

in the text should indicate in a footnote that, when taken literally, the phrase could mean “youngest son.”

[To be concluded in our January 2001 issue.]

WILBUR A. BENWARE

ROMANS 1.17 AND COGNITIVE GRAMMAR¹

The author is Professor of Linguistics in the University of California at Davis.

Ignotus grammatica est ignotus theologica ek pisteōs eis pistin

—Philip Melancthon

Introduction

This paper suggests that an exegetical problem in Rom 1.17 can be resolved by an appeal to the theory of Cognitive Grammar regarding prepositions.² The locution *ek pisteōs eis pistin* has been subject to any number of interpretations which are reflected in the numerous commentaries on Romans and, of course, in translations by a wide variety of renderings. Some have taken a word-for-word approach, but even then they do not always treat the prepositions in the same way; compare, for example, the King James Version and Luther, each of which handle the expression on a literal word-by-word basis:

KJV	from faith to faith
Luther	<i>aus Glauben in Glauben</i>

The RSV/NRSV keeps the same structure of two asyndetically-joined prepositional phrases and renders the prepositions in an idiosyncratic fashion:

RSV/NRSV	through faith for faith
----------	-------------------------

Other translators have preferred a paraphrase in recognition of the fact that a translation which simply glosses the syntax gives an obscure reading:

NEB	...because here is revealed God's way of righting wrong, a way that starts in faith and ends in faith.
Jerusalem Bible	...since this is what reveals the justice of God to us: it shows how faith leads to faith.
Die Bibel im heutigen Deutsch	<i>Der Weg dazu ist vom Anfang bis zum Ende</i> (from beginning to end) <i>das bedingungslose Vertrauen auf ihn.</i>

¹ I wish to thank Paul J. Achtemeier and Lincoln Hurst for reading an earlier draft of this paper.

² A partial list of the most important works include: C. Vandeloise, *L'espace en français*, Paris: Editions du Seuil 1986; A. Herskovits, *Language and Spatial Cognition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986; R. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, Stanford: Stanford Univ. 1987-1991; C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (ed), *The Semantics of Prepositions*, Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter 1993.

After a brief review of the various interpretations of this expression (hereafter the “idiom”), the discussion will concentrate on the grammatical question. It will become clear that several translations and commentaries agree with the conclusions which will be reached here. The purpose of the present study is to ground those views in a rigorous grammatical analysis, that is, to show why their often tentative proposals have a firm basis in the grammar of the language, and why other interpretations are excluded.

The interpretations of Rom 1.17

Commentators on Romans differ in their interest in the grammatical questions which this passage raises. Interpreters fall roughly into two groups: those who say little or nothing about the syntax of Rom 1.17, but simply make a stab at the sense of this idiom (without necessarily placing much confidence in their guess), and those who also wrestle with the syntax of the clause and the place of this idiom and its meaning in it. Most fall into the first group, for example, Althaus, Barth, Barrett, Bruce, Lightfoot, Murray, Newman and Nida, Nygren, Sanday and Headlam, and Stuhlmacher¹ to name a few of the many who have undertaken a study of Romans. Those in the second group tend to focus on the relation of the idiom *ek pisteōs eis pistin* to the verb as well as the role of the noun phrase *dikaïosunē theou* but generally pass over an analysis of the prepositional phrases themselves, for example, Cranfield, Fridrichsen and Käsemann.² Only Stowers³, Wilckens⁴ and Dunn⁵ wrestle with the idiom and come to the conclusion that questions about the beginning and goal of faith seem to be at issue. Otherwise it is surprising how few interpreters offer more than a passing comment on this idiom in spite of the virtual unanimity on the point that Rom 1.16-17 states the “thesis” of the epistle.

A few examples from each of the two groups will suffice to illustrate the treatment of this idiom. In one of the best-known 20th-century commentaries, that of Karl Barth, the interpretation proceeds without any attention to the grammar of the idiom of 1.17. Barth takes the asyndetically-joined phrases to mean “from faithfulness to faith” and explains that “from faithfulness the righteousness of God reveals itself” and unto faith is revealed that which God reveals from his faithfulness”.⁶ Hence, *eis pistin* in his view refers to the end point of the revelation of God’s faithfulness; the *ek pisteōs* refers to the motivation or source. Barth takes

1 Paul Althaus, *Der Brief an die Römer*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1978; Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, London: Oxford 1933; C.K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, 2nd ed, London: A and C Black 1991; F.F. Bruce, *The Letter of Paul to the Romans*, 2nd ed, Leicester: IV; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1985; J.B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*, London: MacMillan 1904; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*, vol 1, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1959; Barclay Newman and Eugene Nida, *A Handbook on Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, New York: ABS 1973); Anders Nygren, *Der Römerbrief*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1965; William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 5th ed, Edinburgh: T and T Clark 1896); Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, Louisville: Westminster/John Knox 1994.

2 C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, 6th ed, Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1975-1979; Anton Fridrichsen, “Aus Glauben zu Glauben”, *ConNt* 12 (1948) 54; E. Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1980.

3 Stanley K. Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans*, New Haven and London: Yale Univ. 1994.

4 Ulrich Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer*, 2. Aufl., Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag 1987, 88.

5 James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, Dallas: Word Books 1988, 43-44.

6 Barth, 41-42.

advantage of the ambiguity of reference for *pistis* by concluding: “Whether we say ‘of the faithfulness of God’ or ‘of the faith of men’, both are the same”,¹ something which is evident when Paul’s use of the Old Testament passage (Hab 2.4) is examined. What Barth does not explain is how the interpreter is free to choose a different referent for each noun of this idiom. His interpretation makes use of the polysemy of *pistis* to render Rom 1.17 in terms of a revelation and response dialectic. As attractive as that may be theologically, we will see that it is inadmissible grammatically.

C.K. Barrett² takes issue with Barth’s translation (“from God’s faithfulness to man’s faith”) without, however, mentioning him explicitly, and suggests that this “obscure expression” probably means “faith from start to finish”. Barrett, as well, does not explain his reasoning for this interpretation.³ He takes the idiom in such a way that the object of each preposition has the identical referent, something which one can do even while maintaining the ambiguity of *pistis*, that is, it can refer either to God’s faithfulness or to the faith of human beings.⁴ But, of course, the semantics of this noun is a different issue, one which has understandably been given a great deal of attention in systematic theology.

The second group of interpretations includes the brief notice by Anton Fridrichsen, who cites Lietzmann⁵ to the effect that the linked prepositional phrases are a rhetorical-pleonastic expression: The preposition *ek* gives the basis and essence of God’s righteousness, *eis* the constantly-renewed repetition of the goal of God’s righteousness. He also offers a brief discussion of the syntax of the clause, raising the question whether *eis pistin* is linked to the verb or whether it is a complement of the subject noun phrase. Cranfield and Käsemann also go into the latter issue, but the idiom itself remains rather peripheral to the discussion. Käsemann briefly discusses *ek pisteōs* as a separate phrase (as in 1.17b), stating that the idiom as a whole usually refers to a movement in salvation history. In short, the second group of commentators finds the expression as enigmatic as the first. What is lacking throughout these discussions is a grammatical approach which would provide a principled reason for their interpretation.

1 Barth, 42.

2 Barrett, *Romans*, 31.

3 Cranfield (*Romans*, 99), gives a selection of translation-interpretations from Tertullian on, which show a great deal of imagination and interpretative freedom. It is interesting to note that Ambrosiaster (c 380) in his Latin commentary anticipated Barth’s interpretation with his “from God’s faithfulness to man’s faith.” In modern times, Lighfoot and Adolf Jülicher, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, (7. Aufl., Leipzig: Mohr 1931) understood the locution much in the same way as proposed in this essay: *dikaioσunē theou* has faith both as its ground and as its goal. Along with Barrett, both Cranfield and Nygren follow Lighfoot, even if not recognizing him explicitly.

4 The discussion of the sense of the noun is the major focus of the long excursus on Rom 1.17 by Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans*. He has little to say about the use of the prepositions except as they are used separately elsewhere in the New Testament with “faith” as their object. See also Gabriel Hebert, “Faithfulness and Faith”, *Theology* 58 (1955) 373-379, and Thomas F. Torrance, “One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith,” *The Expository Times* 58 (1957) 111-114.

5 Hans Lietzmann, *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe. An die Römer*, 4. Aufl., Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1933.

A Cognitive Grammar approach to prepositions

Cognitive Grammar is an approach to linguistic description which holds that language is an integral part of cognition. In some versions of the theory, in fact, there is no semantic component of linguistic structure separate from cognitive structure itself. Cognitive Grammar eschews formal logic as an apt framework for linguistic analysis and does not give syntax the privileged position it holds in much modern (read: post-Chomskyan) linguistic theory. Basic to the Cognitive Grammar framework is the notion of “construal,” that is, the idea that the mind routinely construes the same relation in different cognitive “domains”, such as the spatial and temporal domains. Relevant for this essay is just one facet of Cognitive Grammar on whose representation most practitioners in principle agree: that of prepositions.

In the history of grammatical analysis there have been basically two views on how prepositions are to be described linguistically, which for the sake of simplicity we will call the “maximalist” position and the “minimalist” position. The maximalist (traditional) position attempts to capture all the senses which a preposition can have in a language and to categorize its senses under such headings as “locative,” “temporal,” “modal,” etc. possibly appending a list of occurrences in idiomatic expressions. Typically a dictionary is organized in this way. Greek-English dictionaries, for example, give the user a number of “senses” for each preposition and refer to various passages both in Ancient and Koiné Greek which illustrate each sense. In this regard the dictionaries are consistent with the entries for nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs, which do the same.

Cognitive Grammar takes a minimalist approach, espousing the view that each preposition fundamentally expresses a prototypical relation, which is couched in terms of conceptual structure rather than in grammatical terms (for example, the relation between two noun phrases). In this view the various “senses” described by the maximalist position are held to be a function of the noun phrase which is the object of the preposition. If the noun phrase refers to a located entity, for example *the bookmark in the book*, the sense of *in* is considered to be locative (because “book” is a located entity), whereas in *tea in the afternoon*, *in* is said to have a “temporal” sense (since “afternoon” refers to a unit of time), and *in this way* it is “modal”. But the labels “locative”, “temporal”, etc. are not derived from an examination of the preposition itself, but are the result of a reading from its object noun phrase. This means that the preposition can have as many “senses” as the astute grammarian is able to tease out from the classification of possible noun phrase objects. Cognitive Grammar, on the other hand, looks for the underlying relation which each preposition of a language encodes. It is important to note in this regard that it makes a distinction between perceptual space and the conceptual representation of it. Spatial relations are computed in the mind and are not mirror images of what is “out there” in the physical world. In fact, without this assumption it is difficult to see how human languages could encode relations among other than first-order entities.¹

The minimalist position is taken here for three reasons:

(1) A practical one: the “senses” of prepositions, for example, those in the phrases in Rom 1.17, cannot be categorized under the usual rubrics (except “miscellaneous” or “idiomatic”). If they could, the exegetical question would not even arise;

(2) A linguistic one: as stated earlier, the so-called “senses” of a preposition are derived from a classification of the object noun phrase, not from a consideration of the function of the preposition itself;

(3) A cognitive one: The brain categorizes mental representations of objects, events, qualities and relations.¹ There must be a universal set of relational possibilities which the prepositions of any given language encode.² It will be assumed that a prototypical relation for each preposition of a language is all that is necessary for a conceptual representation. It is on the basis of this single prototypical abstract relation that all of the actual locutions with that preposition are built, whether it is conceived of as a concrete relation, such as letter in the box, or a metaphorical one, as in God in Christ.

The position taken here, then, is that *each preposition expresses a unique prototypical relation* which can be construed in a number of different “conceptual domains”, such as space, time and manner. In order to express that relation, two terms will be introduced which are commonly used in Cognitive Grammar: Trajector (TR) and Landmark (LM) (in *Gestalt* psychology they are roughly equivalent to the precepts “figure” and “ground” respectively). The LM is the point of reference and is thus stationary; it may possess a specific characteristic shape. The TR is that entity which stands in relation to the LM; it may or may not be conceived of as mobile, depending on the preposition in question. Grammatically, the LM is identical with the object of the preposition. The TR is expressed by some other noun phrase in the same clause, usually the subject or the object of the verb. In the clause *She laid the slip of paper in the book*, the LM is expressed by *the book*, the object of the preposition *in*; the TR is the object of the verb, in this particular clause *the slip of paper*. It is tempting to designate such locative relations as in some sense fundamental, since the terms themselves—LM and TR—are taken from the spatial domain. But this is simply a terminological convenience. There is, of course, nothing abnormal or odd about creating non-locative noun phrases as objects of prepositions. The key notion in this conception of the preposition, as stated earlier, is “construal”. Obviously, such a claim is true only when the relation in one domain is understood to be exactly equivalent to that in another. This will be the underlying thesis in the examination of the idiom of Rom 1.17.

The prepositions of Rom 1.17

We now come to a discussion of the TR-LM relation of the two Greek prepositions in Rom 1.17a, *ek* and *eis*. As alluded to above, there is a set of characteristics which define the prototypical use of a preposition, but not all of those characteristics need be present in any given use of it. There are, in other words, no necessary and sufficient conditions which must be satisfied. In Greek the preposition *ek*

1 Antonio R. and Hanna Damasio, “Brain and Language”, *Scientific American* 268 (September 1992) 89-95.

2 How each human language encodes spatial relations is an empirical question. There is some consensus at this point that there are three possible cognitive “frameworks” for the representation of spatial relations which hold cross-linguistically. See the articles in Paul Bloom et al, *Language and Space*, Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT 1996.

presupposes a bounded LM which serves as a starting point (the “Source”) for the TR. The TR is placed in relation to it in the following way: it is first located within the space defined by the LM and then comes to exit it completely. It thus traces a “Path” from the Source located within the LM to some point outside of it. Although the meta-language of “Trajector,” “Landmark,” “Path” and “Source” is drawn from spatial imagery, the use of these terms is not limited to noun phrases referring to space, for example in the phrase *ek nekrōn* “from death”, *nekrōn* is the LM; the TR is whatever entity has been “moved” from out of that LM. The TR-LM relation belongs, then, to conceptual structure; it is not, to repeat, a mirror image of what exists “out there” in the real world of objects. Any noun phrase can play the role of TR or LM as long as it is possible for the mind to construe such a relation.

The preposition *eis* presupposes a bounded LM at which a TR completes its Path. The TR enters the LM from the space outside of it and its Path ends within the LM at a point we will call the “Goal”. Again, the LM need not be expressed by locative noun phrases, see, for example, *eis telos* “to the end”(of time) or “to the fullest”.

A discussion of the TR will be postponed until the syntax of Rom 1.17a is treated on page 338.

Thus the relation which each of the two Greek prepositions employed in Rom 1.17 is quite straightforward: *ek* presupposes a LM from which the TR departs; it prototypically has three dimensions, but this is not a necessary condition for its use. The TR is first located at the LM and then exits it. *eis* encodes a point of arrival (again, it may typically be three-dimensional); the TR is first not at the LM and then comes to be in it. The relations which the two prepositions express are thus mirror images of one another, a fact which can be expressed formally in a representation of the structure of each, where the ampersand here is read as “and then”:

ek: [be-at’(TR, LM)] and [BECOME NOT be-at’(TR,LM)]

eis: [NOT be-at’(TR,LM)] and [BECOME be-at’(TR,LM)].

The first line reads: the TR is at the LM and then comes to be not at the LM; and the second: the TR is first not at the LM and then comes to be at the LM. Stating the relation expressed by each preposition this way helps to illustrate the mirror-image relationship between the two. And it is the possibilities offered by the relation expressed by each of these which leads to their being asyndetically joined to express the *trajectory* of a TR from a Source to a Goal along a Path connecting the two.

The idiom as used in Greek literature

The expression [*ek* NOUN PHRASE *eis* NOUN PHRASE] is not uncommon in the corpus of Greek literature. A sample of representative usage will help illuminate its employment in Romans and in several other places in the Greek Bible. The following generalizations hold consistently:

1) The NOUN PHRASE encompasses nouns of all types, referring to any sort of entity, whether first, second or third order.

2) Anarthrous noun phrases are by far the most usual, though the use of demonstratives in anaphoric reference is not uncommon, for example *ek tinos eis ti* (“from this to that”).

3) Expressions occur both with different nouns as well as identical ones, for example, *ek pueros eis aera* (“from fire to air”; Johannes Philoponus, *Aristotelis libros de eragitione et corruptione*); (“from fire to fire”; *Anthologia Graeca*); *ex alogon eis alogon* (“from absurdity to absurdity”; Aristides Quintilianus, *De Musica*); *ek topou eis topon* (“from place to place”; Johannes Philoponus, *Aristotelis analytica priora commentaria*), etc. The following discussion will be limited to the latter type only.

4) Throughout Greek literature the verb with which this expression occurs is non-telic, that is, it expresses an unbounded activity, for example, *metēgagen ek pueros eis pur* (“guide from fire into fire”); *ex henos eis hena metabainē* (“change from one to one”), etc. With concrete nouns (first-order entities) the verb expresses the movement of the subject from one location (the Source) to another (the Goal).

Schematically, then, the prototypical clause with this expression is constructed as follows:

[subject noun phrase]+[non-telic verb]+ [*ek* NOUN PHRASE *eis* NOUN PHRASE].

The occurrence of the asyndetically-joined prepositional phrases with this kind of verb results in the subject of the predicate being construed as moving from the source to the goal repeatedly; cf the parallel construction in English: “They went from house to house”. The nouns in the expression “from house to house” are understood to be identical in kind, but maximally undifferentiated; they function as kind of ciphers. The communicative intent of such an expression is to express the iteration of a bounded event, that is, the trajector proceeds between two locations, encoded, however, as identical nouns, a non-specified number of times. The referents are different, but are undifferentiated. The Goal of one trajectory can also be and is the Source of another. The interpretation of iteration comes from embedding a bounded trajectory within the scope of predication of a non-telic verb.

The idiom [*ek* NOUN PHRASE *eis* NOUN PHRASE] in the Greek Bible

The idiom in Rom 1.17a and several other biblical passages differs from a literal locative expression due to the use of abstract nouns (third-order entities). However, as with concrete nouns, there is no qualitative difference between Source and Goal. In *ek pisteōs eis pistin*, the Path has the same conceptual terminus (Goal) as starting point (Source). The other relevant passages in the Greek Bible are Ps 84.7; Jer 9.3; and 2Cor 2.16 (twice):¹

Ps 84.7 (Greek 83.8) *poreusontai ek dunameōs eis dunamin*

Jer 9.3 *ek kakōn eis kaka exēlthosan*

2Cor 2.16 *hois men osmē ek thanatou eis thanaton, hois de osmē ek zōēs eis zōēn.*

In interpreting the idiomatic structure [*ek* NOUN PHRASE *eis* NOUN PHRASE], it is important to strictly observe (1) the relation which each preposition encodes, and (2) the employment of the identical noun. In each instance the English

¹ The use of *apo* rather than *ek*, as in 2Cor 3.18 *apo doxēs eis doxan*, seems to be a variant on this idiom; the LM for *apo* is fundamentally the same as for *ek*: the TR is conceived of as separating from the LM, and moving away from the Source.

rendering should fit the formula: “has its Source in N_i and its Goal in N_i ,” or more freely: N_i “from start to finish”. It follows that this analysis eliminates the translation that is sometimes adopted for Ps 84.7, where the idiom is rendered to make a difference in degree between the two nouns: “from strength to strength”. Weiser takes this to mean that “...as God is in their hearts, their strength increases...”¹ No. The idiom must maintain the exact conceptual identity of the two nouns, as it does everywhere else in Greek literature. Ps 84.7 might then read: “in the strength [of the Lord] from beginning to end”. In passing one might note that the LXX translation of the Psalm text is based on one possible pointing; the other renders the Hebrew “from village to village”,² which, of course, would not allow for any suggestion of degree. Neither can the Jeremiah passage be construed as pointing to an increase in evil. Because the Source and Goal are the same, the idiom simply underscores immutability, unchangeableness, in this case evil from start to finish. The same is true for the Corinthians passage. The fragrance (*osmē*) for the one means life from beginning to end, for the others, death from start to finish. No one has suggested to my knowledge that the Corinthians passage has to do with an increase in life or an increase in death. If a difference in degree is an inadmissible interpretation in one passage, it is inadmissible in all.

The idiomatic structure [ek NOUN PHRASE eis NOUN PHRASE] and the syntax of Rom 1.17

The question with which commentators have wrestled most in this passage is the syntactic relation of *ek pisteōs eis pistin* to the remainder of the clause in which it occurs. Fridrichsen observes that commentators have linked this expression

- (a) to the subject *dikaioṣunē theou* or
- (b) to the verb *apokaluptetai* or
- (c) to neither, but “loosely” to one or the other.

More recent commentators, such as Käsemann, have opted for (c), although just what is meant by this choice is not entirely clear. Newman and Nida suggest that in translating, it may be necessary to recast the expression by placing it in its own clause, and perhaps this is what Käsemann is proposing: The idiom as a whole is a kind of elliptical adverbial clause. Newman and Nida’s suggestion clearly implies that they view it as an adverbial adjunct, a non-obligatory clausal element which conveys in what manner the righteousness of God is revealed. Cranfield concedes that the syntax suggests that *ek pisteōs eis pistin* was intended to be connected with the verb, but that it is probable that in Paul’s thought it was linked rather with *dikaioṣunē theou*.³ He supports his argument by appealing to Paul’s quotation from Habakkuk and the syntax of Rom 3.21-22. This results in the contradiction that the grammar suggests one thing, but Paul’s thought another.

The Trajector (TR) in Rom 1.17a

Earlier, prepositions were described as the relation between a Trajector and a Landmark. The LMs for the two prepositions *ek* and *eis* have been sketched above

1 Artur Weiser, *Psalms*, Philadelphia: Westminster 1962, 568.

2 M. Dahood, *Psalms II, 51-100*, Garden City: Doubleday 1968, 281-282.

3 Cranfield, *Romans*, 100.

(see page 335). The TR is grammatically a noun phrase which stands in relation to each of them. In the clause under investigation it can only be the subject noun phrase *dikaiosunē theou*, since it is the only one available. As a TR, it is conceptualized as “moving” from one point (the Source) to another point (the Goal), in the same way that one would express the movement of an object in the physical world from a source to a destination. In terms of Paul’s use of the idiomatic structure [ek NOUN PHRASE eis NOUN PHRASE], then, *pistis* characterizes the entire path from the beginning point to the end; the TR which “traverses” this Path from Source to Goal, is *dikaiosunē theou*. It is “there” at the Source and again at the Goal.

In a sentence with a simple motion activity verb, such as “go” or “move” plus the designation of Source and Goal (“George went from house to house”), the TR is understood as traversing the distance in a discrete period of time. The traverse is not, in other words, a punctual event. It is true that the verb *apokalupt-* basically refers to a punctual event, which is the way the RSV, for example, translates: “is revealed”. But this makes the internal structure of the verb incompatible with the conceptual structure of the idiom. To eliminate this incongruity the Greek present should be rendered in English by the “progressive” aspect.¹ In Rom 1.17 the verb *apokaluptetai*, a present passive, must therefore be translated “is being revealed/disclosed” to indicate that at the beginning (Source) and at the end (Goal) the same *dikaiosunē theou* is disclosed.

Conclusion

From the viewpoint of Cognitive Grammar, the asyndetic relation of the two prepositional phrases in Rom 1.17 leads to an interpretation whereby a TR *dikaiosunē theou* “moves” between a Source (*pistis*) and a Goal (*pistis*). Since the Source and Goal are expressed by the identical noun, the idiom is best interpreted as “begins in faith(fulness) and ends in faith(fulness)”,² or “faith(fulness) from beginning to end”. Parallel passages must be rendered similarly, for example, 2Cor 2.16: “death from beginning to end” and “life from beginning to end”, consistent with the use of this idiom in Greek literature in general. Further, since the structure of the asyndetically-joined prepositional phrases presupposes a discrete interval of time, this fact must also be rendered in understanding the verb. Here, then, are several possible ways that this sentence could be translated on the basis of the above analysis:

(1) For it is in it [the gospel] where a right relationship with God is being revealed, where it is a question of faith from beginning to end;

Or more freely:

(2) For in the gospel a right relationship to God is being revealed nowhere else but in faith.³

1 C.F.D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1963, 7.

2 Rudolf Bultmann. *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*, Minneapolis: Augsburg 1985, 67, discusses this idiom briefly and points out that Adolf Jülicher had understood Rom 1.17 as “Faith (is) the beginning...and the end.”

3 Which translation—“faith” or “faithfulness”—is still an open question.

The first rendering takes Newman and Nida's suggestion to put the substance of the prepositional phrases in its own clause. Cranfield's suggestion is more discursive: "For in it (that is, in the gospel as it is being preached) a righteous status which is God's gift is being revealed (and so offered to men)—a righteous status which is altogether by faith."¹ Lightfoot, Nygren, Cranfield, and Barrett, believing that this verse forms part of the "thesis" for the entire epistle (as many commentators do), have thus tried to be consistent by proposing an interpretation which accords with the argument presented in the body of the letter. Some recent translations have also cast the expression in this way (*Die Bibel im heutigen Deutsch* and the NEB). The present analysis offers the grammatical undergirding for supporting their proposal as the most faithful rendering of the Greek expression. Here, then, is one way that this sentence could be translated on the basis of the above analysis: "In the gospel, right relationship with God is being revealed: It is a path which begins in faith and ends in faith."

References

- Allhaus, Paul: *Der Brief an die Römer*. 13. Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1978.
- Barth, Karl: *The Epistle to the Romans*. Transl. of 6th ed. London: Oxford 1933.
- Barrett, C.K.: *The Epistle to the Romans*. 2nd ed. London: A and C Black 1991.
- Bloom, Paul, et al: *Language and Space*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT 1996.
- Bruce, F.F.: *The Letter of Paul to the Romans*. 2nd ed. Leicester: IV; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1985.
- Bultmann, Rudolf: *The Second Letter to the Corinthians*. Minneapolis: Augsburg 1985.
- Cranfield, C.E.B.: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 6th ed. Edinburgh: Clark 1975-1979.
- Dahood, M.: *Psalms II, 51-100*. Garden City: Doubleday 1968.
- Damasio, Antonio R. and Hanna: "Brain and Language". *Scientific American* 268 (September 1992) 89-95.
- Dunn, James D.G.: *Romans 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38. Dallas: Word Books 1988.
- Fridrichsen, Anton: "Aus Glauben zu Glauben". *ConNt* 12 (1948) 54.
- Hebert, Gabriel: "Faithfulness and Faith". *Theology* 58 (1955) 373-379.
- Herskovits, A.: *Language and Spatial Cognition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986.
- Jülicher, Adolf: *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*. 7. Aufl. Leipzig: Mohr 1931.
- Käsemann, E.: *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1980.
- R. Langacker: *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. 2 vols. Stanford: Stanford Univ. 1987-1991.

1 Cranfield, *Romans*, 100.

Lietzmann, Hans: *Einführung in die Textgeschichte der Paulusbriefe. An die Römer*. 4. Aufl. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr 1933.

Lightfoot, J.B.: *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*. London: MacMillan 1904.

Lyons, John: *Semantics*. vol 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1977.

Moule, C.F.D.: *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1963.

Murray, John: *The Epistle to the Romans*. vol 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1959.

Newman, Barclay and Eugene Nida: *A Handbook on Paul's Letter to the Romans*. New York: American Bible Society 1973.

Nygren, Anders: *Der Römerbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht 1965.

Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam: *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T and T Clark 1896.

Stowers, Stanley K.: *A Rereading of Romans*. New Haven and London: Yale Univ. 1994.

Stuhlmacher, Peter: *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Transl. S.J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox 1994.

Torrance, Thomas F.: "One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith." *The Expository Times* 58 (1957) 111-114.

Vandeloise, Claude: *L'espace en français*. Paris: Editions du Seuil 1986.

Weiser, Artur: *Psalms*. Philadelphia: Westminster 1962.

Wilckens, Ulrich: *Der Brief an die Römer*. 2. Aufl. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukircher Verlag 1987.

C. Zelinsky-Wibbelt (ed): *The Semantics of Prepositions*. Berlin, N.Y.: Mouton de Gruyter 1993.

ALAN S. DUTHIE

"AND" AGAIN: A RESPONSE TO ETTIEN KOFFI

The author teaches in the Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon.

I have the following comments on Ettien Koffi's article "There is More to 'And' than Just Conjoining Words" [*BT* 49.3 (July 1998) 332-343].

I agree that the relatively surface structures of grammar may indeed have at least the sort of meaning known as "textual".

I also accept the conclusion on Col 2.1-2 where *you* should have replaced *they* in English versions; or perhaps better, *you and they* for extra clarity, and not to exclude *they*.

But I would rather stick to *Moses and Aaron*, imitating the Hebrew, and hoping that readers of translations would get the idea that Moses was the leader, then shift to *Aaron went with Moses*, because to me, a native speaker of English, it is not clear who the leader is; it could easily be Aaron (with Moses following him).