have seen, or else from the Pauline letters, as we shall see. Therefore another translation, consistent with the rest of the apostle's statements, undoubtedly deserves preference. But such a thing is possible. For the preposition εἰς need not always point to an object grasped by the belief, but may just as well indicate the direction in
which the belief is moving, similar to the relation expressed by κατὰ. My friend, Professor Dr. Hesselmeyer in Tübingen, who is in charge of publishing a Greek lexicon and can therefore claim a certain authority in this question, I owe the knowledge that this assumption is justified, since εἰς and κατὰ are often used promiscuously:

a) meaning with regard to, e.g., τὰ εἰς or κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον,
b) ,, ,, ,, like, e.g. e.g., κατὰ or εἰς ταῦτα (just like that),
c) ,, ,, ,, for the purpose, e.g. κατὰ or εἰς Θέαν ἦκεν,
d) ,, ,, ,, all around at numbers,
e) distributive, e.g., εἰς or κατὰ δύο for two,
f) adverbial, e.g., εἰς or κατὰ δύναμιν to the best of my ability.

As much as this observation favors the approximation of the meaning of εἰς to that of κατὰ, I do not want to go as far as Hesselmeyer, who following my suggestion, briefly identifies εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν and κατὰ Χριστὸν πιστεύειν. It seems to me that the idea peculiar to the preposition εἰς is that clarification is achieved with that in whose direction one is moving. The εἰς Χριστὸν should lead to one ἐν Χριστῷ. With this consideration, however, it becomes only more likely that we are on the right track with our interpretation of the present passage, because the εἰναι ἐν Χριστῷ, the most indiscriminate possible oneness with Christ, is a concept that Paul has a preference for, as is well known, and in which he also often returns in the letter to the Galatians. In

(p. 429)

(p. 429) Christ and thus also in his faith is the one who has grown into him, also into his faith. So it has εἰς Χριστὸν πιστεύειν a different coloring than κατὰ Χριστὸν πιστεύειν, where Christ is meant only as standard and point of reference. Haussleiter comes to a similar conclusion when he says in the preface already mentioned that the presupposition that Christ is only thought of as an object of faith is erroneous. The connection indicated by Paul is much more intimate, so that whoever has become a believer in Christ is henceforth in Christ and thus in faith.

The asserted view finds striking confirmation in a little-noticed rule of the Greek language. Hesselmeyer drew my attention to the fact that the position of the εἰς Χριστὸν in front of πιστεύειν instead of behind it is not meaningless. This indicates that εἰς Χριστὸν is not to be the object of belief, but should be an adverbial determination to πιστεύειν. The first term characterizes the second in such a way that “believe in a Christian way” must be considered the better translation. At first, I received this statement with the greatest distrust, especially since I knew that my friend had not yet examined the New Testament. But when I undertook this examination and compared the passages in the New Testament in which pisteuein in conjunction with εἰς and ἐπὶ c. Accus. found I found his opinion confirmed against all expectations. (The connection with ἐπὶ c. Dat. had to be disregarded because it does not indicate the object but the basis of the belief; the same applies to the simple dative because it expresses a relationship that we expect from our fellow human
The object of belief is always placed after the πιστεύων. In the case of relative clauses, the rule cannot, of course, be carried out. But otherwise, I have only been able to discover one single passage in the whole New Testament that seems to violate it, namely John 14:1. Because for the author of the Gospel John Jesus is the object of faith, εἰς ἐμὲ should come after πιστεύετε. But now it is by no means certain that the comma before καὶ has its correct place. My feeling is that it stands behind one much better so that the second one would be a powerful and extremely effective repetition of the invitation to believe, while the other would enunciate a thought worthless for the context. In this way, the last exception to the rule would also be eliminated. Under these circumstances, one can most likely draw the following conclusion: When Paul, who is acknowledged to be well acquainted with the Greek language, always puts the object of faith behind πιστεύων, but in our place, as well as Phil. 1, 29 εἰς Χριστὸν puts in front, so he wanted to express a different thought than it is elsewhere in the New Testament with πιστεύειν εἰς θεόν or εἰς Χριστὸν.

In 2.20 the fact that from v. 19 onwards it is a question of the apostle being like Christ, but not that he speaks of him as the object of his faith, already speaks for the subjective interpretation of τοῦ ὑιοῦ, is different. By the law, he says, I died to the law. This gives him the idea that this was also the case with Christ, definitely in his death on the cross. Therefore it is further said: "I am crucified with Christ." Not only did the same thing happen to him, but the similarity of his experience has developed into an intimate connection, into complete unity between the two. Christ has almost become the subject of his own personality so that it is me, but Christ, who lives in me." The other idea of faith in Christ fights against this idea. For as long as Christ is the object of my faith, he is something external to me and excludes the merging of one personality with the other. Things are different when Christ's mind has become mine and I, as it were, perish in his essence. Then there is the most beautiful harmony between the expressions: "Christ in me" and "I in the faith of Christ".

It is now said, indeed, that faith in Christ leads to imbibing him and making him the governing principle in us. However, this is an unclear mixture of two fundamentally different series of ideas, which one should not credit the apostle with unless there is a compelling need to do so. — Besides, one cannot avoid the impression that Paul means ἐν πίστει etc. to describe what it means that Christ lives in him; in other words: the development of thought should progress. Such is the case with the assumption that τοῦ ὑιοῦ is a Genetivus Subiectivus. From the opposite point of view, however, the thoughts move in a descending line, and a rearrangement of the sentences in the following way would be more meaningful: I not only live in faith in Christ, but Christ himself lives in me. The objective version is therefore not recommended.

We pass on to the 3rd chapter. In verse 22 it says that the promise is given to the believers ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Every unbiased reader will primarily understand the genitive in question subjectively and will only refrain from it if
weighty reasons in the context compel it. However, this is not the case. Already in v. 22 itself, a difficulty arises with the opposite opinion, namely a tautology that cannot be eliminated despite tortuous attempts: based on faith in Christ the promise is given to those who believe in Christ.

Here the matter is much more unfavorable than in the similarly sounding verse Rom. 3, 22, because there it can be pointed out with a semblance of justice that the addition εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας introduces a new idea. In addition, however, it is to be noted that in the preceding statements of the chapter there is nothing to indicate that faith in Christ helps to possess salvation. Apart from the fact that Abraham was once said to be ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ (v. 6), the term πίστις is always spoken of as such. V. 5: The spirit is given ἐξ θυσίας πίστεος; V. 7: οἱ ἐκ πίστεως are Abraham's children; V. 9: οἱ ἐκ πίστεως are blessed with believing Abraham;

V. 14: We receive the promise of the spirit διὰ τῆς πίστεως. If one wants to add an object to πίστις in all these passages, it can only be done on the basis of what was said about Abraham's faith; i.e. it is God but not Christ. A look at the following verses gives us no other picture. Not only does v. 24 say without further ado that one is justified ἐκ πίστεως, but even Christ is to a certain extent identified with faith. In any case, one gets the impression that the apostle means more than that Christ established the rule of faith after breaking that of the law (verse 13). In verses 23-25 the appearance of Christ is placed in exact parallel with the appearance of faith. Both coincide in time. With Christ, faith came or became manifest and free after being held down by the law for a long time. He brought the faith that since Abraham lay as a hidden treasure in the field of the world to light again, namely by destroying the power of the law through the power of the faith demonstrated by his death on the cross.

We only have to remove the uncertainty that is in v. 26. For the separation of διὰ τῆς πίστεως and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ or for the translation: "By faith, inasmuch as you are in Christ Jesus, i.e. in his fellowship" instead of the usual: "By faith in Christ Jesus" says the following:

1. πίστεος in connection with en and in the meaning "believe in" does not occur in Paul. On the other hand, as already mentioned above, the expression ἐν Χριστῷ as a term in its own right "in fellowship with Christ" is very popular with him and is taught again four times in Galatians (2, 4; 3, 14, 28; 5, 6).

2. Verses 27-29 are even connected to v. 26 by γὰρ. However, they do not develop the idea of πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ but rather that of εἶναι εἰς Ἐλαλ ἐν Χριστῷ. For v. 27 says how the Galatians entered into Christ,
belonging to Christ, is evidently to be equated with the εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, fellowship with him.

3. After Paul had asserted in v. 16 that the promise to Abraham was not τὸ ἑσπέριμαν ὡς ἐπὶ πολλῶν, but ὡς ἐφ᾽ ἐνός, proof that we all belong to the ἐν σπέρμα was required, if we were to partake of that promise. But this proof could only succeed if it was shown that we belong together with the one seed of Abraham, the bearer of the promise, i.e. are one with Christ. If now faith appears in the context as a means of justification but not as a means of connection with Christ, then faith could be completely ignored in this argument. Hence the end of the proof is not, "You are believers in Christ," but, "You are of Christ," and for this reason σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ. Hence πίστις is also to be taken absolutely in v. 26: "We are God's children through faith par excellence." But such faith, as ἐν shows, is oriented towards Christ, or this forms the framework, so to speak, in which it is framed.

As an appendix, it should also be noted that it is tempting to assert, as the apostle's opinion, that Christ could not have τὸ σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ, if he had not possessed the peculiarity πίστις. Because only οἱ ἐκ πίστεως are Abraham's children (v. 7). Undoubtedly, the terms οἱ and σπέρμα are very close. However, v. 16 distinguishes between σπέρμα and σπέρματα and only mentions Christ τὸ σπέρμα. On the other hand, all believers in Christ are called σπέρμα in v. 29. However, should the assumption just expressed not be upheld, then what is certain is what should be proved, that the letter to the Galatians not only permits the subjective understanding of the genitive in question, but more than favors it.

(p. 434)

C. The other Pauline letters.

Here we can be briefer, because, unlike the letters to the Romans and Galatians, we are not dealing with lengthy explanations of faith, but only with brief mentions of it, which as such are less suited to furnishing certain results. Moreover, Paul's authorship is often in question.

A genitive depends on πίστις in Phil 1, 27 (τοῦ ἐν οὐγγελίῳ), 2 Tim. 2, 13 (ἀληθείας), Col. 2, 12 (τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ θεοῦ), Eph. 3, 12 (αὐτοῦ sc. Χριστοῦ), Phil. 3, 9, where it says: δικαιοσύνην τὴν διὰ πίστεως Χριστοῦ τὴν ἐκ θεοῦ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει. In the first 3 places, the genitive is most likely to be interpreted subjectively; in any case, nothing stands in the way of this interpretation. In the Ephesians passage, however, the objective version must be admitted; but that cannot carry weight, because Paul can hardly be regarded as the author of this letter. The last point, on the other hand, is very valuable. For here it can be asserted with full confidence that Χριστοῦ can only be understood subjectively because otherwise ἐπὶ τῇ πίστει after the previous διὰ πίστεως would be completely superfluous and meaningless. But then this sentence becomes a classic testimony to how Paul thought of the way to attain our righteousness. For it appears mediated by Christ's faith, comes from God, or is a gift from him and is based on (our) faith.
The following passages offer πίστις in a prepositional context with the person of Christ: Eph. 1, 15 (ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ), Col. 1, 4 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), Col. 2, 5 (ἡ εἰς Χριστὸν πίστις), 1 Tim. 3, 13 and 2 Tim. 3, 15 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), Philem. 5 (πρὸς τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν). The last passage must immediately be removed from this context, because here the πίστις is directed not only to Christ but also to all the saints and therefore does not mean faith but faithfulness.

(p. 435)

In the passages from Timothy, an objective version is out of the question if one considers the other language used in these epistles, as it is given to us in 1 Tim. 1, 14 and 2 Tim. 1, 13 blocks it off. For there ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is evidently to be connected not only to ἀγάπη but also to πίστις, and no one will dare to assert that ἡ ἀγάπη ἐν Χριστῷ means love for Christ. Hence there can be no question of faith in Jesus, all the more so since this relation is not usually expressed by the preposition ἐν. The latter also speaks against the objective version in the Ephesians passage and the first passage in the Colossians mentioned. On the other hand, in the second, the earlier comments on Gal. 2, 16 regarding word order and the meaning of εἰς to apply.

The verb πιστεύειν is Phil. 1, 29 with εἰς, 1 Tim 1, 16 with ἐπί c. Dat. and 2 Tim. 1, 12 constructed with the simple dative. In the last passage, because of κατὰ δύναμιν θεοῦ (v. 8) and the whole context of these words, only God, and not Christ, can be the referred to as the person who trusted Paul. In the other passage from Timothy, however, Christ is not the object, but the ground of faith. Phil. 1, 29 finally already in Gal. 2, 16 found its settlement.

There is nothing left to consider but Col. 1, 2 πιστοὶ ἀδελφοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ, but where the addition ἐν Χριστῷ, apparently does not belong to πιστοὶ, but to ἀδελφοί, and Eph. 1, 1 πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, where again the preposition ἐν excludes the objective version.

If one summarizes all the results obtained from the Pauline epistles, then the investigation can be concluded with the certainty that wherever faith in Christ has hitherto been found expressed, Christ is presented as the herald and completer of faith, as illustrated in the Epistle to the Hebrews. But the fact, that this letter is acknowledged to have come from Pauline circles, and apart from it neither the Synoptics, nor John, nor any other writer of the New Testament speaks explicitly of faith in Christ, which means that our result is a received further strong confirmation.

It is urgently necessary, to stop ignoring Haussleiter’s thesis, unconcerned about the misinterpretations of his party comrades with frank love of truth, and finally to start seriously examining it and making it fruitful for biblical theology and church dogmatics.

-------------------------