

THE OBEDIENCE OF FAITH  
IN THE LETTER TO THE ROMANS

Part III: The Obedience of Christ  
and the Obedience of the Christian

D. B. GARLINGTON

THE investigation of the obedience of faith in Romans, commenced some three years ago,<sup>1</sup> has thus far yielded two basic conclusions. (1) The phrase ὑπακοή πίστεως (Rom 1:5; 16:26) embodies a twin idea: the obedience consisting in faith and the obedience arising out of faith.<sup>2</sup> (2) Faith's obedience, defined in the first instance as perseverance, is the link between present justification by faith and eschatological justification for the "doers of the law" (Rom 2:13). We come now, in the concluding study, to consider the role of Christ, the obedient one, who ensures the obedience of his people. Our attention will be directed to Romans 5.

I. *Romans 5 within the Scheme of Chaps. 5-8*<sup>3</sup>

As one reads these chapters, one cannot help but be impressed with the series of antitheses constructed by Paul, which in very, broad terms may be reduced to the following elements. Chap. 5: life in Christ vs. death in Adam; 6:1-7:6: newness of life in Christ vs. death and bondage to sin and the law; 7:7-8:39: life and liberty in union with Christ and the Spirit vs. captivity to the flesh, even in spite of indwelling sin and the believer's groaning for the redemption of the body (7:14-25; 8:18-25). In each instance, the motif of the believer's once-for-all break with the past and his entrance into a new state of affairs stands out in prominent relief: an old pattern of existence is broken in order that a new mode of life may begin.

<sup>1</sup> *WTJ* 52 (1990) 201-24; 53 (1991) 47-72.

<sup>2</sup> "Though that faith begins for Paul as a 'hearing' . . . it does not stop there. It involves the entire personal commitment of a man/woman to Christ Jesus as 'Lord'.... The word ὑποκοή implies the 'submission' or total personal response of the believer to the risen Lord" (J. A. Fitzmyer, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *Kyrios*-Title," in *A Wandering Aramean: Collected Aramaic Essays* [Chico: Scholars Press, 1979] 132).

<sup>3</sup> A portion of this segment of the article is adapted from my "Romans 7:14-25 and the Creation Theology of Paul," *TinJ* ns 11 (1991) 202-6. The purpose is to set forth a salvation-historical structuring of the chapters without pretending that this is the only way of approaching the text. On the complexity of chaps. 5-8 as a whole, see J. C. Beker, *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 84-85.

This is the Christian's "definitive sanctification,"<sup>4</sup> inasmuch as the representatives of the old age—sin, death, the law, and the flesh—have been overthrown and caused to release their grip on those who are now in Christ.

There is, accordingly, a pronounced Christological focus to each phase of the believer's transformation from his old condition to the new. Chap. 5 highlights our solidarity with Christ as he heads up the age to come, in opposition to our former union with Adam, who is the head of "the present evil age" (Gal 1:4). In 6:1-7:6 the believer has died to sin and has been raised in newness of life; because he has died to the law through the body of Christ, he is discharged from that which held him captive, so that "now," i.e., in this new phase of world history, he serves not in the oldness of the letter but in the newness of the Spirit. Chap. 8 makes explicit the connection between the sonship of Christians and the sonship of Christ: we are the sons of God because he is the Son of God. In the Son our lives are no longer characterized by fear and bondage to the flesh; it is to the image of the Son that we are being conformed; and it is by virtue of the indwelling Spirit of the Son that we now walk after the Spirit, as formerly we walked after the flesh.

Hand in hand with the ethical and Christological dimensions of these chapters there is a conspicuous time-element. Echoing 3:21, the "eschatological  $\nu\theta\nu$ " is present in 5:10; 6:21; 7:6, 17; 8:1; and even when the "now" of salvation is not expressly mentioned, it is nonetheless just beneath the surface of all of those passages which speak of the definitive break with the old age. From the ethical point of view chaps. 5-8 can be viewed as Paul's delineation of the eschatological (resurrection) life of the people of God, those upon whom "the ends of the ages have come" (1 Cor 10:11). The frequent occurrence of "life" throughout the section takes us back to 1:17, where, according to Paul's use of Hab 2:4, life is the outcome of the righteous man's faith, as well as 4:17-21, according to which Abraham's faith was in the God who raises the dead. Ultimately "life" is a creation concept, stemming from Genesis 1 and 2 (cf. Rom 2:7).<sup>5</sup>

Therefore, from 5:1 through the end of chap. 8 one can discern that Paul runs the entire course of salvation history, from old creation to new. After the transitional paragraph of 5:1-11, 5:12-21 depicts the disobedience of the old humanity in Adam and the obedience of the new in Christ. The next section, 6:1-7:6, speaks further of the inception of the new creation with the death and resurrection of Christ: the oldness of the letter has given way to the newness of the Spirit. As an outgrowth of an objection raised and answered in 7:7-12, 7:13-25 articulates the overlap of the two creations, with its resultant tension in the believer's inward being. Chap. 8 finally predicts the glories of the consummated new creation. The substructure of

<sup>4</sup> J. Murray, "Definitive Sanctification," in *The Collected Writings of John Murray* (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1977) 2.277-84.

<sup>5</sup> See "Obedience of Faith, II," 57-58.

Romans 5-8, therefore, can be viewed as the passing away of the old creation and the advent of the new. Paul thus announces the arrival of the eschaton or, most pointedly, the new creation. It is as though this entire portion of the letter were an elaborate commentary on 2 Cor 5:17. We are thus alerted that the purview of Romans 5 in particular is not to be confined to justification, at least not to the narrowest possible sense.<sup>6</sup>

In this light, we see that Paul's running debate with Judaism is continued into the present stage of the letter. The essential difference between him and the Jewish outlook lay precisely in his conviction that, in Christ, the eschaton had arrived. Thus, the argument of chaps. 5-8 grows out of what has preceded. Given the assumption of 3:21-4:25 that faith in Christ has secured both justification and the promise to Abraham of a seed, it follows that in *Christ* the life of the new creation is here. (It is frequently noted that from 5:1 to 8:39 ζάω and ζωή, used some 24 times, dominate Paul's vocabulary.)

## II. *Rom 5:1-11: Reconciliation and New Creation*

Some commentators make 5:1-11 the conclusion of what has preceded (3:21-4:25), while others classify it as the beginning of a new section of the letter (chaps. 5-8).<sup>7</sup> Actually, it makes relatively little difference which course we follow, because these verses are essentially a transitional passage containing ideas from the previous part of the argument (faith, grace, sinners, justify, blood, enemies, wrath, the resurrection of Christ) as well as those which pave the way for what is to follow (suffering, endurance, hope, the Holy Spirit, the love of God, future salvation as the result of past reconciliation).<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> E.g., J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 1.179, 184, 185.

<sup>7</sup> There are variations, of course. For example, R. D. Kaylor, *Paul's Covenant Community: Jew and Gentile in Romans* (Atlanta: Knox, 1988) 93; Beker, Paul, 85. The ensuing exposition accepts that chaps. 5-8 stand as a unit, whose substructure is comprised of a theology of creation. Cf. my "Romans 7:14-25," 203-4. The leading parallels between 5:1-11 and chap. 8 are listed by N. A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977) 88-90, and D. J. Moo, *Romans 1-8* (Wycliffe Exegetical Commentary; Chicago: Moody, 1991) 323.

<sup>8</sup> On the place of chap. 5 within Romans, see the analyses of Moo, *Romans*, 300-303; J. D. G. Dunn, "Paul's Epistle to the Romans: An Analysis of Structure and Argument," *ANRW* 2.25.4, 2855-58; G. Bornkamm, "Paulinische Anakolouthe," in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien* (BEvT 16; Munich: Kaiser, 1966) 81-82; R. P. Martin, *Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology* (Atlanta: Knox, 1981) 136--40; E. Brandenburger, *Adam and Christ us: Exegetisch-religions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Röm. 5,12-21 (1 Kor. 15)* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962) 255-64; N. Elliot, *The Rhetoric of Romans: Argumentative Constraint and Strategy and Paul's Dialogue with Judaism* (JSNTSup 45; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990) 226; J. A. T. Robinson, *Wrestling with Romans* (London: SCM, 1979) 57; M. C. de Boer, *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5* (JSNTSup 22; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988) 148-49. Elliot (*Rhetoric*, 226) maintains that Romans 5 *in toto* is the pivot on which the letter's argument turns, and A. Nygren thinks that the chapter is the "high point" of the letter, where all

The particular terms "ungodly," "sinners," "enemies," and "wrath," as compared with "justified," "saved," and "reconciled," articulate a contrast between the believer's past and his present. Kaylor is correct that this contrast is organized around the theme of reconciliation. As illustrated most graphically from Hosea, reconciliation derives its meaning from Israel's covenant relationship with God: "Reconciliation implies the restoration of a previous condition and as such builds upon the idea of a covenant within which God and Israel once lived in a harmony which was subsequently disrupted. . . . God betrothed Israel in faithfulness, but though God remained faithful, Israel became 'adulterous' and pursued other lovers (gods)."<sup>9</sup> Reconciliation, seen in this light, is nothing less than the restoration of a broken marriage. That it is a central concept for Paul emerges from 2 Cor 5:16-21, where, as in Rom 5:1-11, Paul can characterize his new covenant ministry as one of reconciliation for both Jew and Gentile.

Structurally the paragraph can be analyzed according to the "ABA" pattern so frequent in Romans.<sup>10</sup>

A: vv. 1-2, the two direct results of justification by faith

B: vv. 3-10, the relation of these two

A: v. 11, the two direct results of justification by faith

### 1. *The Two Direct Results of justification by Faith, vv 1-2*

The first result is peace with God. It is peace which particularly highlights the eschatological dimension of what has transpired with the work of Christ. The term "peace" (= "rest") is one that characterizes the OT's Messianic outlook (e.g., Isa 9:6-7; 32: 52:7; 57:19; Ezek 37:26; Hag 2:9; cf. Num 6:22-26). In the prophetic expectation, the Messiah is the "Prince of Peace" (Isa 9:6), in whose person Yahweh's **שְׁלוֹמ** will attend the time of worldwide bliss, the new creation, when the lion and the lamb dwell together and war is no more. It is too often overlooked, however, that the

the lines of Paul's thinking converge (*Commentary on Romans* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1949] 209). Nygren, rightly in my view, links chap. 5 to chaps. 6-8, as do others (see Moo, *Romans*, 300 n. 1).

<sup>9</sup> Kaylor, *Community*, 93-95; quote from pp. 94-95. See further Martin, *Reconciliation*, 136-54.

<sup>10</sup> See throughout A. Feuillet, "Le plan salvifique de Dieu d'après l'Épître aux Romains," *RB* 57 (1950) 336-87, 489-529; J. J. Collins, "Chiasmus and the 'ABA' Pattern of the Text of Paul," in *Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1963) 2.575-83. From another point of view, these verses exhibit chiasmus ("ABBA"):

A: peace, 1-2a

B: hope, 2b

B: hope, 3-5

A: peace, 6-11

direct background to Rom 5:1 is Isa 32:17-18: "And the work of righteousness shall be peace; and the effect of righteousness quietness and assurance forever. And my people shall dwell in a peaceful habitation, and in sure dwellings, and in quiet resting places." According to the prophet, the **שְׁלֹמֹ** of the restored Israel is to be the result of her renewed commitment to the covenant (**קְדֻשָּׁה**), an event commensurate with the outpouring of the Spirit of Yahweh (v. 15) and the appearance of a king whose own rule is characterized by righteousness (v. 1). Rom 5:1 thus announces the fulfillment of Isaiah's oracle in the rightwising of the believer in Christ, again suggesting that Paul's parameters are broader than simply justification as a past forensic act, since against the backdrop of Isaiah 32 **δικαίω** broadens to include the new Israel's commitment to the covenant *in toto*.<sup>11</sup> The vindication/restoration/blessing of the people of God has been procured by Christ, as attended by the effusion of the love of God into our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom 5:5). The long-awaited eschaton is here, because cosmic peace (**שְׁלֹמֹ**) and salvation have been proleptically manifested in Christ and disclosed in our obedience to his lordship.<sup>12</sup>

We may add that at the other end of this overall segment of the letter, in 8:31-39, is to be found the counterpart. The questions of 8:33 are taken from Isa 50:8-9, which embody the challenge of the obedient Servant of Yahweh to his enemies to set forth their case in the presence of God the Judge, who, he is confident, will exonerate him from all wrongdoing. The context of Isaiah's Servant-song is replete with new creation associations, signifying that the blissful future for Israel is to be secured by the obedience of the **עַבְדֵי יְהוָה**. For Paul this Servant is Christ, in whom eschatological vindication has been secured for the latter-day people of God. Nevertheless, the conspicuous fact is that Paul refers these rhetorical questions not to Christ directly but to Christians, who, with the same confidence of the Servant himself, can call upon God to vindicate them from the accusations of every enemy.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the comments on the **δικαίω** group in "Obedience of Faith, II," 50-51. Although, strictly speaking, "rightwise" is a more comprehensive term than "justify," the two will be used synonymously throughout. That **δικαίω**, in 5:1, summarizes 3:21-4:25 is not a particular problem for this more inclusive reading of the verb, since 4:18-22 stresses the *persevering quality* of Abraham's faith. Apart from the claim that **δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ** is a technical term taken over by Paul from Jewish Apocalyptic, underlying this exposition are the perspectives of E. Käsemann's "The Righteousness of God" in Paul," in *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969) 168-82, as reflected in his *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) e.g., 79-80, 154-58. See further de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 150-56; Beker, *Paul*, 262-64.

<sup>12</sup> Beker, *Paul*, 264. Cf. de Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 236 n. 35; Bultmann, *Theology* 1.276, 278. Beker's treatment of "grace" is also relevant. Once grace in Paul has been loosed from its privatistic Western moorings, says Beker, and placed in its original apocalyptic setting, it is seen to refer to both a cosmic power and to the domain of our life in Christ. Though this study does not in any sense endorse the notion of an infused righteousness, Beker is correct that the historic debate concerning *gratia imputata* versus *gratia infusa* bypasses Paul's basic intent (*Paul*, 265).

In light of these findings, Rom 5:1 and 8:31-39 can be looked upon as a kind of *inclusio*, signaling the commencement and the conclusion of a major section of the letter. In the case of both, with their respective OT backdrops, there is an identification of the covenant community with a central covenant figure (Servant-King): his obedience forms the matrix of his people's obedience and consequent blessings. This, we shall argue, is the conceptual framework of Rom 5:12-21, which forms Paul's horizons as he develops his Adam/Christ typology.

The second effect of justification is the Christian's boasting in the hope of the glory of God. The combination of ἐλπίζ and ἡ δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ is distinctively eschatological in impact. "Hope" is faith directed to the future,<sup>13</sup> and "the glory of God," according to 8:18-25, is the consummation of the new creation and, by implication, the rectification of Adam's failure to be God's image (3:23). Indeed, 8:18, 24-25 again combine glory and hope, as the believer is pointed forward to the renewal of the creation and the redemption of the body. Paul, then, asserts that present reconciliation has as its consequence the assurance that one may anticipate the consummate fullness of a new heavens and a new earth. The Christian, in other words, may be assured that his hope in Christ will not expose him to eschatological shame;<sup>14</sup> and such hope is vital because in between there is the reality of suffering, tension, and groaning as one anticipates the end, the peculiar emphasis of 7:14-25 and 8:18-25. *Perseverance* thus becomes the keynote of Christian existence as long as the tension of the "Already" and the "Not Yet" in the cosmic plan of God remains unresolved.

## 2. *The Relation of the Two Effects of justification by Faith, vv. 3-10*

In this "B" section of the paragraph Paul correlates the two results of justification, taking them up in reverse order (thus the possibility of a chiasmic ordering of the verses). To be more precise, vv. 3-5 expand on hope, and vv. 6-10 explicate peace (= reconciliation).

Anticipating 7:14-25 and 8:18-25, vv. 3-5 relate that the believer's hope is alive precisely because of the presence of trials. As Beker explains, these are the tribulations of the end-time (Paul's modification of the Messianic woes), which Christians do not merely endure, but rather glory in.<sup>15</sup> The very fact of suffering, in its own way, is a sign that the ages have taken a decisive turn in the cosmic purposes of God. Tribulation, however, necessitates hope, a hope produced by the love of God poured into our hearts by

<sup>13</sup> Cf. J. M. Gundry Volf, *Paul and Perseverance: Staying in and Falling Away* (Louisville: Westminster/Knox, 1990) 50 (n. 11), 55. See the excellent remarks on hope in Paul by Beker, *Paul*, 146-49.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Gundry Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 50. "Shame," particularly in the prophets, is synonymous with judgment. The imagery stems from Genesis 3: the shameful nakedness of Adam and Eve was the reversal of their original glory.

<sup>15</sup> Beker, *Paul*, 146.

the Holy Spirit, in keeping with the prophetic prediction that the Spirit would be poured out in the age to come (e.g., Isa 32:15; Joel 2:28-29).

Vv. 6-10 bring to the fore the work of Christ as effecting (Messianic) peace with God. We note only two of the verses' prominent features.

First of all, Paul repeatedly emphasizes the person of Jesus as he elaborates this result of justification. This is due to his insistence that the eschaton has arrived *in Christ*; and life in Christ is the life of a new epoch and domain. The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ for Paul, as Beker confirms, "has essentially a participatory-instrumental meaning and signifies the transfer to the new age that has been inaugurated with the death and resurrection of Christ."<sup>16</sup> When we look back to 3:24, we can see that 5:6-10 is a commentary on Paul's claim that justification is by God's grace through the redemption *which is in Christ Jesus*. Consequently, what differentiates Paul's conception of righteousness from Jewish apocalyptic eschatology is that "this righteousness (both as God's redemptive action and as gift) finds its apocalyptic disclosure (a) in the event of the death of Jesus Christ, and thus, as Rom 3.21 radically puts it, (b) 'apart from the law'."<sup>17</sup>

Second, vv. 9-10 are a statement of inauguration and consummation in the saving purposes of God: what Christ has done for us in the past he will bring to completion in the day of judgment. The two verses explicate each other:

v. 9: if justified by his blood, then (how much more) saved from (eschatological) wrath

v. 10: if reconciled by his death, then (how much more) saved by his (resurrection) life

The past redemptive event in Christ has given rise to hope in the believer, a hope which has as its primary focus the future eschatological consummation of the new creation. Or, as Elliot puts it, vv. 9-10 "relocate the soteriological fulcrum in the apocalyptic future: the gracious justification and reconciliation of the impious is made the basis for sure hope in the salvation to come."<sup>18</sup> Paul thus polarizes past and future as the epochal stages of the salvation experience, with an assurance that although the consummation of redemption is still outstanding, the believer can take comfort that God's purposes cannot fail.

It is normally observed that the argument is akin to the rabbinic *qal wahomer* pattern, which can be viewed as either *a minori ad majus* or *a maiori*

<sup>16</sup> Ibid., 272.

<sup>17</sup> De Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 155-56. As C. H. Cosgrove rightly contends, the accent in 3:21-31 is universality: "Faith as access to redemption . . . is open to both Jew and Gentile" (*Justification in Paul: A Linguistic and Theological Reflection*, *JBL* 106 [1987] 665).

<sup>18</sup> Elliot, *Rhetoric*, 229. See further Beker, *Paul*, 176-81.

*ad minus*, depending on how the interpreter assesses the force of the argument.<sup>19</sup> Although it may be misleading to speak of a "greater" and a "lesser" strictly speaking, given the magnitude of both the past and the future dimensions of the Christian's redemption, I favor *a minori ad majus*, because, without minimizing the significance of Christ's death, his sacrifice must eventuate in the final salvation of his people in order to accomplish its goal. The salvific process is commenced with present justification (δικαιωθέντες νῦν), but it will not be consummated until we are finally saved (σωθησόμεθα).<sup>20</sup> And "the process of consummating the work of salvation is more like an obstacle course than a downhill ride to the finish-line. For the destiny of Christians does not go unchallenged in a world opposed to God's purposes. The powers of evil in the form of afflictions and trials threaten continuity in their salvation."<sup>21</sup> Thus, for instance, Cranfield's remark<sup>22</sup> that deliverance from eschatological wrath is, in relation to justification, "very easy" fails to appreciate the formidable nature of the "obstacle course." Given the θλίψεις which attend the life of faith this side of the resurrection, the great thing, from the perspective of the present passage, is yet to be accomplished.

### 3. *The Two Direct Results of justification by Faith, v. 11*

Verse 11's restatement of vv. 1-2 displays the genius of the "ABA" style of writing, because it is not a mere verbal repetition of vv. 1-2 but is shaped by the intervening material of vv. 3-10. Thus, there are some significant variations. (1) Boasting in the hope of the glory of God becomes boasting in God through Christ, the reversal of Paul's former boast in Yahweh and the Torah (2:17, 23). (2) Reconciliation becomes virtually synonymous with "justification," "peace," and "access" (v. 2), which, in salvation-historical terms, relates to man's pristine condition of dwelling in the immediate presence of God in paradise (cf. the way Rev 21:5 and 22:2 correlate the renewed presence of God with access to the tree of life).<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> E.g., Gundry Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 53; Moo, *Romans*, 318; C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975) 1.266. See further Str-B 3.224-26; H. Müller, "Der rabbinische Qal-Wachomer-Schluß: Zur Adam-Christus-Typologie in Rm 5," *ZNW* 58 (1967) 73-92; Brandenburger, *Adam*, 221-24; S.-H. Quek, "Adam and Christ according to Paul," in *Pauline Studies: Essays Presented to F. E. Bruce on His 70th Birthday* (eds. D. A. Hagner and M. J. Harris; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980) 67-79.

<sup>20</sup> The disputed last clause of 4:25, ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν, makes perfectly good sense as a reference to eschatological justification, being equivalent to σωθησόμεθα in 5:9-10, particularly as 5:10 stresses that ultimate salvation is due to the *life* of Christ.

<sup>21</sup> Gundry Volf, *Paul and Perseverance*, 81.

<sup>22</sup> Cranfield, *Romans* 1.2666.

<sup>23</sup> "Justification or reconciliation, is, as we have already been told, the initial act of a process; but it carries with it the assurance that the process will be completed" (C. H. Dodd,

In sum, as the transition from chaps. 1-4 to 5:12-8:39, 5:1-11 explicates the believer's reconciliation in such a way as to announce the arrival of the new creation (cf. 2 Cor 5:17-19, which does the same). From both the juridical and experiential points of view, a radical change has been effected in the Christian's standing before God and in his way of life: whereas once we were "sinners" and the "ungodly" enemies of God under his wrath, we now have been justified and reconciled and rejoice in the hope of eventual salvation.

### III. *Rom 5:12-21: Adam and Christ. Disobedience and Obedience*<sup>24</sup>

#### 1. *Structure and Relation to the Preceding*

Because of its connection with 5:1-11, 5:12-19 proceeds to develop a theology of the obedience of Christ, as contrasted with the disobedience of Adam. As Elliot observes, the section takes shape around Paul's "breaking and realignment of typological correlations," formed on the structure "just as ... so also" (ὡς/ὥσπερ . . . οὕτως).<sup>25</sup> The paragraph, as is commonly known, exhibits the most conspicuous example of Pauline anacolouthon. The train of thought commences in v. 12; but because Paul felt the necessity of a justification and elaboration of this statement, he does not formalize his analogy until v. 18. The section would appear to follow the "ABA" pattern:

*The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* [MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1932] 77). Dodd's correlation of justification and reconciliation is rightly grounded in the parallel of the two in Rom 5:1-11. Karl Barth entitles the whole of chap. 5 "The Gospel as Man's Reconciliation with God" (*A Shorter Commentary on Romans* [London: SCM, 1959] 55).

<sup>24</sup> Account can be taken of only a cross section of the growing mass of literature on 5:12-21 alone. See the bibliographies of Cranfield, *Romans* 1.270-71 n. 1; Käsemann, *Romans*, 140; U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKKNT 6; 3 vols.; Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1978-82) 1.305-6; Quek, "Adam and Christ," 74-75 nn. 4-5; J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1988) 1.244-45; Brandenburger, *Adam*, 280-85; H. A. Lombard, "The Adam-Christ 'Typology' in Romans 5:12-21," *Neot* 15 (1981) 97-100; S. L. Johnson, "Romans 5:12—An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology," in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study* (eds. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 299 n. 6; H. Seebass, *NIDNTT* 1.88. Access to the Jewish materials on Adam (though interpreted variously) may be had through Brandenburger, *Adam*, 15-57; J. Jervell, *Imago Dei: Gen 1,6f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis and im den paulinischen Briefen* (FRLANT 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 15-121; R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966); J. R. Levison, *Portraits of Adam in Early Judaism: From Sirach to 2 Baruch* (JSPSup 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988); Str-B 3.226-29; W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism* (3d ed.; London: SPCK, 1970) 36-57; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "The Theological Structure of Romans V.12," *NTS* 19 (1972-73) 339-54; S. Kim, *The Origin of Paul's Gospel* (WUNT 2/4; Tübingen: Mohr, 1981) 162-93; H. Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (HTKNT 6; Freiburg: Herder, 1977) 183-89.

<sup>25</sup> Elliot, *Rhetoric*, 229.

A: v. 12: the initial statement of the old humanity's solidarity with the first Adam and its consequences

B: vv. 13-17: justification and elaboration of the proposition begun in v. 12

A: vv. 18-19: recapitulation and formal statement of the analogous work of Adam and Christ and its consequences

[Vv. 20-21 lie outside the Adam/Christ analogy proper.]

Numerous commentators are correct that the "therefore" of v. 12 is to be connected with the whole of vv. 1-11. Yet the paragraph can be reduced to two overlapping notions. For one, there is the juxtaposition of the believer's former condition (ungodly, sinners, enemies, wrath) with his present one (justified, saved, reconciled). The section 5:12-21, then, takes us back to the inception of "this present evil age," with the fall of Adam, and explains that our past existence was the result of the disobedience of the first man. At the same time, however, we are informed that our current condition is due to the work of another Adam, who by his obedience has introduced a new creation.<sup>26</sup> In brief, "Adam is the head of the old aeon, the age of *death*; Christ is the head of the new aeon, the age of *life*."<sup>27</sup> Or, as Paul expresses it to the Corinthians, "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive" (1 Cor 15:22), and, most pointedly, "If anyone is in Christ, [there is] the new creation; the old things have passed away, behold, all things have become new" (2 Cor 5:17).

Second, there is the Christian's assured perseverance due to the life of the risen Christ, 5:9-10. It is true that the new creation has arrived because "peace" and the "hope of glory" are the immediate effects of rightwising by faith. Nevertheless, this new creation must be consummated, and the people of God must endure  $\theta\lambda\iota\psi\iota\varsigma$  until their adoption is complete (8:18-24). Therefore, the Adam/Christ analogy is intended to ground the final perseverance of the saints in the perseverance (obedience) of Christ himself, because the one who now lives by the power of an indissoluble life (Heb 7:16) was obedient unto death (Phil 2:8). It is just here that the perspectives of 5:1-11. merge: as we once bore the image of Adam and were compelled to repeat his disobedience, so now we bear the image of Christ and are privileged to imitate his pattern of suffering followed by glory (cf. 1 Pet 1:3-12).

These constituent elements of 5:1-11, combined with the "therefore" of 5:12, alert us that the horizon of 5:12-21 is not to be restricted to a past forensic declaration. What is at stake in Romans 5 in its entirety is salvation in the broadest sense—the new creation inaugurated and consummated—and the necessity of perseverance until the old creation is thoroughly displaced by the new. Thus, while  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$  remains difficult,<sup>28</sup> the inference

<sup>26</sup> See Nygren, *Romans*, 210-11; F. J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary* (Cleveland: World, 1961) 141.

<sup>27</sup> Nygren, *Romans*, 210.

<sup>28</sup> See the discussion of the various options by Moo, *Romans*, 328-30.

drawn from vv. 1-11 is to this effect: the Christian's entrance into the new creation and his assurance of enjoying its finalized bliss depend on his union with the living Lord, who is another Adam and the truest image of God. From a slightly different perspective, very much compatible with the outlook of the Fourth Gospel and Hebrews, we might say that the one who takes charge of the new creation is, at the same time, the new Creator: it is through his work that all things have become new (2 Cor 5:17).

## 2. *Paul's Creation Typology*

The verses exhibit an observable swing from the personal and individual language of 5:1-11 to a different key in which "the whole sweep of human history is embraced by the two epochs instituted by Adam and Christ."<sup>29</sup> The perspective of vv. 12-19 thus differs from vv. 1-11 in its cosmic focus. Yet the continuity between the two paragraphs is equally noticeable by virtue of "the re-emergence of the reversal theme in explicit terms of the two men whose single acts of disobedience and obedience encapsulate and determine the character of the two epochs which together span human history. A very effective conclusion is thus achieved by showing how the sweeping indictment of Adamic humanity in 1.19ff., and repeated summarily in 3.23, is more than answered by the abundance of grace through Christ."<sup>30</sup>

It is in keeping with this cosmic/salvation-historical perspective that Paul continues to retrogress from the Torah backward in history. In chap. 4 he appealed to Abraham's priority to the law; and here he takes a further step back to Adam and the creation, thus recapitulating the argument begun in 1:18, in which he depicted the revelation of God's wrath as the outworking of the primal covenant relationship between the Creator and his creatures (the punitive side of the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*). Paul's tendency in Romans to move back beyond the Torah, a tacit denial of its eternity, is further illustrated by 2:12-16, according to which creation accounts for the law shared in common by Jew and Gentile.

At the head of old and new creations respectively are the first Adam and the last. In Acts 17:26 Paul is reported to say that God made from one (*ἐξ ἑνός*) all people to live on all the face of the earth; and here the comparison of the two Adams stresses that through "one man" (*δι' ἑνός*) and his singular act of disobedience or obedience the whole race has been affected for ill or for good. With all the debate on particulars, the one given of the passage is that each division of humanity is in solidarity with its leader, so that the action of the "one" has a bearing on the condition of the "many."

<sup>29</sup> Dunn, *Romans* 1.271. Dunn further observes that the final sentence of chap. 5, which serves as a transition into the next phase of the discussion, places side by side the two quasi-powers who dominate the old aeon (sin and death).

<sup>30</sup> Dunn, "Analysis," 2856. Cf. Moo, *Romans*, 326.

Of course, there is no overall consensus as to the mechanics of the solidarity in question.<sup>31</sup> Since Paul does not say explicitly what impels his logic, the exegete must reconstruct from his world of thought, which can be understood variously. Corporate personality is a possibility, though it has not escaped criticism;<sup>32</sup> and while it cannot be dismissed entirely, Käsemann is correct that "Decisive in the interpretation of our text . . . is not the comparison of two heads of a generation, but of the two figures, in sharp dualism, who alone inaugurated a world of perdition and salvation, so that they cannot be listed in a series of ancestors." "In dualistic contrast Christ and Adam are now the bearers of destiny for the world determined by them."<sup>33</sup>

Thus, in interpreting Rom 5:12-21 it is vital to see that Paul's vision encompasses the whole of creation. "The spheres of Adam and Christ, of death and life, are separated as alternative, exclusive, and ultimate, and this happens in *global breadth*. An old world and a new world are at issue."<sup>34</sup> Consequently, given the creation focus of 5:12-19 (and chaps. 5-8 as a whole), man as the image of God springs immediately to mind. It is through the first and last Adams respectively that humanity bears either the failed or successful likeness of the Creator. The identification and character of all people thus depend on Adam or Christ, the "direct" images of the invisible God. Therefore, the primal principle of creation continues: *like begets like*. The "many" and the "all" bear the likeness of the "one" in that they derive their being and nature from him and imitate his example. This, we shall argue, most effectively opens up Paul's intentions in this highly controversial passage.

### 3. *Paul's Dialogue with Israel*

This portion of Paul's letter is more than just a teaching model to explain the nature of the new creation which has arrived in Christ; it is, in fact, integral to his interaction with the Jewish point of view. In the words of J. C. Beker, "Jew and Gentile are now subsumed under the one figure of Adam, who by his transgression sealed 'all men' . . . under sin and death. The subject is no longer Jew or Gentile but 'the many.'"<sup>35</sup> Taken within

<sup>31</sup> Cf. W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895) 132; Moo, *Romans*, 340. The various attempts to relate the personal and corporate aspects of sin and death are discussed in full by Moo, *ibid.*, 335-41.

<sup>32</sup> See S. E. Porter, "The Pauline Concept of Original Sin, in Light of Rabbinic Background," *TynBul* 41 (1990) 16 (with literature). Akin to corporate personality is the "ancestor-descendant" motif, i.e., the descendant is affected by the actions of the progenitor. See J. Cambier, "Péchés des Hommes et Péché d'Adam en Rom. V.12," *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 221, 225-26.

<sup>33</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 142-43, 146. Cf. A. Oepke, TDNT 2.542

<sup>34</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 147 (italics mine).

<sup>35</sup> Beker, *Paul*, 15.

its polemical context, Rom 5:12-19 bears witness to the radicalness of Paul's stance toward Israel. Some two and half centuries before Paul we encounter the idea that the people of Israel and their Torah are God's new beginning and the remedy for the ills of Adam's disobedience (Sir 10:19; 17:1-17).<sup>36</sup> Similar ideas characterized apocalyptic as a whole.<sup>37</sup> Moreover, in at least one rabbinic text, *Gen. Rab.* 14.6, Abraham appears as a second Adam, compensating for the failure of the original Adam. As N. T. Wright has demonstrated, the Adam theology of Jewish literature is intended to advance a claim about *Israel* in the purposes of God. As such, it fulfills a specific purpose, i.e., to mark out this nation as God's true humanity and the realization of his creation designs. In brief, "Adam has become embodied . . . in Israel, the people of the Torah, and in her future hope."<sup>38</sup>

On reflection, one can say that there is a legitimate sense in which a new beginning was made with Abraham and continued into subsequent Israelite history. However, Israel's mistake was to suppose that the world was made for her and that she alone was meant to reprise the role marked out for Adam, consonant with the fact that it was the law—the embodiment of true wisdom—which formed the charter of Israel's national life precisely as the way of God's true humanity.<sup>39</sup> As a result, Paul's contemporaries were insistent that participation in the new creation was possible only within the parameters of the chosen people and their Torah.

This means that the apostle's qualification of the Jewish position is an important one, inasmuch as all the promises of God find their "yes" in *Christ* (2 Cor 1:20). If Israel marked a new beginning in the saving purposes of God, it was only that in the fullness of time this new beginning might, in Christ, be extended to the ends of the earth. The role traditionally assigned to Israel has devolved on Christ: Paul now regards *him and his people* as God's true humanity.<sup>40</sup> He is bold enough to say, on the one hand, that humanity outside of Christ—including Israel—is in Adam and, therefore, still participates in the effects of his sin ("ungodly," "sinners," "enemies," "wrath"). On the other hand, with equal boldness, he asserts that everyone in Christ—regardless of ethnic identity and commitment to the Torah—has entered the new creation with its blessings ("justified," "saved," "reconciled"). In general terms, 5:1-1.1 describes weak, ungodly people who have

<sup>36</sup> See D. B. Garlington, "ἸΕΡΟΣΥΛΕΙΝ and the Idolatry of Israel (Romans 2.22)," *NTS* 36 (1990) 145-47; id., 'The Obedience of Faith': *A Pauline Phrase in Historical Context* (WUNT 2/38; Tübingen: Mohr, 1991) 58-60.

<sup>37</sup> De Boer, *Defeat of Death*, 153-54.

<sup>38</sup> N. T. Wright, "Adam in Pauline Christology," *SBLSP 1983*, 360-65 (quote from p. 364). Cf. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 31-37.

<sup>39</sup> Wright, "Adam," 361-63.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, 365-87 (esp. pp. 370-73). Wright qualifies, however, that Christ does not simply replace Israel; he began where Adam ended, with the entail of sin, working its way out to judgment, and thus must deal with the "many trespasses" and condemnation resultant from Adam's sin (*ibid.*, 371-72). He later contrasts the redemptive work of Christ with Israel's failure to redeem the world, seeking, rather, to rule it (p. 389).

missed the way of God's covenant nation.<sup>41</sup> However, the real impact (scandal) of Romans 5 as a whole is precisely the involvement of Israel in Adam's apostasy.

It is the role played by Rom 5:12-21 within Paul's dialogue with Israel which, at least in part, serves to inform us of his intentions; that is, Christ has succeeded where Adam and Israel have not.<sup>42</sup> The first man failed to accomplish his mandate of bringing the earth to its full potential, its "eschatological" state. Another son of God, Israel, likewise became idolatrous by exchanging the glory of the immortal God for images (Rom 1:23 = Ps 106:20; Jer 2:11).<sup>43</sup> In the case of Paul's contemporaries, the disobedience in question was a failure to be loyal to the God of Israel because of an idolatrous attachment to the Torah.<sup>44</sup> By way of contrast, the obedience of Christ, as we shall argue, can be defined as his perseverance in faith and his consequent realization of what man was intended to be in the first Adam. Our treatment of the passage, then, will concentrate on those aspects of Paul's argument which stand at the forefront of his claim that the last Adam has succeeded where the first Adam fell short.

#### 4. *The Disobedient First Adam and the Old Humanity*

(1) *Adam's Sin as the Gateway of All Subsequent Sin and Death.* Verse 12, the protasis of Paul's sentence, to be completed by the apodosis of vv. 18-19, is a statement of cause and effect: through one man sin and death entered into the world, so that death (has) spread to all men because all, in some sense, (have) sinned. Unlike many of his contemporaries, Paul does not speculate about the way in which sin entered the world: he is concerned with universal experience, not cosmic speculation. However, it is equally true, contrary particularly to Dodd, that he *is* concerned with origins, if for no other reason than to lay the foundation for the origin of righteousness in Christ. If, as Dodd affirms, in Adam humanity is corporately sinful,<sup>45</sup> it is precisely because Adam was the first disobedient man. Adam, most pointedly, is the origin of sin and, consequently, death in the world: "Adam sums up and symbolizes all this humanity both in his person and in his behaviour, and

<sup>41</sup> Kaylor, *Community*, 100.

<sup>42</sup> The joint failure of Adam and Israel is evident in Rom 7:7-11. See my "Romans 7:14-25," 207-10.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. G. C. Berkouwer, *Sin* (Studies in Dogmatics; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971) 274. Berkouwer has seen that the sin of Israel follows the same lines as the breaking of the original covenant by Adam (Hos 6:7). Cf. B. B. Warfield, "Hosea VI.7: Adam or Man?" in *Selected Shorter Writings of Benjamin B. Warfield* (ed. J. E. Meeter; Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1970) 1.116-29.

<sup>44</sup> This is the thesis of my "ΙΠΟΣΥΛΕΙΝ." Cf. "Obedience of Faith, II," 51-52, 55. On the kindred idolatry motif of Acts 7:39-53, see J. Kilgallen, *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7,2-53* (AnBib 67; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976) 90-98.

<sup>45</sup> Dodd, *Romans*, 80.

the conditions of life of every individual are moulded by it."<sup>46</sup> As Dunn reminds us, Adam (ἄδამ) means "man": what can be said of Adam can be said of men in general, and what is true of men in general is true of Adam.<sup>47</sup> Thus, "In the fall narrative of Genesis 3 'all subsequent human history lies encapsulated'; its incidents are re-enacted in the life of the race and indeed, to some extent, of each member of the race."<sup>48</sup>

Of course, what Paul precisely means is a matter of both historical and contemporary debate.<sup>49</sup> Consequently, it is possible only to set forth certain conclusions without entering in detail into the debate. The controversy centers chiefly on the last clause of v. 12, Paul's depiction of the plight of mankind outside of Christ. Sin and death first entered the world δι' ἑνός ἀνθρώπου, yet death spread to all people, in Paul's words, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Käsemann identifies v. 12d as the real interpretive problem, where, in his view, the motif of destiny which dominates v. 12a-c gives way to that of the personal guilt of mankind.<sup>50</sup> Of course, not everyone sees in these words personal guilt at all, but the imputed guilt of Adam's original trespass. So, in what sense is it meaningful to say πάντες ἥμαρτον, thus accounting for the dissemination of death and suffering among the human race? The various answers to the question have understandably focused on ἐφ' ᾧ and ἥμαρτον, to which we shall give some attention; yet the scope of reivreg is not irrelevant to the discussion.

The Augustinian equation of ἐφ' ᾧ with *in quo* ("in whom," i.e., Adam), grammatically and lexically speaking anyway, has been discounted by modern scholars, even if theologically one accepts that mankind sinned "in Adam."<sup>51</sup> With some degree of confidence at least, it can be said that the expression is either idiomatic, meaning "because" or "in that," or equivalent to ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι, grounding the death of mankind in the circumstance that all have sinned.<sup>52</sup> Either lends itself to the interpretation herein proposed.

<sup>46</sup> Leenhardt, *Romans*, 141 (see his perceptive comments on pp. 140-44). Cf. Nygren, *Romans*, 213. Various Jewish authors attributed the advent of sin to Satan (e.g., Wis 2:14) and Eve (e.g., *Apoc. Mos.* 32.2), not Adam directly. Paul himself can associate Eve with humanity's fall (Rom 7:11; 2 Cor 11:3; 2 Tim 2:13-14), without, however, holding her responsible for it. *Deut. R.* 9 (206a), like Paul, blames Adam. 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 54.15 also formally agrees with Paul that it was Adam who sinned first and brought death upon all who were not in his own time (but see below n. 65).

<sup>47</sup> J. D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (London: SCM, 1980) 101. Cf. Davies, *Paul*, 55.

<sup>48</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Tyndale, 1963) 126.

<sup>49</sup> These have been detailed by Cranfield, *Romans* 1.274-79; id., "On Some of the Problems of the Interpretation of Romans 5.12," *SJT* 22 (1969) 330-38; Johnson, "Romans 5:12," 306-13; J. Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin* (repr. Nutley, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed, 1977).

<sup>50</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 147.

<sup>51</sup> E.g., Murray, *Imputation*, 9 n. 10; Bruce, *Romans*, 130.

<sup>52</sup> S. Lyonnet, "Le sens de ἐφ' ᾧ en Rom 5, 12 et l'exégèse des Pères grecs," *Bib* 36 (1955) 436-56, as followed by numerous scholars (but see the criticisms of Brandenburger, *Adam*, 171-720). For example, M. Black, *Romans* (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1973) 89, proposes that

The referent of ἥμαρτον is a much more complicated matter. For reasons to be clarified presently, the view propounded here is that the verb has to do with the human situation resultant from its union with Adam. Paul, in other words, explains the universal sway of death to be due to the sin = apostasy of mankind, as rooted in the sin = apostasy of the first Adam. ἥμαρτον, accordingly, gives voice to mankind's repetition (in principle) of Adam's trespass, thus giving rise to the spread of sin and death throughout the human family. Among the commentators, the stance assumed by me is approximated by Cranfield (following the lead of Calvin), who understands ἥμαρτον in terms of "the fruit of the desperate moral debility and corruption which resulted from man's primal transgression and which all succeeding generations of mankind have inherited."<sup>53</sup> This is preferable, I think, to the imputation of Adam's guilt. However, even it is not precisely the point.

It is not to be overlooked that in Romans 5 Paul's thought is steeped in the creation. Thus, while it is true that humanity in Adam inherits a "sinful nature," eventuating in an aversion to God and his law, the most relevant thing we can say is that *man in Adam enters the world devoid of the Spirit of God*. As writers in the Reformed tradition have affirmed, Adam was made to be the temple of the Holy Spirit.<sup>54</sup> Therefore, when he fell, he forfeited the indwelling of the Spirit, so that all his descendants emerge from the womb bereft of the Spirit. As formed in the likeness of "the man of dust" (1 Cor 15:49), man in Adam, in Paul's words elsewhere, is a ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος (1 Cor 2:13),<sup>55</sup> possessing, in his fallenness, an ἀδόκιμος νοῦς (Rom 1:28). Vis-à-vis Cranfield and others, Ridderbos and Berkouwer are quite right that the present context directly concerns fallen man's immediate involvement in Adam's sin and death, not moral corruption as such.<sup>56</sup> This is why I have sought to emphasize that "sin" in the first instance is not so much "depravity" as a (damnation-) historical state introduced

the expression should be translated "*wherefore, from which it follows* [= thus providing proof], that all men, like Adam, sinned." Another alternative is proposed by Cambier ("Péchés," 242-51), who renders ἐφ' ᾧ as "celui qui," with ἀνθρώπους as the antecedent.

<sup>53</sup> Cranfield, *Romans* 1.278; id., "Problems," 335-40; Calvin, *Romans*, 111-12; id., *Institutes*, 2.1.8. Cf. Leenhardt, *Romans*, 141-46; Sanday/Headlam, *Romans*, 134. "Surely there must be something inherent in being human that causes everyone, without exception, to decide to worship idols rather than the true God" (Moo, *Romans*, 335; cf. p. 341). Moo, however, favors the imputation of Adam's sin.

<sup>54</sup> G. Smeaton, *The Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (repr. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1958) 10-17; M. G. Kline, *Images of the Spirit* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 13-34; Garlington, "Romans 7:14-24," 214.

<sup>55</sup> The ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος of 1 Cor 2:13 is the one to whom the things of the Spirit of God are foolishness. Man stemming from Adam is not only σῶμα ψυχικόν constitutionally (1 Cor 15:44), he has become ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος in the pregnant sense of the phrase, i.e., bereft of the Spirit and unable to discern the plan of God for the ages.

<sup>56</sup> H. N. Ridderbos, *Aan de Romeinen* (Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament; Kampen: Kok, 1959) 116; Berkouwer, *Sin*, 497.

by Adam.<sup>57</sup> Human failing is a reality; yet, in perspective, it is but the by-product of the apostasy bequeathed by Adam, whose hallmark is the absence of the Spirit.<sup>58</sup> Again thinking in salvation-historical terms, confirmation is had by Paul's teaching that the impartation of the Spirit is a new creation (cf. John 3:6, which also draws on the principle that like begets like). In becoming the renewed image of God, man in Christ is again indwelt by the Spirit, whose temple Adam was formed to be. We might say that whereas the first Adam forfeited the Spirit, the last Adam, in his role as life-giver, restores the Spirit (1 Cor 15:45). In this regard, Paul actually transcends the Adam-model in his representation of Christ by ascribing to him the role of the Creator-Spirit of Gen 1:2; 2:7.

It can be said, then, that Paul's intent in the latter part of v. 12, particularly evident from the words "and so death spread to all men," is *original death* more than original sin; it is original death that furnishes the background for the actual theme of the section: the origin of life.<sup>59</sup> Adam's ἁμαρτία, as chaps. 5-8 clarify, is not so much this or that infraction of the divine law; it is, rather, a state of estrangement and condemnation, which can do no other than produce death in the all-embracing sense.<sup>60</sup> In this regard, Moo correctly surmises that sin is given an active role: it "reigns" (5:20; cf. 6:13); it can be "obeyed" (6:16-17); it pays wages (6:23); it seizes opportunity (7:8, 11); it "kills" (7:11, 13); it is a power that holds sway in the world outside of Christ, bringing disaster and death on all humanity.<sup>61</sup>

<sup>57</sup> Cambier points out that the epochal coming of sin into the world parallels the epochal advent of Christ as "the coming one" ("Péchés," 232-33).

<sup>58</sup> This interpretation does not really assume an implicit "middle term," i.e., a bridge from Adam's sin to ours (Moo, *Romans*, 337, 354; cf. Murray, *Imputation*, 67), because the birth of every person into the world *ipso facto* guarantees immediate involvement in Adam's sin and death. But even if such a middle term is required, it is one provided by creation itself. Like begets like: as Adam sinned (apostatized), so have his progeny, who bear his image.

<sup>59</sup> R. Bultmann, "Adam and Christ According to Romans 5," in *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of Otto A. Piper* (eds. W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder; London: SCI, 1962) 152; F. L. Godet, *Commentary on Romans* (repr. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977) 205; Dunn, *Romans* 1.273. One can agree with Moo (*Romans*, 338 n. 39) that "original death" requires a corresponding idea of "original sin." But it is the definition of "original sin" which is the crux of the debate. As Dunn adds later, "Paul could be said to hold a doctrine of *original sin* in the sense that from the beginning everyone has been under the power of sin with death as the consequence, but not a doctrine of *original guilt*, since individuals are only held responsible for deliberate acts of defiance against God and his law" (*Romans* 1.291). The relation of original sin in Paul and the rabbinic doctrine of the יצר הרע, is here being left an open question, except to say that the element of choice appears to figure in both (Gambier, "Péchés," 220).

<sup>60</sup> See M. Stuart, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (London: William Tegg, 1857) 206-7; Dunn, *Romans* 1.275-76; Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 160-61, who writes that this is death in the sense of ἀπώλεια and ἀπόλλυσθαι, the outworking of God's ὀργή and the τέλος of sin (6:21). Brandenburger, *Adam*, 165-67, adds that θάνατος is man's radical lostness before God (κατάκριμα), as is shown by the antithesis of θάνατος-ζωή αἰώνιος (vv. 12, 17, 21).

<sup>61</sup> Moo, *Romans*, 331. Sanday/Headlam similarly describe sin as "a malignant force let loose among mankind" (*Romans*, 132). For this reason, death is also depicted in tyrant-like

"Paul," Käsemann adds, "is not speaking primarily of act and punishment but of ruling powers which implicate all people individually and everywhere determine reality as destiny."<sup>62</sup> All this suggests that sin is far more than guilt forensically considered; it is, in fact, a life-force of its own.

While individual acts of sin are the outgrowth of this ἁμαρτία, the consistent use of the singular noun throughout Romans 5-8 intimates that Paul looks upon sin as a unified and coherent whole;<sup>63</sup> along with death and the law, it stands for the old creation as that entity hostile to God and aligned with evil. If, as seems to be the case, Paul distinguishes between "sin" and "transgression," the latter is but the unavoidable consequence of the former, "an inward disposition of rebellion against God rising out of exaltation of the self."<sup>64</sup> To put it most pointedly, "sin" is *apostasy*. Paul, therefore, can insist in 6:5-11 that the believer has died to sin, i.e., renounced his former condition of rebellion: his orientation is now to the new age and its ideals. This means, on the other hand, that the contrast between chap. 6 and 7:14-25 is not as stark as has been imagined, because while one can renounce in principle the values of the old life, those values still seek to assert their dominance, thus setting up the conflict depicted in 7:14-25.

It is in this setting that ἥμαρτον, which focuses attention on human activity subsequent to Adam, speaks of the race in its imitation of its forebear,<sup>65</sup> with the effect that death spread to all people, "taking hold of each

terms. See C. C. Black, "Pauline Perspectives on Death in Romans 5-8," *JBL* 103 (1984) 430-31.

<sup>62</sup> Käsemann, *Romans*, 150 (on v. 14). Cf. Gambier, "Péchés," 233-34; Brandenburger, *Adam*, 160 et passim.

<sup>63</sup> See Beker, *Paul*, 189-90. Moo points out that 5:12-8:13 contains 65 percent (42 of 64) of Paul's usages of ἁμαρτία—and all are in the singular (*Romans*, 331). He further contends that "sin" (in the singular) is composed of individual acts of sin; these, he says, are a principle or network of sin, "which is so pervasive and dominant that the person's destiny is determined by the those actions." I would want to say, rather, that the various actions, or "sins," are determined by the "sin" which is Adam's rebellion. A person's actions, of course, have a bearing on his destiny. Yet in Adam one's destiny has already been fixed, until, that is, one is transferred into Christ.

<sup>64</sup> C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1957) 112.

<sup>65</sup> "The distinction between the 'one' and the 'all' is matched by the distinction between ἁμαρτία and ἥμαρτον. . . ." (Dunn, *Romans* 274). Reference is frequently made to 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 54.19: "Adam is, therefore, not the cause, except only for himself, but each of us has become his own Adam." In context, the statement reminds Israel that Adam's choice to forsake God does not have to be the choice of everyone. While death is inevitable because of his sin (v. 15), judgment is not. Hence, individuals must decide for future glory so as to avoid the coming torment (vv. 15-16); those who choose otherwise are the unrighteous, who do not love God's law and refuse to be instructed by his creation (vv. 14, 17-18). Inasmuch as both this author and Paul highlight human responsibility, there is a formal agreement between them. However, any attempt to draw a direct parallel must take cognizance of one important qualification, viz., that in the latter the faithful and the wicked both reside within the community of Israel. Throughout the apocalypse the scribe speaks to the people and, e.g., in chaps. 41-42 he confronts the issue of apostasy from the covenant. Hence, the ability to choose assumed by the

individual man in turn, as the generations succeeded one another."<sup>66</sup> This is the sin whose essential traits return in every sin:<sup>67</sup> "As poison once swallowed penetrates to all parts of the body, so it happened in Adam, in whom the whole race was virtually contained; in him the tendency to dissolution victoriously asserted itself over all the individuals that were to come, so that every one of them was born dying."<sup>68</sup> It is in this sense that David confesses that he was brought forth in iniquity and conceived in sin (Ps 51:5). Not only so, the gravity of the human condition grows exponentially with the birth of every new person into the world,<sup>69</sup> beginning with Cain, whose murder of his brother followed immediately upon his father's rebellion against God.

It is in this all-embracing sense that death εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διήλθεν; it has *permeated* (Murray) and *pervaded* (Sanday/Headlam) Adam's race *in toto*. Though it is true that several times in Romans 5 Paul calls our attention to the one man through whom sin and death became realities, there is reason to think that his concern is equally with the κόσμος or the people to whom death has penetrated.<sup>70</sup> Wilckens calls attention to the fact that v. 12 (vv. 18-19) does not mention Adam by name, from which he infers that Paul's interest lies not so much in Adam personally as in his role of the portal through which the *world* became the place of death's activity. That is to say, Adam's sin is significant because it occasioned the demise of the κόσμος.<sup>71</sup> Without, then, downplaying the repeated stress on the one man,

words "Adam is not the cause, except only for himself" is to be located within its covenant context, as are similar statements in, e.g., Sir 1:26; 15:15; 21:11; Tob 4:5; *Pss. Sol.* 9.7; *T. Ash.* 1; 4 Macc 1:15; CD 3.3. Cf. Garlington, "Romans 7:14-25," 221 n. 105. In distinction, the impression left by Paul is that Adam's descendants not only willingly imitate his example, they are compelled to do so because they partake of a community of nature with him, including—quite radically—Israel.

<sup>66</sup> Cranfield, *Romans* 1.274.

<sup>67</sup> Berkouwer, *Sin*, 274.

<sup>68</sup> Godet, *Romans*, 206.

<sup>69</sup> See Leenhardt, *Romans*, 143. Paul's own thought is remarkably similar to 4 Ezra 3.7-11, 20-27; 4.30; 7.118. L. Morris observes that Paul is not simply repeating a Jewish commonplace, since no other author goes as far as he. Nonetheless, these references show that his position developed naturally from his Jewish background (*The Epistle to the Romans* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988] 230 n. 47). Cf. Wright, "Adam," 370. C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: A. & C. Black, 1962) 8-9, 14-15, deduces that the common element between Paul and the various Jewish writers is the disastrous effects of Adam's sin, which are ultimately cosmic in proportion. Cf. Scroggs, *Adam*, 17-20, 33-38; Wedderburn, "Structure," 344-45.

<sup>70</sup> On κόσμος, see J. G. Gibbs, *Creation and Redemption: A Study in Pauline Theology* (NovTSup 26; Leiden: Brill, 1971) 51 n. 2; Garlington, "Romans 7:14-25," 226-27 n. 126.

<sup>71</sup> Wilckens, *Römer* 1.315. Dunn calls Adam an "epochal figure," i.e., he is "the one who initiated the first major phase of human history and thereby determined the character of that phase for those belonging to it" (*Romans* 1.289). Cf. Barth, *Shorter Commentary*, 61; Ridderbos, *Romeinen*, 112; A. J. M. Wedderburn, "Adam in Paul's Letter to the Romans," in *Studia Biblica 1978. III. Papers on Paul and Other New Testament Authors* (JSNTSup 3; ed. E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1980) 423.

whose significance we shall explore below, it follows that the preposition διὰ should receive at least equal stress: it was *through* the one man that all have been affected for ill. When in vv. 18-19 Paul returns to his original point, it is this preposition which will serve to underscore the instrumental significance of Christ for the new humanity's obedience and life.<sup>72</sup>

Thus far it has been intimated that within the cadre of the present passage the terms "sin" and "disobedience" are to be regarded specifically as apostasy. The basis for this assumption now needs to be clarified. In a nutshell, not only is such a connotation appropriate because of the focus on perseverance in Romans 5 but also because of several supporting considerations: the precedent established by the earlier portion of Romans, Paul's Jewish heritage, and parallels in other NT authors. To these we now turn.

That sin, which has opened the floodgates to death and destruction, ought to be interpreted in the terms proposed is supported by Paul's use of identical language earlier in the letter. According to Rom 2:12, one of the things held in common by Jew and Gentile is sin: ὅσοι γὰρ ἀνόμως ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως ἀπολοῦνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἐν νόμῳ ἥμαρτον, ἀνόμως κριθήσονται. The verb ἁμαρτάνω here stands over against Adam's original quest for glory, honor, and immortality, commensurate with his continued trust in the word of God and commitment to the person of his Creator.<sup>73</sup> "Sin," therefore, is apostasy or mankind's failure to attain to its raison d'être.

Rom 3:23 epitomizes the whole of human history with the words πάντες ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ. The phrase πάντες ἥμαρτον, which is the precise combination of words found in 5:12, glances back to 3:9: πάντα ὑφ' ἁμαρτίαν εἶναι, Paul's conclusion from the foregoing discussion of mankind's rebellion against God the Creator. In fact, 3:23 itself is a summary of 1:18-3:20, in which Adam/creation motifs occupied a place of some prominence. With the willing compliance of the first man, the agenda of creation was sabotaged by Satan, and all who bear Adam's likeness continue his resistance to the Creator and thus fall perpetually short of the divine image (note the present tense of ὑστεροῦνται). Humanity (including Israel) in Adam is idolatrous (apostate) by definition: all his progeny bear his image in that they are born in a condition of estrangement from God (cf. Ps 51:5), with an inbuilt disposition to serve the creature rather than the Creator. Hence, 3:23, as it distills the whole of 1:18-3:20, sheds a considerable amount of light on 5:12, especially as the verse provides another point of contact with chap. 5, viz., the creation term "glory."

<sup>72</sup> The same is true of 1 Cor 15:21. Stuart (*Romans*, 204) remarks that διὰ, designates the *causa principalis*, not the mere secondary, instrumental, or occasional cause. Note how in vv. 18-19 δι' ἑνός is complemented by εἰς πάντας and πάντας ἀνθρώπους, who are made either sinners or righteous.

<sup>73</sup> Garlington, "Obedience of Faith, II," esp. 56-61.

That is to say, humanity's shortfall of the glory of God is its failure to be the accurate image of God (Ps 8:5).<sup>74</sup>

Wedderburn maintains that this interpretation of ἄμαρτάνω is supported by the fact that Paul normally uses the verb with regard to responsible and personal sinning, particularly in the Romans passages just cited, in which, he remarks, "Paul's whole argument would be vitiated if any mouth were not stopped by the consciousness of its own guilt before God."<sup>75</sup> The clause πάντες ἥμαρτον, therefore, in both cases is to be taken in the same sense, i.e., death has spread to all because all *have sinned*, i.e., have apostatized, because of their union with Adam. Thus interpreted, the aorist in each instance is constative (summary) and is to be translated by the English present perfect tense.<sup>76</sup>

As to Paul's Jewish background, of obvious significance is Genesis 3's account of the fall of Adam. Without going into any real detail, the heart of the narrative is to the effect that "Adam endeavoured to set himself in the place of God . . . and in that moment sin was born."<sup>77</sup> Not content with being God's image, he aspired to be as God himself. "Man was unwilling to recognize a Lord; he chose to be Lord himself, and to glorify himself,"<sup>78</sup> all because the Serpent "twisted the instruction of the Creator given for man's good and made it sound like the legislation of a dictator fearful of losing his special status and prerogatives. Thus deceived, man clutched at a godlike life and grasped only death."<sup>79</sup> From that point on, the Creator/creature distinction was distorted, rendering Adam an idolater and a defector from the covenantal bond established in the creation.<sup>80</sup> Berkouwer, then, justifiably writes that although the word *fall* does not occur in Genesis 3, "sin is pictured as *apostasy from God*."<sup>81</sup>

Moving briefly to postbiblical Judaism, we find that "sin" assumes precisely the meaning of apostasy in Sir 24:22: "Whoever obeys me will not be

<sup>74</sup> On man as the glory-image of God, see Kline, *Images*, 13-43.

<sup>75</sup> Wedderburn, "Structure," 351. He further remarks that a reference to individual guilt makes the best sense in the light of Jewish parallels (*ibid.*, 352). See the defense of this interpretation of ἄμαρτάνω and ἄμαρτία by Brandenburger, *Adam*, 175-76 (who passes on other references, p. 175 n. 3); Stuart, *Romans*, 213-17, 220-27; Cambier, "Peches," 235-41. The verb ἄμαρτάνω is used of Adam's own personal sin in v. 16a, so that the sin of his posterity matches his own.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Cranfield, *Romans* 1.279; Cambier, "Péchés," 241; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 833. As contra Morris (*Romans*, 231), the aorist in 5:12 no more *has* to point to "one act in the past," i.e., the sin of Adam, than in 2:12 and 3:23.

<sup>77</sup> Barrett, *Romans*, 111. On the motif of Adam's idolatry in Rom 1:18-32, based on Genesis 3, see M. D. Hooker, "Adam in Romans I," *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 297-306; Dunn, *Christology*, 101-2; Barrett, *Adam*, 17-20; Wedderburn, "Adam," 413-19.

<sup>78</sup> Barrett, *Romans*, 36-37 (on 1:21).

<sup>79</sup> Dunn, *Christology*, 103.

<sup>80</sup> See Garlington, "Romans 7:14-25," 207-10, and the literature cited, to which I would add Berkouwer, *Sin*, 268-74.

<sup>81</sup> Berkouwer, *Sin*, 268. Likewise Calvin, *Institutes* 2.1.4; A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit: Ein Kommentar zum Römerbrief* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1935) 192.

put to shame, and those who work with my help will not sin." This is to be compared with Sir 4:15-16 and 15:15:

He who obeys her will judge the nations,  
 and whoever gives heed to her will dwell secure.  
 If he has faith in her he will obtain her;  
 and his descendants will remain in possession of her.  
 ...  
 If you will, you can keep the commandments,  
 and to act faithfully is a matter of your own choice.

In these several pronouncements, the scribe exhorts his students to obey wisdom or the Torah. According to the immediate context of 4:15-16 (vv. 17-19), one is to give heed to wisdom because she is a tester of those who come forward to serve the Lord (cf. Sir 2:1-6). The author here casts his disciples in the role of Israel tested in the wilderness, to see if they will persevere in trials and confirm their confidence in wisdom, their guide and disciplinarian.<sup>82</sup> Sir 15:15 places in parallel keeping the commandments and faithful action, which is not "legalistic" perfection but the disciple's continued allegiance to his covenant commitment.<sup>83</sup> It is in comparison with these kindred statements that the saying of 24:22 makes sense: "Whoever *obeys* me will not be put to shame, and those who work with my help [ἐν ἐμοί] will not *sin*." (Note how Ben Sira quite naturally associates two of the most crucial terms of Rom 5:12-19, "obedience" and "sin.") In light of the sage's encouragement to confess one's shortcomings (4:26), "sin" cannot have reference to sinless perfection, and, because of the *parallelismus membrorum* of the verse, "obey" likewise cannot mean anything approaching this. Rather, wisdom's promise is that the obedient person will not sin so as to forsake Yahweh and incur judgment (contrast 2 Apoc. Bar. 54.22, in context). This was particularly relevant for Ben Sira, given the incipient Hellenistic encroachments on Israelite religion and culture in his day.<sup>84</sup>

Compatible with the perspective of Ben Sira is the claim of the Wisdom of Solomon that "We will not sin, because we know that we are accounted thine" (Wis 15:2). The immediate context dictates that the "sin" in question is idolatry or apostasy. By way of parallel, Wis 14:29-31 is especially relevant. The writer condemns those who trust in lifeless idols, devote themselves to, i.e., obey (προσέχω) them, and, consequently, have contempt for the holiness of God's covenant. Accordingly, there is a "just penalty for those who sin." Therefore, ἁμαρτάνω assumes in this setting the specific connotation of abandonment of Yahweh in favor of a pagan lifestyle. But, for the writer, because believers are accounted God's, their *perseverance* is assured. In terms of Wis 15:3, the faithful possess the knowledge of God,

<sup>82</sup> I have treated the text in *Obedience*, 26-28.

<sup>83</sup> See further *ibid.*, 31-33.

<sup>84</sup> See *ibid.*, 15-19, and the other literature cited.

which is the root of their immortality, as opposed to idols, which have no power to confer eternal life. This reading of "sin" in the passage is buttressed by the motif of the testing of the righteous sons of God which permeates the book of Wisdom.<sup>85</sup>

In view of the above texts, the statement of Pr Man 8 is perfectly comprehensible: "Thou therefore, O Lord, that art the God of the just, hast not appointed repentance to the just, to Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, who have not sinned against thee; but thou hast appointed repentance to me that am a sinner." A casual reading would suggest that the author is attributing sinlessness to Israel's patriarchs. To "sin," however, means "commit idolatry." The Prayer places this confession in the mouth of Manasseh, one of the most wicked of the Israelite kings, who made his children pass through the fire of idolatrous sacrifice. So, for this author repentance has been appointed even for the worst kind of sinner, the idolater and the apostate. The "just," by contrast, do not need repentance in the sense intended, because they have never forsaken the covenant. Cf. *Pss. Sol.* 17:36 and *T. Jud.* 24:1, which predicate "sin"-lessness of the Messiah.

Such a meaning of "sin" is also in evidence in NT authors other than Paul. The Epistle to the Hebrews warns its readers, "If we sin deliberately after receiving the knowledge of the truth, there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins" (Heb 10:26). The adverb "deliberately" or "willingly" (ἐκούσιως), as H. W. Attridge comments, reflects the Pentateuchal distinction between high-handed and inadvertent sins, which, he says, was widely recognized in postbiblical Judaism. "As the sequel indicates, our author has in mind a specific willful sin, that of apostasy."<sup>86</sup> It goes without saying that the burden of the entire letter is perseverance.

1 John 3:4-9 equates sin with lawlessness (ἀνομία). The concept of lawlessness is one which, in Jewish history and literature, comes into prominence during the Greek persecution and Maccabean revolt of the second century BC. To make a long story very short, the lawless (ἄνομοι and παράνομοι) correspond to the "Sons of Belial," who, according to Deuteronomy 13, arose from the people to induce them to worship foreign gods. Lawlessness, in other words, was apostasy.<sup>87</sup> John's own equation of sin as lawlessness fits very easily into this category, so that the ἀνομία which is ἁμαρτία, and vice versa (both subject and predicate are preceded by an article), is not to be reduced to individual infractions of God's law; it is, rather, *the abandonment of God himself*. This is why John can identify the one who sins with the Devil, who "has sinned from the beginning" (v. 8). The apostate, in other words, bears the image of the one responsible for mankind's primal falling away in the Garden of Eden.

<sup>85</sup> See *ibid.*, 74-79, 84-86.

<sup>86</sup> H. W. Attridge, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989) 292. Cf. Dunn, *Romans* 1.275.

<sup>87</sup> See Garlington, *Obedience*, 91-102 et passim.

Stephen Smalley confirms that elsewhere in the NT lawlessness bears a technical meaning and can serve as a description of the "Satan-inspired rejection of God and his law that will be manifest in the present age and will come to a climax before Christ's second coming." "It implies," consequently, "not merely breaking God's law, but flagrantly opposing him (in Satanic fashion) by so doing."<sup>88</sup> I. H. Marshall concurs: "To commit sin is thus to place oneself on the side of the Devil and the Antichrist and to stand in opposition to Christ." He argues that this understanding of "lawlessless" is in keeping with John's earlier teaching on the presence of the Antichrist in the world. "One cannot hope for the appearing of Christ and at the same time persist in the sin which signifies rebellion against him. Sin is not a matter of isolated peccadillos: it is an expression of siding with God's ultimate enemy—the Devil (vv. 8-10)."<sup>89</sup> It is in this specific sense that John can affirm that anyone born of God does not "sin," i.e., apostatize (1 John 5:18): he is kept by Christ, and the evil one does not touch him. But because temptations to apostasy are always present, John feels compelled to remind his readers to keep themselves from idols (5:21), particularly as there is such a thing as a sin which is "unto death" (5:16), i.e., apostasy.<sup>90</sup>

In encouraging his fellow Christians to persevere through the fiery trial to which they have been called, Peter places before them the example of Christ, who did not sin and on whose lips no deceit was found (1 Pet 2:22). The words ὅς ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὐδὲ εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ are quoted from the LXX of Isa 53:9, except that ἁμαρτίαν is substituted for ἀνομίαν. For Isaiah, ἀνομία (ἄνπι) is significant because of the bitter irony involved in the treatment the Servant of Yahweh: he is to be cut off from the people as an apostate from the covenant, although, in fact, he was not guilty of such "lawlessness." Peter's perspective is the same: he would have his readers understand that Jesus, even in the face of abusive speech insinuating his guilt (v. 23), did not repay evil with evil; rather he continued to entrust himself to the one who judges righteously and finally finished his course.

The change of ἀνομία to ἁμαρτία in the quotation may be accounted for by its second clause. The first man on whose lips deceit was found was Adam, who sought to cover his sin (cf. Prov 28:13) by blaming his disobedience immediately on his wife and ultimately on God (Gen 3:12). For Isaiah, the Servant's refusal to commit ἀνομία is the reverse of Adam's apostasy and attempted cover-up. Again Peter's concern is the same as the prophet's; but in substituting "sin" for "lawlessness," he draws on a synonymous term (as evidenced by John's usage) which places it beyond doubt

<sup>88</sup> S. Smalley 1, 2, 3 John (WBC; Waco: Word, 1984) 155. Paul's own phrase ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς ἀνομίας (2 Thess 2:3) may be an allusion to Adam, the first man associated with ἀνομία or apostasy (Barrett, *Adam*, 14). It is particularly striking that the same verse connects this man with ἡ ἀποστασία.

<sup>89</sup> I. H. Marshall, *The Epistles of John* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 176, 177.

<sup>90</sup> See Smalley, *1 John*, 297-98.

that, unlike Adam, Christ did not forsake his Father and then resort to deceit to excuse his rebellion.

In light of these data, the assertion of 1 Pet 2:22 is not a generalized or abstract statement of the sinlessness of Christ: it is an assurance that the believer can endure in the midst of persecution, because his Lord, the one who refused to repeat the infidelity of Adam, "did not sin." In his own way, Peter, as Paul, represents Christ as another Adam, who succeeds where his predecessor failed.

Apart from "sin," "disobedience" frequently in the OT and usually in intertestamental literature is tantamount to apostasy. The materials are too massive even to begin to canvass. I can only relate the conclusion drawn from a previous study of the Jewish materials:<sup>91</sup> whereas obedience is a commitment to God's covenant as articulated by the law of Moses, disobedience is apostasy from the covenant and the God of the covenant. The same connotation is brought over in the NT in Heb 3:18-19, where "those who were *disobedient*" were unable to enter the land because of *unbelief*. It is the disobedience (= unbelief) of the first wilderness generation which in Hebrews is juxtaposed to the obedience of Christ (e.g., 5:8) and the obedience to which its readers are called (e.g., 3:7-19).

In keeping with these examples in Romans and in Jewish and Christian sources, which have to do directly with ideas associated with the train of thought in Romans 5, I would suggest that a pattern within the letter is observable. Rom 1:18-3:20 is Paul's indictment of the "sin" of the human race, depicted in Adam-like terms. Rom 3:23 (preceded by 3:9) summarizes the entire first portion of the letter with its declaration that "all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God. Rom 5:1-11 similarly epitomizes the "sin" of man outside Christ with the terms "ungodly," "sinners," "enemies," and "wrath." Rom 5:12-19 then builds upon the foundation laid in the earlier chapters by making explicit what was more or less implicit before; that is, the human race's estrangement from God the Creator is traceable back to the first human being, Adam, whose "sin" and "disobedience" plunged the world into grief. All this sets the stage for Paul's presentation of another Adam, who by his "righteousness" and "obedience" rectifies the apostasy of his predecessor and its consequences on his race: the divine program for man which broke down with Adam is to be run through again, this time in the person of Jesus.<sup>92</sup>

Finally, in our consideration of Rom 5:12, there is the scope of "all" in Paul's assertion that *πάντες ἥμαρτον*. It is often charged that the above interpretation fails to reckon with the reality of infant mortality, especially in light of the statement of v. 14 that death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's trespass. Suffice it to say that the objection overlooks the phenomenon that *πάντες* in

<sup>91</sup> Garlington, *Obedience*, passim.

<sup>92</sup> Dunn, *Christology*, 111.

5:12-19 has primary reference to Jew and Gentile without distinction, in keeping with the other occurrences of "all" in Romans. Likewise in 3:23, the same "all" who have fallen short of God's glory are justified by God's grace (3:24). In both 3:23 and 5:12 πάντες is *ethnically qualitative*, not quantitative: Paul's argument is that Israel, as much as the Gentiles, is in Adam and repeats his sin. As such, the fate of infants (and the mentally deficient) simply does not fall within his horizon,<sup>93</sup> although it is true the tragedy of infant mortality does relate to the Adam/humanity solidarity as actually developed by Paul: infants die because they are "in Adam" (1 Cor 15:22) and, therefore, inherit the legacy left by him—death.

(to be continued)

Toronto Baptist Seminary  
130 Gerrard Street East  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5A 3T4

<sup>93</sup> Cf. Calvin, *Romans*, 113; Stuart, *Romans*, 215-16; Godet, *Romans*, 207; Cranfield, "Problems," 339; Moo, *Romans*, 339 (n. 40), 343; Dunn, *Romans* 1.276; J. Denny, "St. Paul" Epistle to the Romans," in *The Expositor's Greek New Testament* (repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970) 2.627; Kaylor, *Community*, 110; Wedderburn, "Structure," 351; Cambier, "Péchés," 253.

This material is cited with gracious permission from: y  
Westminster Theological Seminary  
2960 W. Church Rd.  
Glenside, PA 19038  
www.wts.edu

Please report any errors to Ted Hildebrandt at: [thildebrandt@gordon.edu](mailto:thildebrandt@gordon.edu)  
Thanks to Larissa Boehmke for proofing this article.