

LIBERTY BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE CONNECTION BETWEEN
ADAM AS A TYPE OF CHRIST AND CHRIST HIMSELF:
AN EXEGETICAL AND STRUCTURAL APPROACH TO ROMANS 5:12-19

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF LIBERTY BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF THEOLOGY

BY
SOON HO HONG

LYNCHBURG, VIRGINIA

MARCH 2010

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To Dr. Freerksen. He has taught and directed me through the course of my study in the Seminary.

Special thanks to Dr. Yates for his effort in reading and critiquing this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate the theological and exegetical debates concerning Adam-Christ typology and to specifically explain the structure of the Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5:12-19. The Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5:12-19 is called structural typology because the meaning of the context is revealed through the structural analysis. To understand the connection between Adam as a type of Christ and Christ himself, it is essential to know the structure of the text and to define the meaning of the text through exegesis. This thesis examines some disputes regarding the structural and grammatical issues of Romans 5:12-19. Three types of the comparative conjunctions used in Romans 5:12-19 show that the correspondence between Adam and Christ appears based on similarity. Comparing Christ and Adam stresses the greater redemptive grace of Christ and His gift.

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Purpose	3
Statement of the Importance of the Problem	3
Statement of the Position of the Problem	4
Limitations	5
Thesis	6
2. THE HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF ADAM AS TYPE OF CHRIST	7
Introduction.....	7
Origin and Definition of Typology	7
The Background of Paul's Usage of Adam Typology	10
Jewish background.....	11
Hellenistic background	14
The History of Interpretation of Adam-Christ Typology	17
Patristic interpretation.....	17
Reformation interpretation.....	20
The interpretation of nineteenth and twentieth centuries.....	22
Current interpretation.....	26

3. EXAMINATION OF THE TEXT THROUGH AN EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 5:12-19	30
Introduction.....	30
Relation of Romans 5:12-19 to the Context of Romans	30
Issues of Interpretation in Romans 5:12	34
The Role of Romans 5:13-14, Parenthesis or Not?.....	44
Those Who Had not The Likeness of the Transgression of Adam —Romans 5:14	45
Adam as a Type of the One to Come—Romans 5:14.....	49
4. INTERPRETATION OF ADAM TYPOLOGY IN ROMANS 5:12-19.....	55
Introduction.....	55
The Text and Translation for the Structural Analysis of Romans 5:12-19.....	55
The Syntactical Structure of Romans 5:12-19.....	62
The Structural Interpretation of Romans 5:15-19	66
The structural analysis of Romans 5:12-19	66
Entrance of sin into the world—Romans 5:12.....	68
The problem of parenthesis—Romans 5:13-14	70
The comparison between Adam and Christ—Romans 5:15-17	73
The conclusion of Adam-Christ typology—Romans 5:18-19.....	75
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	83

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Romans 5:12-19 is known as one of the most difficult and controversial passages to interpret in Pauline literature. In the study of Romans 5:12-19, there are some problems which continue to plague scholars, which are (1) the debate of the relation to the context of Romans, (2) issues surrounding the interpretation of specific words and phrases, and (3) problems concerning the structure of the context.

Some questions remain unanswered regarding the structural and grammatical problems of Romans 5:12-19. How does this section function within Romans? Is chapter 5 the conclusion of the preceding Romans 1:18-4:25 or the introduction of its subsequent chapters?¹ However, the more critical problem concerning the structure of Roman 5:12-19 is in its internal context, namely its structural problem related to Adam-Christ typology. Does Romans 5:12-19 only speak of the contrasts between Adam and Christ or of the comparisons as well?

In Romans 5:12-14, Paul argues that even though sin and death entered the world through Adam, individuals die because of their own sin. Paul then proclaims that death came to those who lived between the time of Adam and Moses. Paul mentioned that there

¹ Dunn and Morris regard Rom 5:12-19 as the conclusion or the final part of the preceding passage, Rom 3:21-5:21. However, Schreiner and Moo regard it as a part of the introduction of Romans 6-8 (see James D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1-8* (Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988), 271; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1988), 33; Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, 6 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998), 26, and Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 291).

is “another” law that is “written in our hearts” in Romans 2:14-15. Thus, it seems that those who lived between Adam and Moses are included in Paul’s declaration which is that “all have sinned.” However, in Romans 5:13 Paul seemingly makes a contradictory statement: “But sin is not imputed when there is no law.” It seems that this parenthetical statement theologically conflicts with Romans 5:12, 14.

The discussions concerning the grammatical and exegetical problems in Romans 5:12-14 are also perplexing. In verse 12 there are the problems concerned with the prepositional phrase Διὰ τοῦτο (“because of this”), the comparative conjunction ὥστε and οὕτως, and the phrase ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (“because all people have sinned”). Especially, the phrase ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον brings up a grammatical question in the understanding of the typology of Adam. How are interpreters to comprehend the connection between the sin of Adam and the sins of humanity made through the use of this phrase?

Paul’s repetition of terms such as ἁμαρτία, παράπτωμα, νόμος, χάρισμα, δικαίωμα, and χάρις raises questions about the meanings and importance of such words. Since these terms are important to understanding the typology of Adam, they need a proper definition. Therefore, a word study on each of these is needed in order to understand the typology of Adam.

Above all, the biggest uncertainty is that of the so-called Adam typology in Romans 5:12-19. The use of the word “type” in the sentence Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος (“Adam who is a type of the one to come”) does not correspond with the other sentences in Romans 5:12-19. How is Adam “a type of the one to come,” and what is the identity of that “one to come?” The interpretation of Romans 5:12-19 is unclear.

Statement of the Purpose

To comprehend the Adam typology, it is essential to know the structure of the text and to define the meaning of the text through careful exegesis. Therefore the central aim of this thesis is to investigate the theological and exegetical debates concerning Adamic typology and to explain the structure of Adamic typology in Romans 5:12-19.

To achieve the purpose of this thesis, it is first necessary to examine the history of Adamic typology. Second, it is necessary to understand the views of scholars concerning the disputed theological and exegetical problems and the specific words and phrases related to the typology of Adam in Romans 5:12-19. Third, it is necessary to discuss the parallels and comparisons between Adam and Christ in order to understand the meaning of Adam as a type of Christ and his relationship to Christ. Finally, it will be necessary to consider what Adam as a type of Christ means for believers today. This study will examine the text exegetically to resolve both grammatical and theological issues.

Statement of Importance of the Problem

Adam typology in Romans 5:12-19 is closely connected with the origin of sin and death of humankind, and explains the disobedience of Adam and the redemptive act of Christ. James D. G. Dunn states,

Adam plays a larger role in Paul's theology than is usually realized—and even when that role is taken into account it is often misunderstood. Adam is a key figure in Paul's attempt to express his understanding both of Christ and of man. Since soteriology and Christology are closely connected in Paul's theology it is

necessary to trace the extent of the Adam motif in Paul if we are to appreciate the force of his Adam Christology.²

It is not an overstatement to say that the Adam typology of Romans 5:14 is the core idea of Pauline Christology and soteriology. Therefore, to understand Pauline Christology, it is important to grammatically and exegetically scrutinize Romans 5:12-19. It is also important to obtain a proper interpretation of Romans 5:12-19, especially of the Adam typology in Romans 5:14, for the following reasons. First, it helps Christians to understand the use of types in the New Testament, especially in the epistles of Paul. Second, it provides more comprehension concerning Pauline Christology and soteriology. Third, it qualifies the belief of Christians concerning Jesus Christ and His redemption.

Statement of Position on the Problem

The position of this thesis is that grammatical and exegetical study, especially the typology of Adam, takes priority over anything else. The problem of the Adam typology in Romans 5:14 is a theological problem with a grammatical and exegetical problem. Moreover, theology should be discussed on the basis of grammatical and exegetical study. However, the discussion of this thesis will be restricted to the grammatical and exegetical approach. One of the central debates in the text is about Paul's structural parallel between Adam and Christ in verses 12-14. Contextually, Paul begins a comparison in verse 12, but he breaks off the comparison and completes it only in verses 18-19. It seems that Paul wants to emphasize the dissimilarity between Adam and Christ in verses 13-17.³

² James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980), 101.

³ Morris, 268.

However, all of Romans 5:12-19 consistently compares by contrast Adam with Christ, sin with grace, life with death, and fall and rise, except in one phrase, “Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος” This phrase, especially the use of the word *type*, is exceptional in the context of Romans 5:12-19 in that it makes the understanding of Adam typology so difficult.⁴ This thesis will deal with the concern of the so-called Adam typology in verse 14 and the whole text of Romans 5:12-19.

Limitations

Although various methods of approach are needed to understand the text, this thesis will be limited to a grammatical and exegetical approach. It does not attempt to take a theological approach to understanding Pauline Christology and soteriology. Therefore, any theological issues will be not investigated except theological discussion exposed through the exegetical study . The results of the interpretation of the text might be connected with theological doctrines in order to apply to the Christian life. However, to examine the problems in the text the exegetical and structural approach will be used. Second, the scope of investigation will be restricted to Romans 5:12-19 and verses 20 and 21. Romans 5:12-19 consists of a completed structure of Adam typology, and verses 20 and 21 are reiterative. The aim of the thesis is to explain Adam typology through the study of the text structure.

⁴ An approach of comparison and contrast is divided into two schools. Barth, Bruce, Cranfield, Morris, and Moo emphasize the similarity between Adam and Christ, but Käsemann, Dunn, and Godet emphasize the contrast between Adam and Christ (see Karl Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans*, trans. Edwyn C. Hoskyns (London: Oxford University Press, 1965), 176; F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002), 124; Charles E. B. Cranfield and W. Sanday, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1975), 283; Morris, 234; Moo, 334; Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 276-277; Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans*, trans. and ed. by Geoffrey William Bromiley (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 151-152; Frédéric Louis Godet, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977), 361.

Thesis

The thesis of this paper is as follows. First, there is a thematic shift between Romans 1:18 and 4:25, and between Romans 5:1 and 8:39. Romans 5:12-21 acts as the introduction to chapters 6-8 and a segue from Romans 5:1-11. Second, the comparative structure of the protasis clause including ὥστερ in verse 12 is broken off and not completed until verse 18. Third, the meaning of the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ is “because (or for the reason that),” a causal idea. Fourth, Romans 5:13-14 (or 17) acts as a parenthesis, adding to the incomplete comparative structure and meaning of verse 12. Fifth, Adam is not a type of Moses but rather a type of Christ. Finally, Adam-Christ typology is explained by the structural analysis of Romans 5:15-19, which has a form of similarity in the connection between Adam and Christ, however, in the form of correspondence by antithesis. Therefore, the relation is called antithetical correspondence.⁵

⁵ Leonhard Goppelt, “Tupos,” *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Abridged edition, translated and abridged by Geoffrey Bromiley, v. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 252.

CHAPTER 2

THE HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF ADAM AS TYPE OF CHRIST

Introduction

In order to understand Adam-Christ typology, it is necessary to examine its history. Because Paul refers to the connection between Adam and Christ in his epistles, the topic has been continually studied by scholars. In chapter two, the history of the development of Adam typology will be examined throughout the history of biblical interpretation in order to answer the questions concerning the typology of Adam. This study will progress as follows: (1) origin and definition of typology, (2) the background of Paul's usage of Adam Christology, and (3) the history of interpretation of Adam-Christ typology.

Origin and Definition of Typology

Many authors of Scripture used typology as a way of conveying God's revelation, challenging scholars from the first century until present day to understand the thought and typology of Scripture by its authors. However, the concrete study concerning Adam typology began with Irenaeus of Lyon.⁶

To understand the typology of Scripture, it is first necessary to define it.

Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible defines "typology" as "a method of biblical

⁶ David A. Sapp, "An Introduction to Adam Christology in Paul: A History of Interpretation, the Jewish Background, and an Exegesis of Romans 5:12-21" (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990), 4, and see J. T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968), 86-92.

interpretation by which a person, event, or institution ('type') in the OT corresponds to another one ('antitype') in the NT within the framework of salvation history."⁷

In the LXX of the Old Testament τύπος was used four times; two of those instances were used in Greek translations of the Hebrew OT. First, τύπος translated the Hebrew תְּבִיטָה as used in Exod 25:40 where the Lord commands Moses to build the earthly sanctuary. In the context it might be used as a meaning such as "original," "pattern," and "model."⁸ Second, another τύπος translated זָלָם as used in Amos 5:26. Here it was translated as "idol," or "graven image," and referred to the idols of foreign gods made by Israel.⁹ Others occur in Macc 3:30; 4 Macc 6:19.

The Greek word τύπος has many meanings,¹⁰ and it was an observable and well-known metaphor in the ancient world. τύπος occurs fifteen times in the NT,¹¹ and in the NASB it was translated as example (6 times), pattern (3 times), form (2 times), type, imprint, place, and image.¹² So, Paul uses it mainly in the sense of "example," "pattern,"

⁷ David Noel Freedman, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck, *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 1341.

⁸ Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Tupos Structures*, Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 2 (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981), 13.

⁹ Ibid, 136-137.

¹⁰ The Lexical meaning of τύπος has the following range of meanings: (1) as a mark made as the result of a blow or pressure, mark, trace; (2) as an embodiment of characteristics or function of a model, an object formed to resemble some entity, image, statue; (3) as a kind, class, or thing that suggests a model or pattern, form, figure, pattern; (4) as the content of a document, or an archetype serving as a model, type, pattern, model. Erwin Fahlbusch, eds. *The Encyclopedia of Christianity, Vol. 5, Si-Z* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 576.

¹¹ Jn. 20:25 (2 times); Acts 7:43, 44; 23:25; Rom. 5:14; 6:17; 1 Cor. 10:6; Phil. 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:7; 2 Thess. 3:9; 1 Tim. 4:12; Titus 2:7; Heb 8:5; 1 Pet. 5:3.

¹² KJV translated τύπος as ensample (4 times), example (2 times), print (2 times), figure (2 times), fashion, manner, and form; NIV translated it as example (4 times), pattern (4 times), model (2 times), idol, follow, form, and mark.

and “model,” and in the NT τύπος generally suggests a certain similarity between the original form and model.

The word τύπος appears to be derived from the Greek verb τύπτω, meaning “strike,”¹³ and it might have originally been a “hollow form” or “mold” from an early emphasis upon the basic idea of “form,” namely “the result of a blow or pressure and/or that which gives the blow or impression.”¹⁴ Typology has this basic meaning on the basis of the semantic development and understanding of τύπος. In Scripture, OT events, institutions, or persons may be patterns or prototypes (τύποι) that prefigure the NT events, institutions, or persons that deepen and fulfill them. The former things are referred to as antitypes (ἀντιτύποι).¹⁵ For instance, in Heb. 8:5 (quoting Exod. 25:40) the author places the heavenly sanctuary as the “pattern” (τύπον). But in Heb. 9:24 the author uses “copy” (ἀντίτυπα) as the contrary concept of the tabernacle, in which priests still serve according to the Mosaic law. In Rom. 5:14 Paul refers to Adam as the “type” of Christ. In 1 Cor. 10:6 Israel is a “type” for judgment upon the Church. So, τύπος (or ἀντίτυπος) used in the NT is a representation of a specific view of salvation history and interprets new-age realities in terms of the OT historical counterparts in background of the OT for the NT typology.¹⁶

Therefore, typology might be outlined concerning the use of typology of Scripture as follows: (1) τύπος in Paul’s epistles is rendered “example,” “pattern,” and “model,”

¹³ Erwin Fahlbusch, eds., *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*, Vol. 5, Si-Z (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2008), 576.

¹⁴ Davidson, 133-135, 412; Walter Bauer, William Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1019-1020.

¹⁵ Fahlbusch, eds., 576.

¹⁶ Sapp, 170-171.

and it generally suggests a certain similarity between the original form and model. (2) Typology is a way of representing the history of Scripture, in particular, the salvation history of God's people, Israel and the Church. Therefore, the material of biblical typology involves the historical events of the OT, institutions, or persons in salvation history. (3) Typology shows historical correspondence between historical realities. (4) The antitype not only shows a simple one-to-one correspondence, but also an increase or heightening of content and meaning.

The Background of Paul's Usage of Adam Christology

The opinions of scholars about the background of Paul's Adam Christology vary. However, most scholars tend to identify the sources of this aspect of Paul's thought as either Jewish or Hellenistic. Paul was a Diaspora Jew and familiar with Jewish culture. He was also a Pharisee (Phil. 3:5), and boasted of his Hebrew heritage in several places (Rom. 11:1; 2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5). In addition, Paul was influenced by the Hellenistic culture. He was born in Tarsus of Cilicia, a center of Greek civilization. Acts 17:18 is a good example, where Paul quotes the Tarsian poet Aratus in his Areopagus speech in Athens, showing he is familiar with Greek literature, and especially Greek poetry. However, it is hard to guard against drawing any rigid lines of division between the so-called "Palestinian-Jewish" world and the "Hellenistic-Gentile" world.¹⁷

¹⁷ Rarry Kreitzer, "Christ and Second Adam in Paul," *Communio Viatorum* 31, no. 1-2 (Spr-Sum 1989): 59.

Jewish background of Adam and Christ

In Acts 22:3 Paul introduces himself as follows: “I am a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city. Under Gamaliel I was thoroughly trained in the law of our fathers and was just as zealous for God as any of you are today. . . .” Paul’s own introduction is most telling about his Jewish background.

Some scholars attribute Paul’s use of Adam-Christ typology to his Jewish heritage.¹⁸ W. D. Davies explains Paul’s use of the idea of Christ as the second Adam as resembling “the Jewish idea of the Messianic Age as contrasted with the present evil world.”¹⁹ However, he disagrees that “Paul’s conception of Christ as the Second Adam goes back to the pre-Pauline Christian tradition.”²⁰ The Messianic Age is spoken of in terms of the first creation in 4 Ezra 7:30a: “And the world shall be turned back to primeval silence for seven days, as it was at the first beginnings.”²¹ Thus, it is “the re-establishment of the original creation.”²²

In the expectation of an Age to Come referred to in 1QS 4:23 and CD 3:20, the present and corrupt powers are overthrown and creation is restored to an ultimate pre-fall state, as described in Genesis 1 and 2, bringing to mind the idea of Messiah as second

¹⁸ See Kreitzer, 59-60.

¹⁹ Ibid., 59-60. See W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism; Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), 38-39.

²⁰ Davies, 41-42.

²¹ Michael E. Stone, and Frank Moore Cross. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*, Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 202.

²² Kreitzer, 60.

Adam.²³ As Adam and Christ represent leaders of the old and new creations, it is quite understandable to compare them in this way. Davies states,

In view of the interpretation of His Advent as a new creation, the thought of Christ as the Second Adam was easy and ultimately almost inevitable. Paul, we know, made this transition and explicitly called Jesus ‘the Second Adam’—the counterpart of the Adam whose creation was described in Gen. 1 and 2.²⁴

Thus, Davies considers that the use of Christ as Second Adam is “the logical extension of a desire to understand the hope of the Messianic Age in a world contaminated by sin.”²⁵ He views Jesus as the Messiah of the New Age, transferring Adamic ideas onto him on this basis. The Apostle Paul originated this comparative thought between the Messiah and Adam.²⁶

Robin Scroggs attempted to approach Adam and Christ through the Old Testament, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Rabbinic literature. His attempt is not only to analyze Christ as Second Adam but also to provide a Jewish background for the use of Christ as the last Adam. Scroggs posits that the focus of Paul’s Adamic Christology is “eschatological humanity.” He says,

. . . Paul’s Christology of the Last Adam is primarily directed toward illuminating and assuring the Christian’s hope of eschatological humanity. . . . To see the true man as a complete reality in the present, the believer can look only to Christ the Lord, who as Last Adam is the man God intends all men to be. Christology cannot be dissolved into anthropology; rather anthropology is derived from Christology.²⁷

²³ Kreitzer, 60.

²⁴ Davies, 41.

²⁵ Kreitzer, 60.

²⁶ Ibid., 60.

²⁷ Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966), 59.

Scroggs also argues that Paul transferred Jewish anthropology expressed in the first man, Adam, to Christ.²⁸ Adam was the glorious image of God before he fell, and this was God's intent for all humanity. Christ is the eschatological realization of that true humanity. Since Adam was the original ancestor of mankind, Paul probably thought of Christ as "the first patriarch of the new creation."²⁹ Although Paul may have known such Adamic traditions, he would have had some difficulty with the discrepancies between Adam and Christ. The quotations from Gen. 1-2 in 1 Cor. 11:7; 15:27, 45-48 reflect a continuity not between pre-fall Adam and the exalted Christ, but between pre-fall Adam (Gen. 1-2) and fallen, sinful man.³⁰ For Paul, Adam always represents fallen humanity. Consequently, Scroggs tended to reject a continuity between Paul and his Jewish background.³¹

C. K. Barrett's view concerning Paul's Adam Christology is to represent the Jewish tendency to inform human, and particularly Israelite, history through representative individuals.³² For this reason, Jewish views of Adam's fall, Philo's heavenly man, and the Son of Man of Daniel offer models for both the anthropological and cosmological range of the Adam typology.³³ J. D. G. Dunn argues that "the allusion

²⁸ Scroggs, 100.

²⁹ Ibid., 106-107.

³⁰ Sapp, 84.

³¹ Ibid., 83-84.

³² C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1962),

³³ Ibid., 72-76.

to Adam as the one through whom sin and death entered the world is specific, and the treatment of the Adam-Christ parallel and contrast is thoroughly Jewish in character.”³⁴

John R. Levison is very critical concerning the recent studies which take Jewish, Hellenistic, and Gnostic approaches to Adam.³⁵ David A. Sapp explains Levison’s opinion about the recent approach of Jewish views of Adam as follows,

They have been squeezed into the mold of Pauline categories and in some cases Pauline theology. Furthermore, Jewish documents are often grouped together with insufficient consideration of the widely separate dates of the documents and differing nuances of their ideas. To the extent that these criticisms are valid, they point out that, while Jewish material lies historically and theologically closer to Paul than the Gnostic material, one or two criticisms that have been brought against History of Religions research ... also apply to some extent to some treatments of Paul by scholars who are more or less in the Salvation History tradition.³⁶

The above studies have significant implications for the study of Paul’s Adam-Christ typology. First, Paul must be interpreted somewhat independently from other Jewish traditions while still keeping in mind his Jewish heritage. Second, legitimate parallels between Paul and other sources of thought must not be made unless evidence of direct dependence exists.³⁷

Hellenistic background

Paul’s reference in Acts 22:3 (“I am a Jew, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, but brought up in this city.”) shows that he has a Hellenistic Background. Paul’s dispute with a group of Epicurean and Stoic philosophers (Acts 17:18) and his quoting of the Tarsian poet

³⁴ Dunn, *Christology in the Making*, 103.

³⁵ Sapp, 101.

³⁶ Ibid., 101-102.

³⁷ Ibid., 103.

Aratus in his Areopagus speech in Athens (17:28) also show that he is familiar with Greek literature. There is some justification for detecting the influence of Stoic philosophy upon Paul, particularly his use of the words freedom, reason, nature, conscience, duty, and virtue, which are regarded as his use of Stoic concepts by some scholars.³⁸ Whether this influence is direct or is channeled through the Diaspora is uncertain. Paul's use of discourse as a rhetorical device would seem to be the result of a Hellenistic background.³⁹ In short, it is not possible to isolate Paul from the Hellenistic environment in which he was born and educated.⁴⁰ However, it is difficult to know that Paul's use of Christ as Second Adam has a close connection with the Hellenistic environment.

Bultmann asserts that the Gnostic Redeemer myth is taken over by Paul and related to Christ as Second Adam.⁴¹ According to Bultmann, Gnostic motifs were possibly present in the Hellenistic environment, and the myth of the Primal Man is especially important because this myth was influential upon Paul's Adamic thought.⁴² He says, "Paul expresses Christ's meaning as Redeemer especially by paralleling him as the

³⁸ Kreitzer, 62.

³⁹ Ralph Philip Martin, *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*, Vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 324. However, Martin insists that Paul is not influenced by Gnosticism. He says about Paul as follows: "He insists in his Christology and soteriology on many aspects which are not Gnostic."

⁴⁰ Kreitzer, 62.

⁴¹ Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007), 164-183.

⁴² *Ibid.*, 164-183.

‘last Adam,’ with the (fallen) Primal Man Adam.”⁴³ However, Bultmann’s use of Gnostic terminology is unacceptable, according to Ralph P. Martin, who states,

The central issue is one of priority: which came first, Gnosticism or primitive Christianity? Obviously, the New Testament antedates the classical Gnostic systems, but the question is really whether the Gnostic world-view is a pre-Christian and independent phenomenon and whether the New Testament could have been decisively influenced by it. Two further comments may be made. First, Harnack’s famous discussion enshrining the dictum that late Gnosticism represented an “acute Hellenization of Christianity” is one-sided and ignores the roots of Gnosticism in the Judaism of the Greek world, . . .⁴⁴

Philo deals with two different men, the earthly and the Heavenly Man through two stories of the creation of man in Gen. 1, 2. He then emphasizes more fully the former than the latter in terms of the exaltation of Adam within the tradition of Rabbinic Judaism.⁴⁵ His view of Adam through the relationship between Gen. 1 and 2 is very complex. It is understandable that his own interpretation of Scripture is in view of certain Stoic, Platonic, Middle Platonic, and Jewish (but not Gnostic) influences known to have been present in and around Alexandria during or immediately prior to Philo’s lifetime.⁴⁶

In true Platonic approach Philo distinguished between a Heavenly Man whose creation is described in Gen. 1 and an earthly man whose shape is described in Gen. 2. Philo writes,

There are two kinds of men. The one is Heavenly Man, the other earthly. The Heavenly Man being in the image of God has no part in corruptible substance, or in any earthly substance, whatever; but the earthly man was made of germinal matter which the writer calls ‘dust’.⁴⁷

⁴³ Bultmann, 177.

⁴⁴ Martin, 324-325.

⁴⁵ Davies, 47.

⁴⁶ Sapp, 129.

⁴⁷ Davies, 47.

However, Philo's conception of Heavenly Man is closer to Jewish background than Hellenistic, though it does contain Stoic, Platonic, and Middle Platonic elements.

The History of Interpretation of Adam-Christ Typology

Patristic interpretation

An Adam-Christ typology is not mentioned in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers.⁴⁸ Justin Martyr refers to Adam fourteen times in his book, *Dialogue with Trypho*,⁴⁹ but Adam-Christ typology is not mentioned despite "his belief that many Old Testament events are types (τύποι) of New Testament events, and his demonstration from the Scriptures that Jesus is the Christ of the divine οἰκονομία."⁵⁰ Clement referred to Adam only as "the first father of the human race."⁵¹ Ignatius speaks "of the dispensation of the new man Jesus Christ," but makes no comparison with Adam. Theophilus of Antioch mentions Adam and Christ in his books, *ad Autolycom*, but his reference to Adam and Christ is not really an Adam-Christ typology, at least in his books.⁵² Melito of Sardis, a second-century Christian leader and writer in Asia Minor, was a contemporary of Irenaeus and Theophilus of Antioch. He mentions Adam and Christ several times in his Easter homily; however, Christ is not clearly named as the second Adam in it.⁵³ The

⁴⁸ J. T. Nielsen, *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968), 87.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 88.

⁵⁰ Sapp, 3.

⁵¹ Ibid., 3.

⁵² Nielsen, 88-89.

⁵³ Ibid., 89-91.

Epistle of Barnabas, which refers to the connection between Adam and Christ, comes the closest to such a typology. The Epistle of Barnabas tells the story of Adam's creation from the earth and states the hypothesis that man's future redemption shows Jesus' future appearance "in the flesh."⁵⁴ However, in early Christian non-canonical writings an Adam-Christ typology first appears in Irenaeus' book, *Adversus Haereses*.⁵⁵

Irenaeus had an important role in church history. He opposed Gnosticism and Docetism and contributed to the church positively by his own tremendous vision of Christ as the second Adam. He insisted almost monotonously on the unity of the God-man, repudiating the Gnostic separation of the heavenly Christ from the man Jesus.⁵⁶ J. T. Nielsen explains the view of Irenaeus concerning the Adam-Christ typology as follows,

For Irenaeus sin is no more than an intermezzo. Adam was a child, when he was disobedient. Irenaeus greatly stresses the preservation of the flesh: the resurrection of Christ took place in exactly the same flesh in which He walked upon earth, and He will also come again in the same flesh. The background here is the Gnostic contention, that the flesh is not capable of partaking of salvation. Irenaeus goes so far as to maintain that 'flesh and blood' can inherit the kingdom of God, because what Paul meant here were the 'carnales actus' (Adv. Haer. V.14.4). For Irenaeus, chiliasm is in keeping with his use of the Adam-Christ typology, whereby it should be remembered that (a) the chiliasm of Irenaeus is in part due to the Gnostic contempt for the 'plasmatio Dei' and the Gnostic denial of the salvation of the flesh. (b) The chiliasm of Irenaeus was strengthened by the Gnostic view, that immediately after death man's 'true self' returned to the highest heavens, even passing these to go to the Mother or their so called Father.⁵⁷

For Irenaeus, the Adam typology means that the divine Son of God has become second Adam/Son of Man by "reiterating" Adam in himself through the incarnation. He says,

⁵⁴ Sapp, 4.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 4.

⁵⁶ J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (NY: Harper & Row, 1960), 147.

⁵⁷ Nielsen, 92-94.

“This repetition makes him qualified to redeem Adam/man by inserting the Spirit of God in believers.”⁵⁸

Irenaeus made the Adam-Christ typology the central characteristic of his Christology. It might be due to his need to refute that the Gnostics devalue Adam and his material nature. But he sees Adam in a more positive manner than Paul does, resulting in a more positive view of man. It might be by reaction to Gnosticism.⁵⁹ As a result of the reaction, his doctrine of the childhood of Adam was formed, that is, Adam was created not as an adult but as a child, perfect in that he was sinless, yet naive and morally inexperienced. He insists that a man was a child when he rules over creation. However, his task, reigning creation, might have been beyond his capacity. So, Adam wickedly disobeyed God.⁶⁰ Irenaeus believes that Adam’s disobedience was not a high-handed, wicked crime in full knowledge of its consequences and without any reason in his weakness.⁶¹ He says that Adam’s fall efficiently served the positive purpose of keeping man from pride, and was used as the way for his return to God in a perfectly mature condition.⁶²

For Irenaeus, Adam’s fall was due to moral immaturity and weakness rather than to rebellion. Irenaeus described Adam’s fall “more as liability to death than bondage to sin, an interim state of weakness between man’s perfect childhood and his perfect

⁵⁸ Sapp, 5.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 7.

⁶⁰ Ibid.

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., 7-8.

adulthood.”⁶³ Therefore, “the primary work of the Second Adam was to reproduce and fulfill the deficient, incomplete work and immature, inexperienced nature of the first Adam.”⁶⁴

In conclusion, the Adam-Christ typology receives little treatment from patristic theologians other than Irenaeus. But it sometimes appears as a basis for ethical exhortations to Christians — follow Christ’s example, not Adam’s.⁶⁵ The Adam-Christ typology in patristic theology functioned as a part of the explanation of the God-Man, Jesus Christ.⁶⁶

Reformation interpretation

Reformers usually follow patristic lines of thought on the Adam-Christ theology. It is not too much to say that the discussion of the Adam-Christ theology did not clearly develop in that time. For Luther, Adam is explained as a way to inform the condition of the human race. In his book, *Lectures on Romans*, Luther says,

How is he a figure? Because, just as Adam became the cause of death to those who were born of him, . . . so Christ became for the Christians, even though they have done nothing righteous, the provider of righteousness, and he bestowed it on us all through the cross. So then, the likeness of Adam’s transgression is in us, because we must die, as if we had sinned in the same way as he. And the likeness of Christ’s justification is in us, because we have life, as if we had done justice in the same way as he. Because of this likeness, therefore, Adam “is a figure of him who was to come,” namely, of Christ who came after him.⁶⁷

⁶³ Sapp, 8.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 8-9.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 10.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 12.

⁶⁷ Martin Luther and Wilhelm Pauck, *Luther: Lectures on Romans*, Library of Christian classics (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 173.

Calvin in particular showed a marked interest in the title “second Adam” in his book, *Institutes*. He uses “second Adam” to indicate Christ’s true humanity. Calvin writes,

I should also like to know why Paul calls Christ the “Second Adam” [1 Cor. 15:47], unless the human condition was ordained for him in order that he might lift Adam’s descendants out of ruin. For if Christ came before creation, then he ought to be called the “first Adam.” . . . Paul, calling Christ the “Second Adam,” sets the Fall, from which arose the necessity of restoring nature to its former condition, between man’s first origin and the restoration that we obtain through Christ. It follows, then, that it was for this same cause that the Son of God was born to become man.⁶⁸

Calvin dealt with the parallel of Adam and Christ only where Paul mentions it and in connection with those passages in Genesis upon which Paul’s thought is based. But the references in the *Institutes* are not numerous.⁶⁹ Calvin clearly saw the typology as simply one of a number of parallels coordinated by Paul to elucidate the main theme of salvation by grace alone.⁷⁰ In his commentary on Romans 5 Calvin explained that the connection between Adam and Christ is a contrast. He especially tries to explain the meaning of Second Adam in the context, saying,

As then we are all lost through Adam’s sin, so we are restored through Christ’s righteousness: hence he calls Adam not inaptly the type of Christ. But observe, that Adam is not said to be the type of sin, nor Christ the type of righteousness, as though they led the way only by their example, but that the one is contrasted with the other.⁷¹

⁶⁸ John T. McNeill and Ford Lewis Battles eds. *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion* v.1 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), 469-470.

⁶⁹ See *Institutes* 2.1.5, 6; 2.13.2, 4.

⁷⁰ Gordon Bates, “Typology of Adam and Christ in John Calvin.” *Hartford Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (Winter 1965): 47.

⁷¹ Jean Calvin and John Owen. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948), 205.

To conclude, Calvin's use of the Adam-Christ typology reveals the concern to adhere to the meaning and intention of the biblical writers.⁷² Although Calvin restrains his use of the typology of Adam and Christ, it is nevertheless clear that the typology is of major significance to Calvin theologically.⁷³

The interpretation of nineteenth and twentieth centuries

Various presuppositions concerning the Adam-Christ typology challenging Patristic and Reformation views of the Adam-Christ typology appeared after the Enlightenment due to the influence of Friedrich Schleiermacher, F. C. Baur, and Bernhard Weiss.⁷⁴

Baur understood the Second Adam to be "the pre-existent pneumatic man who represents the developing historical principle of the spirit."⁷⁵ He also considered Adam and Christ as "two different periods, two principles, and the internal process of historical development from the one to the other."⁷⁶ For Baur, Christ was a man "in a higher sense" than all other human beings, meaning Christ existed as the "image of God," and the principle and substance of his personality were entirely spirit. According to him, Christ had his complete nature through the resurrection (1 Cor. 15:45; 2 Cor. 3:17)⁷⁷

⁷² Bates, 55.

⁷³ Ibid., 55.

⁷⁴ Sapp, 14, 19.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 14.

⁷⁶ F. C. Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: his life and works, his epistles and teachings* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 212-227. He says, "In all those contrasts in the light of which Christianity is regarded, as that between servitude and freedom, nonage and majority, sin and grace, death and life, the first and the second Adam, . . ."

⁷⁷ Sapp, 16-17.

The thought of Baur concerning the second Adam was influenced by the anti-supernaturalistic idealism of Schleiermacher and Hegel.⁷⁸ His key to the unity between God and man was found in Paul's Adamic Christology. According to Baur, the second Adam was the perfect, preexistent spirit-man so that his historical development from flesh to spirit is easy; however, there is no redemption of human flesh in this system.⁷⁹

Baur's interpretation of Paul's Christology influenced C. Holsten, H. Lüdemann, O. Pfleiderer, and later H. J. Holtzmann. They found the key to the apostle's Christology in his anthropology. They saw Adam and Christ in the same relation as flesh and spirit, and the pattern for renewed humanity.⁸⁰

Bernhard Weiss objected to the virtual identification of flesh with sin argued by Baur and his successors.⁸¹ Weiss saw the flesh as a consequence of the sin of Adam.⁸² He insisted that Christ received a heavenly, pneumatic body only after he died and then laid aside his fleshly, physical body, and in the resurrection he became a life-giving spirit. Weiss "opposed the abandonment of Christ's divine nature on the basis of a 'Second Adam' Christology, but insisted that the divine Son of God was eternally subordinate to the Father."⁸³

In the nineteenth century new interpretations of Paul's Adam Christology were presented. Concerning this, David A. Sapp states,

⁷⁸ Sapp, 17.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 18. See the book of Baur, 245-249.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 19-22.

⁸¹ Ibid., 19-20.

⁸² Ibid., 28-29.

⁸³ Ibid., 32.

The debate raised questions with regard to the possible background of Adam Christology in Philo and the Wisdom literature, apocalyptic and rabbinic theology, or Gnosticism, and whether or not Paul argues against such views. But the intensive influence of idealistic philosophy on interpretations of Paul's last Adam in terms of a preexistent pneumatic man raised significant doubts about its validity. Proper historical and theological presuppositions proved to be crucial to the relative success or failure of any particular viewpoint.⁸⁴

Three schools of thought in Germany affected twentieth century interpretation of Adam Christology: the Eschatological School, the History of Religions School, and the Salvation History School.⁸⁵

The Eschatological school of thought was pioneered by Adolf Hilgenfeld and Emil Schürer and applied in Pauline studies beginning with Richard Kabisch. It was essentially a branch of the emerging History of Religions research.⁸⁶ Eschatological theologians, like many in the nineteenth century, regarded Pauline anthropology and Christology as a physical dualism⁸⁷ and believed eschatology was central to Pauline theology and that of the New Testament. The school was short-lived, but its best insights were adopted by the Salvation History school, as the conventional History of Religions school tended to interpret Pauline Christology in terms of oriental mythology.⁸⁸

The late nineteenth century saw a rise in the Classical History of Religions school under Baur, which opposed the "mediating theology" of the *Ritschlian* school and the *heilsgeschichtlich* background to the New Testament.⁸⁹ The Classical History of

⁸⁴ Sapp, 34-35.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 35.

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 37.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 39-40.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 40.

Religions theology supported “application of the science of comparative religion within the domain of biblical theology.”⁹⁰ This thought dismissed all supernatural activity as untenable “interference” that contradicted science.⁹¹ The Classical History of Religions school saw Christianity as not a supernatural but a living, developing, changing religion.⁹² This school took a new view of Gnosticism as Oriental and syncretistic versus Greek and Platonic.⁹³ In the History of Religions school’s view Paul formed his Adam-Christ theology by adopting his own form of a Primal Man myth influenced by a first-century form of Gnosticism or a Hellenistic Judaism or Hellenistic Christianity influenced by one or the other.⁹⁴

The Salvation Historical approach to biblical interpretation arose in nineteenth-century Germany through the writings of J. T. Beck and J. C. K. von Hofmann.⁹⁵ Many British scholars in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries developed “various aspects of the Old Testament-Jewish background of the New Testament.”⁹⁶ A representative scholar is Oscar Cullmann.⁹⁷

⁹⁰ Sapp, 41.

⁹¹ Ibid., 42.

⁹² Ibid., 42-43.

⁹³ Ibid., 45-46; Bultmann, 164. Bultmann sees “Gnosticism as contributing to the development of Christian thought in the areas of eschatological dualism, the fall of creation, and the history of salvation as accomplished through the descent and ascent of a Redeemer figure.”

⁹⁴ Sapp, 48.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 74.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 74-75. In this viewpoint Herman Ridderbos and G. E. Ladd respectively wrote a theology of Paul and a theology of the New Testament.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 75.

The Salvation Historical viewpoint, which has often been represented as being only a philosophy of history or too historically schematic,⁹⁸ is based on three closely related assumptions. First, “The first cause of Scripture and Christianity is not human culture, but a holy history within world history. God has revealed himself through his Spirit and his son Jesus Christ and is directing history toward his set goal. The Bible is then the normative (canonical) Word of God to his people with its own legitimate worldview.”⁹⁹ Second, “Scripture is essentially a unified whole having a fundamental continuity of thought within a diversity of expressions and historical settings. Biblical interpretation presupposes this continuity between Jesus and Paul, between Old and New Testaments, but must also by critical investigation demonstrate the fact and nature of this unity within diversity.”¹⁰⁰ Finally, “Judaism and the Old Testament form the primary religious and conceptual background for the events of Scripture.”¹⁰¹

Current interpretation

In the history of the interpretation of Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15 with regard to matters of Christology, there have been two primary, diverging trends (as with Pauline Christology as a whole). First, the Classical History of Religions school accepts the origin of Adam Christology; however, it has usually been left essentially unchanged. David A. Sapp concludes from their study the following results: “(1) A single, composite, pre-Christian myth of a Primal Man as Redeemed Redeemer and an Iranian origin for this

⁹⁸ Sapp, 75.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 76.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

myth have been less and less accepted. (2) The idea of Adam as the progenitor of sin and death is rarely considered a purely non-Jewish, Gnostic idea of fate. (3) A supposed polemic against opponents in 1 Cor. 15 is sometimes considered secondary to Paul's own exegetical thoughts, and inferences with regard to the theology of such Corinthian opponents uncertain."¹⁰² History of Religions scholars in general still consider such a myth necessary to explain the existence of Paul's Adam-Christ typology as a whole.¹⁰³

Second, in the Salvation History School, recent views of the Jewish-Christian character of Paul's Adam Christology are addressed. The first is the redemptive work of the Second Adam; it is understood to apply only to the resurrected, exalted Christ or to both the pre- and post-resurrected Christ.¹⁰⁴ Robin Scroggs states that the former view is based on the conclusion that the Last Adam is the firstborn of the dead, the life-giving Spirit, the glory and image of God, whose task is to realize the new creation or true (resurrected) humanity in his own person and to mediate that to others.¹⁰⁵ He argues that even in Romans 5:15-21 the major theme is the future restoration through Christ of the life God had intended for Adam.¹⁰⁶ Dunn insists that the focus of Adam Christology lies clearly in Christ's death and resurrection, but emphasizes the exalted Christ.¹⁰⁷ Dunn believes that Psalm 8 provided Paul with the justification for an Adam Christology that linked the two distinct phases of Christ's life. He states that "although an allusion to Ps.

¹⁰² Sapp, 59-60.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 59-61.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 77.

¹⁰⁵ Scroggs, 92-99.

¹⁰⁶ Sapp, 77.

¹⁰⁷ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006), 199-204, 241.

8:4-5 may also be implied in reference to Christ's life (as in Heb. 2:6-9), the thought in 1 Cor. 15:27 is exclusively on the exaltation of the resurrected Christ."¹⁰⁸ N. T. Wright argues that Dunn has misconstrued the grammar of 1 Cor. 15:45: Christ, already the Last Adam, "became" a life-giving spirit at the resurrection, not "became" the Last Adam, a life-giving spirit. But more than this, Romans 5 (and Phil. 2) demonstrates that the work of Christ, in contrast to Adam, includes his atoning obedience unto death.¹⁰⁹ The second is about the person or nature of the Second Adam that is, Christ who was and is a man, a member of Adam's race.¹¹⁰ The phrase "from heaven" is variously disputed by many scholars: Christ's heavenly function, the heavenly origin or divine source of Christ's pneumatic body, the last Adam's heavenly origin or source.¹¹¹ Third, there are many views of the specific origin of Paul's Adam-Christ typology within the Jewish-Christian background, but the various options are not always mutually exclusive.¹¹²

In conclusion, present-day Salvation Historical research, despite some shortcomings, claims to show the adequacy and necessity of the Jewish-Christian background in the interpretation of Paul's Adam Christology.¹¹³ Second, generally Patristic interpretation agrees with this research except where it reinterprets parts of 1 Cor. 15 on dogmatic grounds or is tied too closely to Neo-Platonic ontology.¹¹⁴ Third, the

¹⁰⁸ Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, 241.

¹⁰⁹ Sapp, 79-80.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 81.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 82-83.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 83-96.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 99.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

view of the Salvation History School is that Paul's last Adam is the human Messiah who not only "obeyed God where Adam had failed" but also "redeemed descendants of Adam from sin and death through that obedience."¹¹⁵

¹¹⁵ Sapp, 99.

CHAPTER 3

EXAMINATION OF THE DEBATABLE TEXT THROUGH AN EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 5:12-19

Introduction

Romans 5:12-19 contains some phrases and clauses which have been disputed by scholars for a long time, and they will be examined in this chapter. First, the recent studies of how Romans 5:12-21 functions within Romans will be treated: namely, whether chapter 5 belongs with the preceding chapters or the following chapters. Second, three issues exist in Romans 5:12 alone: the reference of *Διὰ τοῦτο*, use of *ὥσπερ*, and the meaning of *ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον*. Third, the problem of parenthesis will be examined. Fourth, the meaning of two arguments, *τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ* and *Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος*, will be examined from Romans 5:14. Lastly, the recent study to understand the comparison between Adam and Christ in Romans 5:15-19 will be examined.

Relation of Romans 5:12-19 to the Context of Romans

The debate about chapter five's relation with other parts of Romans has not yet disappeared. The views of scholars about the position of chapter 5 are generally divided into three classes. One class considers chapter 5 as the conclusion of the preceding context, Romans 1:18-4:25,¹¹⁶ and the second class as the introduction of its subsequent

¹¹⁶ W. Sanday and A. C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, The International critical commentary (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905), 131-132; Matthew Black,

chapters, Romans 6:1-8:39.¹¹⁷ The last class divides chapter 5 and makes a major transition “with 1:18-5:11 being dominated by the antithesis between sin and justification and 5:12-8:39 by the antithesis between life and death.”¹¹⁸ However, the last view will be excluded from the discussion of this chapter because it is not generally supported by many present scholars.¹¹⁹

Dunn supports the opinion of the former as especially emphasizing the connection of terms between Romans 1:18-4:25 and chapter 5. To defend his position, Dunn states,

Chapter 5 is now regularly taken as the beginning of a new section. . . . chapter 5 as a whole must be regarded as a conclusion to the argument so far. 5:1-11 certainly functions in this way. The backward links are too many and deliberate: δικαιοσύνη /δικαίω ἐκ πίστεως as the chief theme of the letter as announced in 1:17 and developed through 3:21-4:25, is now summed up in 5: 1 and 9. . . . There are echoes of the central argument (3:21-26) in vv.. 2 (grace, hope of glory), v. 9 (“in his blood”) and vv.. 9, 11 (“now”); central themes of the indictment of 1:18-2:29 are picked up in reverse—1:18//5:9 (ὁργή), 1:18//5:6(ἀσέβεια/ἀσεβής), 1:21. 23//5:2 (δόξα), 1:28//5:4 (ἀδόκιμος/δοκιμή), 2:17//5:11 (καυχᾶσαι ἐν θεῷ/καυχώμενοι); and the climactic sequence of 5:6-10 (weak, ungodly, sinners, enemies) answers the reverse sequence of 1:19-32.¹²⁰

David Paul Seemuth points to a change of thought, style and structure to support the former, and especially regards the question of Romans 6:1, Τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ;, as the beginning of the major topic being addressed by Paul. He says,

Romans (Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1973), 79; Morris, 33; Dunn, *Romans*, 242-244. See Grant R. Osborne, *Romans* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2004), 124.

¹¹⁷ Charles E. B. Cranfield and W. Sanday, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1985), 252-254. Osborne, 252-254; Käsemann, 131; Moo 290-295; Schreiner, 245-249; and Osborne, 124-126.

¹¹⁸ See Moo, 291.

¹¹⁹ Mounce divides 1:18-5:11 into 1:18-3:20 (the certainty and universality of condemnation) and 3:12-5:11 (the certainty of justification). See Robert H. Mounce, *Romans: an Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture* (Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 139-140.

¹²⁰ Dunn, *Romans 1-8*, 242.

Paul returns to a diatribal style of argument in Rom 6:1 by raising the question ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ; Evidence of the diatribe is seen in Rom 3:1, 9; 4:1; 6:15; 7:7; 8:31; 9:14, 30; and 11:1, 7, 11 as a means of moving the argument forward. Rom 6:1 is introduced by the phrase Τί οὖν. this phrase is a characteristic mark of the diatribe. . . . All of the verbs in Rom 6:1-23 are almost exclusively in the first person. the shift is from the reality of past actions to the necessity of proper behavior. It is a shift from *mythos* to *ethos*.¹²¹

John Murray divides Romans on the basis of theological topics. He insists, “To speak in general terms, chapter 6 deals with sanctification as the preceding chapters had dealt with justification.”¹²²

Scholars who support taking some or all of chapter 5 with what precedes consider that chapters 1-5 express justification and chapters 6-8 sanctification. They also note that many terms (δίκαιος, δικαιοῦν, δικαιοσύνη, δικαίωμα, δικαίωσις, καυχάομαι, ὀργή, etc.) of chapter 5 show significant connections with chapters 1 to 4.¹²³ Lastly, they regard as evidence the fact that in 5:12-21 the third person is used and in chapters 6-8 the first person is used.

However, Scroggs, Cranfield, Achtemeier, Käsemann, Fitzmyer, Schreiner, Moo, Osborne, and others consider chapter 5 not so much the conclusion of Romans 1:18-4:25 as the introduction of its subsequent chapters, Romans 6:1-8:39. Käsemann insists that a setting of the structure which brings chapters 1-5 under the title “justification” and chapters 6-8 under that of “sanctification” distorts Paul’s basic position. He also says,

¹²¹ David Paul Seemuth, “Adam the Sinner and Christ the Righteous One: The Theological and Exegetical Substructure of Romans 5:12-21,” Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1989. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=745618931&sid=11&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009), 33.

¹²² John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 31.

¹²³ Cranfield, *Romans*, 252-254.

The logic of the context will not let us separate the themes of freedom from death, from sin, and from the law. There is no question here of a systematically forced and “linear” construction. All these things belong together in the reality of justification. For this reason one should not put chapter 5 in the previous division of the epistle and find the beginning of the new one only with chapter 6.¹²⁴

C. E. B. Cranfield says that the position of chapter 5 is easily explicable on the supposition that the main division consists of 5:1-8:38 though there is a significant linguistic connection between chapter 5 and chapters 1- 4 because chapters 5-8 “intended to describe the life which those who are righteous by faith are to live.”¹²⁵ He also points out that “much of the language of the previous division should reappear in 5:1-8:39 is only to be expected in view of the fact that 5:1-8:39 is actually drawing out the meaning of the justification with which 1:18-4:25 is concerned.”¹²⁶

Concerning the division between chapters 1-4 and chapters 5-8, Moo provides four supporting arguments. First, the opening in 5:1, *since we have been justified through faith*, sums up the previous section and prepares for a new topic. Initially, the opening of Romans 5:1, “Therefore, having been justified by faith,” sums up Romans 1:18-4:25 and prepares for a new topic. Second, the style of Romans 5:1 is distinguished from the polemical tone of chapters 1-4 because Romans 5:1 employs the first person plural. Third, the relative frequency of certain key words in chapters 5-8 is compared with Romans 1:18-4:25. The terms, “faith” and “believe,” occur 33 times in 1:18-4:25; however, they occur just 3 times in chapters 5-8. On the contrary, the terms, “life” and “to live” occur just two times in Romans 1:18-4:25; however, they occur 24 times in chapters 5-8. The

¹²⁴ Käsemann, 158-159.

¹²⁵ Cranfield, *Romans*, 253.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 254.

word, “righteousness,” occurs 26 times in Romans 1:18-4:25, but 16 times in chapters 5-8, that is, the contrast of 1:18-4:25 with chapters 5-8 does not appear in the word. Fourth, some words repeated in chapter 5 and chapters 6-8 are found, and they show a close connection between 5:1-11 and 8:18-39. Key words are as follows: “love” of God/Christ, “justify,” “glory,” “peace,” “hope,” “tribulation,” “save,” and “endurance.”¹²⁷

Therefore, chapter 5 may be seen as the introduction of its subsequent chapters 6-8. The purpose in 1:18-4:25 is to show that God’s saving promises in the OT have been fulfilled,¹²⁸ that they are available for all peoples, and that they are gained by faith. Chapters 5-8 elucidates its results with a description of the new life.¹²⁹

Issues of Interpretation in Romans 5:12

There are some problems which are still controversial among scholars in Romans 5:12. They affect the interpretation of Adam-Christ typology as well as the view of the section of Romans 5:12-19. First of all, there is what διὰ τοῦτο indicates and means.

The term διὰ τοῦτο is used a total of 63 times in the New Testament, and it is used as retrospective or prospective.¹³⁰ However, most of its uses are retrospective. Paul also uses διὰ τοῦτο in his epistles just as it is used in the rest of the New Testament.¹³¹

¹²⁷ Moo, 292-293.

¹²⁸ Schreiner, 246.

¹²⁹ Davidson, 298-299.

¹³⁰ See Moo, 317-318. He divides use of διὰ τοῦτο into 4 classes: (1) διὰ as causal and τοῦτο retrospective, (2) διὰ as cause and τοῦτο as prospective, (3) διὰ denoting final cause and τοῦτο as prospective, (4) διὰ denoting final cause and τοῦτο as retrospective.

¹³¹ Charles E. B. Cranfield, “On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 22 (Sept 1969), 324.

διὰ τοῦτο can indicate either a backward or a forward reference, but in verse 12 it is used as retrospective because it does not have a following clause which takes it up.¹³²

Therefore, διὰ τοῦτο might be translated as “because of this,” “for this reason,” or “therefore.”

It is also necessary to know what τοῦτο indicates. It is possible to see it as indicating 5:11, 5:9-11, 5:1-11, or 1:18-5:11. However, scholars do not generally agree on what διὰ τοῦτο refers to. Dunn insists that τοῦτο refers back to 1:18-5:11,¹³³ and says, “The διὰ τοῦτο does not signify a conclusion drawn simply from an immediately preceding argument; v. 11 had already effectively rounded off the preceding train of thought. Its function is rather to indicate that vv. 12-21 serve as a conclusion to the complete argument from 1:18-5:11.”¹³⁴ N. T. Wright agrees with Dunn, saying,

... 5:1-11 then provides an advance summary of the point which is made in various ways throughout chs. 6-8: the privileges of Israel, particularly those of the fulfillment of the law and of being children of God, have been transferred to Christ and thence to those who are ‘in Christ.’ 5:12-21 stands in relation to 1:18-5:11 and chs. 6-8 as the link which holds the two parts together. Summing up the first, it provides the basis for the second.¹³⁵

Sanday and Headlam, Cranfield, M. Black, Fitzmyer, and Osborne consider τοῦτο to refer to 5:1-11.¹³⁶ Concerning the reason, Cranfield says the following,

Of these suggestions, the best is surely that which takes the connexion to be with 5:1-11 as a whole. Verses 1-11 have affirmed that those who are righteous by

¹³² Cranfield, *Romans*, 271.

¹³³ Dunn, *Romans*, 271-272. Stuhlmacher also have the same opinion. See Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), 83.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ N. T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 35-36.

¹³⁶ Osborne, 137.

faith are people whom God's underserved love has transformed from the condition of being God's enemies into that of being reconciled to Him, at peace with Him. The point of διὰ τοῦτο is that Paul is now going to indicate in vv. 12-21 the conclusion to be drawn from that has been said in vv. 1-11.¹³⁷

Leon Morris considers τοῦτο to indicate verse 11 for the simpler view because verse 11 is "the conclusion of the foregoing argument."¹³⁸ Of course, the demonstrative pronoun, οὗτος, used as substantive, presents the person or thing comparatively near at hand in the discourse material.¹³⁹ Morris' view might be lexically suitable. However, verse 11 is not natural as a cause with 5:12-21 because verses 12-21 do not contextually explain the cause or reason for verse 11. Therefore, verses 12-21 cannot be seen as the conclusion of verse 11.

Concerning the reference of διὰ τοῦτο, Schreiner says, "The connection between verse 12 and the preceding context must be established thematically since Paul himself does not clearly chart out for us how the unit relates to what has come before."¹⁴⁰ Therefore, the content of 1:18-5:11 is very enormous, as is the space between 1:18-4:25 and 5:1-11, which is the introduction of its subsequent chapters, Romans 6:1-8:39. As the conclusion of 1:18-5:11, 5:12-21 is not a synthesis, but really it is a comparison between the acts of Adam and Christ, and it deals with Christ's act which gave believers reconciliation with God. 5:12-21, in particular, "would seem to function very nicely as the ground, or reason, for the confidence in hope that Paul has stressed in 5:11."¹⁴¹ To

¹³⁷ Cranfield, *Romans*, 271.

¹³⁸ Morris, 228.

¹³⁹ BDAG, 740.

¹⁴⁰ Schreiner, 271.

¹⁴¹ Moo, 317.

know the reference of διὰ τοῦτο, it is necessary to reconcile the theme and tenses of 5:12-21.

Moo asserts that διὰ τοῦτο refers to Romans 5:9-10 because the verses contain future tenses, and the passage states “the final cause without an accompanying ἵνα clause.”¹⁴² Moo adds, “When the forward reference of τοῦτο is a future condition, or promise, its translation as “because of this” naturally comes to have a final sense: “because of this promise.”¹⁴³ Verses 5:9-10 agree on the theme, which is the reconciliation with God through the righteous act of Christ, and on the tense of the verbs, which are future within 5:12-21.

A second dispute is about correlation of the comparative conjunction ὥσπερ and οὕτως. The opinion concerning whether Romans 5:12 is the complete comparative clause or not is divided into two views by scholars. First, Scroggs insists that in verse 12 the clause leading with οὕτως is a true apodosis clause, καὶ οὕτως written in this verse has the same function as οὕτως καὶ.¹⁴⁴ Thus, he says that verse 12 is not only grammatically correct and unmistakably clear, but is also an inverted parallelism, or chiasmus.¹⁴⁵ In his article, Kirby mentions that the comparison is completed in verse 12.¹⁴⁶ He also states that καὶ is used as adverbial, and precedes the word it emphasizes so that the phrase καὶ

¹⁴² Moo, 317.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

¹⁴⁴ Scroggs, 79.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 79. Barrett also has the same opinion, and interprets καὶ οὕτως as “so also.” C. K. Barrett, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Harper's New Testament commentaries (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), 111.

¹⁴⁶ John T. Kirby, “The Syntax of Romans 5:12 : A Rhetorical Approach,” *New Testament Studies* 33, no. 2 (Apr 1987): 283.

οὕτως is interpreted as “even so.”¹⁴⁷ According to this view the ὥσπερ clause is matched by καὶ οὕτως (so also) in verse 12. Seemuth shares the same argument. He contends that οὕτως alone can lead the apodosis, and without a following καὶ, have the same function. According to Seemuth, therefore, verse 12 in this way appears to be a complete thought.¹⁴⁸

However, most scholars do not agree with the assertion that verse 12 has the complete comparative clause. They consider that the comparison structure in this verse is not finished here. Syntactically, when occurring at the beginning of a sentence, normally it introduces the protasis of a comparative sentence. In verse 12, οὕτως is used with the comparative word ὥσπερ. Nevertheless, the structure of verse 12 cannot be viewed as a complete comparison. There is a need to distinguish in Greek between καὶ οὕτως and οὕτως καί.¹⁴⁹ Concerning the use of καὶ οὕτως and οὕτως καί, Cranfield says,

To introduce the apodosis answering to a protasis beginning with ὥσπερ or another word of similar meaning, the simple οὕτω(ς) or the stronger οὕτω(ς) καί (in this order) is used. By contrast, καὶ οὕτω(ς) is equivalent to our ‘and so,’ ‘and thus,’ meaning ‘and so (as a result)’ or ‘and so (in this way)’.¹⁵⁰

Lexically, ὥσπερ is translated into “just as,” “so,” “in the same way,” “thus,” or “in this manner” in the protasis of a comparison structure, which has an apodosis beginning with οὕτως.¹⁵¹ It also suggests an analogy or comparison between the

¹⁴⁷ Kirby, 285.

¹⁴⁸ Seemuth, 216.

¹⁴⁹ Charles E. B. Cranfield, “On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12,” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 22 (Sept 1969): 327.

¹⁵⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, 272.

¹⁵¹ BDAG, 1106.

connected ideas or tells how something is to be done.¹⁵² Therefore, the combination of the protasis which is led by ὥστερ and the apodosis having οὕτως constructs a complete comparative clause. In the New Testament, ὥστερ occurs just 36 times, with οὕτως 6 times and with οὕτως καί,¹⁵³ but with καί οὕτως just one time in Romans 5:12.

In Romans 5:12 καί οὕτως is not translated “so also” but “and so” because the clause introduced by οὕτως is a continuation of the protasis. καί οὕτως is not used as the comparison clause with ὥστερ in Paul’s epistles;¹⁵⁴ it is either used alone or with καί following it, when οὕτως has the function of the complete comparison with ὥστερ in the New Testament.¹⁵⁵ The protasis clause started with ὥστερ in verse 12 does not have the complete comparative clause in verse 15, because verse 15 does not get a true parallel to what is stated in verse 12. Therefore, it can see that “the apodosis begun in verse 12 is broken off and not completed until verse 18.”¹⁵⁶

Concerning the reason that Paul breaks off the comparative structure of verse 12, Cranfield explains as follows,

The latter half of the verse is a continuation of the protasis. Paul then breaks off his construction, in order to give a necessary explanation (v. 13f) of what he has said in that continuation of his protasis and to drive home with much emphasis (vv. 15-17) the vast dissimilarity between Adam and Christ. Finally, instead of

¹⁵² Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996), 762.

¹⁵³ W. F. Moulton, A. S. Geden, and H. K. Moulton. *A concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English revisers*, (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1978), 1032.

¹⁵⁴ Schreiner, 271-272. See also Moo, 318. “Rom. 11:26; 1 Cor. 7:17, 36; 11:28; 14:25; 15:11; Gal. 6:2; 1 Thess. 4:17.”

¹⁵⁵ Moo, 318. οὕτως καί is often used as a comparative conjunction for comparison. See Rom. 5:15, 18, 19, 21; 6:4; 11:31; 1 Cor. 2:11; 11:12; 12:12; 15:22; 16:1; 2 Cor. 1:7; Eph. 5:24; Col. 3:13; 2 Tim 3:8.

¹⁵⁶ Schreiner, 272.

just expressing at last the apodosis which he has all along intended, he now, as his parenthesis has become so excessively long (it is five whole verses), repeats the substance of his original protasis in v. 18a, and then immediately completes it with its proper apodosis in v. 18b. The anacoluthon reflects a real theological difficulty, and is a valuable clue to the right understanding of vv. 12-21 as a whole.¹⁵⁷

In conclusion, verse 12 does not contain a complete comparison, and does not have an apodosis (the second half of the comparison) until verse 18. Concerning the translation of καὶ οὕτως, it must be that the translation of καὶ is “and” as conjunction and οὕτως is “so, in this way” as adverb.

The third debate in Romans 5:12 is about the translation of ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Cranfield classifies the interpretation of the phrase into six main views.¹⁵⁸ First, in an interpretation suggested by Stauffer,¹⁵⁹ ᾧ indicates the masculine θάνατος as its antecedent.¹⁶⁰ However, ἐφ’ ᾧ is just an idiom; it indicates a specific antecedent. Therefore, it is difficult to take the first view which indicates θάνατος.”¹⁶¹ Second, as the view supported by Augustine for his doctrine of original sin and some reformers, that is, as masculine ᾧ indicates ἐνδὲς ἀνθρώπου as its antecedent, and ἐπὶ was used instead of ἐν.¹⁶² Therefore, interpretation of the phrase is “in whom (Adam) all sinned.” The weakness of this view is that the antecedent ἀνθρώπου is far away from ᾧ and that the

¹⁵⁷ Cranfield, *Romans*, 272-273.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid, 274-275.

¹⁵⁹ Ethelbert Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), 270.

¹⁶⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, 274.

¹⁶¹ Schreiner, 273.

¹⁶² Cranfield, *Romans*, 274.

preposition then provides a vague clarification through the use of ἐπί instead of ἐν.¹⁶³ The third view interprets ἐπί as “because of.”¹⁶⁴ The weakness of this view is about the same as the second. The fourth view is to see ἐφ’ ᾧ as a conjunction meaning “because,” to understand ἥμαρτον to refer not to men’s sinning in their own persons but to their participation in Adam’s transgression.”¹⁶⁵ This view sees θάνατος as the result of a collective sin, and death being given to all men “because they all sinned collectively in the transgression of Adam.”¹⁶⁶ Therefore, this view includes the theological essence of Augustine’s interpretation and the grammatical explanation of ἐφ’ ᾧ as meaning “because.”¹⁶⁷ The fifth view, as Pelagius’ view, is to see ἐφ’ ᾧ as a conjunction meaning “because,” but it understands ἥμαρτον to refer to men’s sinning in their own persons unconnected with Adam.¹⁶⁸ The sixth view and the fourth view regard ἥμαρτον as referring to men’s sinning in their own persons but as a result of the corrupt nature inherited from Adam.¹⁶⁹ According to this view, men did not sin in Adam, but they certainly do sin in Adam in the sense that they sin in a real solidarity with him, as a result

¹⁶³ Schreiner, 273-274.

¹⁶⁴ Cranfield, *Romans*, 274.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 274-275.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 277.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 277-278.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 275, 277.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 275, 278.

of his transgression.¹⁷⁰ Supporters of this view include Matthew Black, Bruce, Murray, Barclay, Dodd, Morris, Moo, Stott, and Cranfield.¹⁷¹

Besides Cranfield's classification, Fitzmyer argues that ἐφ' ᾧ is consecutive and that the phrase is definitely not causal but a result. On this reading the subordinating clause, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, would say, "And so death spread to all people, with the result that all sinned." Fitzmyer says,

If the consecutive sense of ἐφ' ᾧ is valid, then the connection, expressed by καὶ οὕτως, is confirmed. Paul would thus be attributing the entire perverse corruption of humanity to Adam in the sense that it began with his transgression of the command laid by God upon him but continued as a result in the sinful conduct of those descended from him.¹⁷²

His view is similar to the sixth, classified by Cranfield, that is, as causal.

Käsemann¹⁷³ and Schreiner translate ἐφ' ᾧ as "on the basis of which," stressing the fact of, and the reason for, the relative pronoun. The point of Schreiner's view is that it builds "a logical connection between two propositions, and what that connection is must be discerned in context."¹⁷⁴ He insists that the idea in the ἐφ' ᾧ construction refers

¹⁷⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, 278.

¹⁷¹ Black, 88; F. F. Bruce, 122-123; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 182-184; William Barclay, *The Letter to the Romans* (The Daily study Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957), 79-80; C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, The Moffatt New Testament commentary (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932), 79-80; Morris, 230-232; Moo, 321-329; John R. W. Stott, *Romans: God's Good News for the World* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994), 150-153; Cranfield, *Romans*, 274-281.

¹⁷² Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5:12," *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 3 (July 1993), 339.

¹⁷³ Käsemann, 148.

¹⁷⁴ Schreiner, 274.

back to death.¹⁷⁵ In this, his view is similar to the first classification. Schreiner mentions that “the most natural way to construe πάντες ἥμαρτον is to see a reference to the personal and individual sin of all people.”¹⁷⁶ It is, in some respects, similar to the Pelagian’s understanding, but in other respects different in that Pelagius applied it to all verses of Scripture but Schreiner applies it only to this verse. Concerning this, Schreiner says,

When Paul says “all sinned,” he indeed means that every human being has personally sinned. . . . As a result of Adam’s sin death entered the world and engulfed all people; all people enter the world alienated from God and spiritually dead by virtue of Adam’s sin. By virtue of entering the world in the state of death, all human beings sin. This understanding of the text confirms the view of scholars who insist that original death is more prominent than “original sin” in this text.¹⁷⁷

Interpretation of ἐφ’ ᾧ is divided into two main groups: a relative pronoun (whose antecedent is either ὁ θάνατος or ἐνδὲς ἀνθρώπου) having the meaning of “in” or “because of,” and a conjunction having the meaning of “on the ground of the fact that” or “because.” When the relative pronoun ὅς is used with ἐπί, it is normally interpreted ““for which,” ‘for the reason that,’ ‘because,’ and ‘for,’”¹⁷⁸ and functions as a conjunction having a causal idea. It was used as an idiom and does not point to a specific antecedent. Grammatically the phrase πάντες ἥμαρτον must be a reference to acts of sins that “have been” committed by all. In the writings of Paul the verb ἁμαρτάνω generally refers to an act performed by an individual.¹⁷⁹ Therefore, interpretation of ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον is “because (or for the reason that) all people have sinned,” that is, individual sin, no matter whether individual sins or all sin by (in) Adam’s sin.

¹⁷⁵ Schreiner, 273.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 275.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 275-276.

¹⁷⁸ BDAG, 727.

¹⁷⁹ Seemuth, 217.

The Role of Romans 5:13-14, Parenthesis or Not?

The dispute, whether Romans 5:13-14 is a parenthesis or not, depends on whether Romans 5:12 is the complete comparative clause or not, namely, whether verse 12 has an apodosis or not. As stated above, some scholars who agree that the *καὶ οὕτως* clause has the same function as *οὕτως καὶ* and functions as the apodosis do not think Romans 5:13-14 as parenthesis.¹⁸⁰ They insist that verse 12 is grammatically correct and has the reversed parallelism.¹⁸¹ Seemuth states,

ὥσπερ, which introduces the protasis of a comparison, here must simply be translated “just as” even though it appears that there is no *οὕτως καὶ* with which Paul usually completes a comparison. The argument that Paul simply forgot to include the apodosis should be rejected, however. Paul knows (see below) that *ὥσπερ* normally requires an apodosis if he is introducing a strong comparison. But he also uses *ὥσπερ* to simply indicate “just as” which connects two thoughts in a comparative way. Even without the terms *οὕτως καὶ* in an apodosis, the sense of the comparison is the same.¹⁸²

If their insistence is right, verses 13 and 14 have an independence rather than a role of parenthesis or digression from Romans 5:12. However, most scholars hold that the *ὥσπερ* clause has no true apodosis, namely, that *καὶ οὕτως* is not used as the comparison clause. Thus, the latter half of verse 12 is a continuation of the protasis which gets interrupted and is eventually completed in verse 18. Cranfield says the reason Paul breaks off his construction is to give a necessary explanation.¹⁸³ The comparison of verse 12 is unfinished; it has a protasis using *ὥσπερ* but no apodosis. Paul does not try to complete

¹⁸⁰ Scroggs, 79. See Seemuth, 89-95.

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Seemuth, 89-90.

¹⁸³ Cranfield, *Romans*, 272-273.

his comparison in the terms of verse 12, and he also delays his thought in verse 12. Paul puts the use of the comparison clause off, and adds a long parenthesis in order to explain the latter part of verse 12. Therefore, verses 13 and 14 function as parenthesis to explain “death spread to all men because all people have sinned” in verse 12.

Those Who Had not Sinned in the Likeness of the Transgression of Adam – Romans

5:14

Who are “those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam” in Romans 5:14, why did death reign over them, and did they sin or not? This issue raises no fewer than four arguments. The first view is that these individuals had sin like that of Adam. Some manuscripts do not have the word $\mu\eta$ ¹⁸⁴ and show evidence that the scribes who deleted $\mu\eta$ misunderstood Paul’s intention of the phrase in the verse. They presumably considered that death ruled those who lived in the period between Adam and Moses because of sin of the same nature as Adam’s sin.¹⁸⁵ Through omitting $\mu\eta$, they thought that men’s sins were like that of Adam. This view might mean that death’s rule over all men is because of individuals’ sin. Nevertheless, it appears to be an attempt on the part of some scribes to eliminate a difficulty within the text.

The second view is that these people had solidarity with Adam in his sin, though they did not sin themselves. Barclay asserts that the people during this period participated in Adam’s sin, saying,

Their involvement in his sin caused their deaths, although there was no law for them to break. That is Paul’s proof that all men did sin in Adam. So, then, we

¹⁸⁴ Schreiner, 281. “614 1739* 2495* pc d* m Origen^{pt} Ambrosiaster.”

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 281.

have uncovered one side of Paul's thought. Because of this idea of the complete solidarity of mankind, all men literally sinned in Adam; and because death is the consequence of sin death reigned over all men.¹⁸⁶

Morris says that Adam's sin influenced the totality of mankind, and Adam's descendants sinned in their own way because they were Adam's descendants.¹⁸⁷ Murray insists "when all the facts of the pre-Mosaic period are taken into account the only explanation of the universal reign is solidarity in the sin of Adam."¹⁸⁸ This view of solidarity with Adam is accepted by many scholars. Ridderbos also gives this typical view, saying,

There was sin then, too: "for until the law [came] there was sin in the world." The sanction of the law (death) did not as yet apply, however. For where there is no law, there is also no transgression (cf. 4:15), and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." Nevertheless, at that time also, death reigned over those who did not transgress in the same manner as Adam, that is, who were not confronted in the same manner as Adam with the divine command and the sanction on it. It is thus apparent that it was not their personal sin, but Adam's sin and their share in it, that was the cause of their death.¹⁸⁹

However, this view's weakness is that the sin of those who lived in the time between Adam and Moses is not different from the sin of Adam. Paul plainly says, "they had not sinned in the likeness of transgression of Adam." They did not repeat the sin of Adam. Nevertheless, scholars who hold this view do not explain how the sin is different from the sin of Adam. To avoid the weak point, Achtemeier sees it as universal disobedience and develops it into the connection between Adam and Christ, saying,

¹⁸⁶ William Barclay, *The Letter to the Romans*, Daily study Bible series. Rev. ed. (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975), 81.

¹⁸⁷ Morris, 234.

¹⁸⁸ Murray, 190-191.

¹⁸⁹ Herman N. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975), 96.

Adam's sin is destined to be repeated even by those who lived before there was a law. It was thus the universal consequences of Adam's disobedience which anticipated the universal consequences of Christ's obedience. It is because of those universal consequences that Paul calls Adam a "prototype of Christ".¹⁹⁰

But his assertion also does not prove the difference between the sin of descendants from Adam to Moses and Adam's.

In the third view, Käsemann insists that Adam indicates the Jewish community as a transgressor of the law, and that the sin of those who lived in the time between Adam and Moses represents "ruling powers which implicate all people individually and everywhere determine reality as destiny."¹⁹¹ Certainly, Käsemann is right in distinguishing between the sin of Adam and his successors' sin before Moses. However, his logic has some faults. If Adam represents the Jewish community, given the law from God, Paul in the verse does not refer to Gentiles of the time after Moses. All men except Jews and Adam are ruled by cosmic power. If so, then cosmic power, which reigns over all men except Jews and Adam, does not differ with "un written" or "natural" law given to Gentiles without law in Romans 2:14.

Scholars insist the fourth view distinguishes between sin (ἁμαρτήσαντας) and transgression (παραβάσεως). In other words, those who lived in the time between Adam and Moses sinned (ἁμαρτάνω), but their sin (ἁμαρτία) is different from Adam's sin, that is, transgression (παραβάσις). According to Barrett, Paul makes a distinction between sin and transgression.¹⁹² Dunn likewise insists that ἁμαρτάνω is used here in a way which implies

¹⁹⁰ Paul J. Achtemeier, *Romans, Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985), 97-98.

¹⁹¹ Käsemann, 150.

¹⁹² Barrett, *Romans*, 112.

that there is a sinning which is not a transgression. Adam's sin was παράβασις since it was an act of disobedience to what he knew to be a command of God (Gen 2:16-17).¹⁹³ In a similar vein, Martin Luther says that "all have sinned not by the same act but by involvement in the same condition; only Adam sinned both in terms of act and condition, in so far as he committed the first sin."¹⁹⁴ Definitely, in verse 14, ἁμαρτία (sin) and παράβασις (transgression) are distinguished. The latter is the formal aspect of an evil deed considered as a violation of a law or commandment.¹⁹⁵ Adam received a commandment from God (Gen 2:17; 3:17); however, he violated it. Those who lived in the period between Adam and Moses, however, did not do evil as he had done, for they violated no commandments.¹⁹⁶ They committed sin (ἁμαρτία), which was different than transgression (παράβασις). However, God's declaration, "you will surely die" was given to Adam committing transgression. Therefore, in verse 14 Paul might not distinguish between sin (ἁμαρτία) and transgression (παράβασις).

The last view is that the reference of Paul according to "those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam" is to emphasize the characteristic of those who lived between Adam and Moses. Supporters are Calvin,¹⁹⁷ Godet, Moo, Schreiner, among others. Godet asserts in his book as follows,

Consequently, the phrase: "even over them who sinned not," etc., embraces the whole human species from Adam to Moses without distinction; mankind during

¹⁹³ Dunn, *Romans*, 276. Cranfield suggests the same view. Cranfield, *Romans*, 283.

¹⁹⁴ Luther, 172.

¹⁹⁵ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 418.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 418.

¹⁹⁷ Jean Calvin and John Owen, 204.

this interval are contrasted with Adam on the one hand, and with the people of Israel from Moses on the other. All these who were not under conditions of a capitally penal kind (ver. 13) died nevertheless.¹⁹⁸

Moo understands the clause, “those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam,” as further classification of those who lived during the period between Adam and Moses.¹⁹⁹ Paul, through this description, draws out “the characteristic of these people that is essential to his argument: the ‘law-less’ context of their sin.”²⁰⁰

Concerning the purpose of Paul, Schreiner says as follows,

... Paul’s objective was twofold. First, the power of death is so great that it exercises its dominion over people even if no law exists. Second, violating a commandment revealed by God increases the seriousness of sin in the sense that the sin is now more defiant and rebellious in character. This point accords with the Pauline conception that sin increases (5:20) and takes on a sharper profile (7:7-11) through the law.²⁰¹

Of the five views, the last is the most attractive. In the text Paul emphasizes that all people sinned in Adam and death reigned over all people with no exceptions. To stress the fact that all people in the totality of history are ruled by death, Paul uses the clause “even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of transgression of Adam.”

Adam as a Type of the One to Come – Romans 5:14

The last discussion of this chapter is about the connection between Adam and Christ. In Romans 5:14, “Adam as a type of the one to come” gives readers two problems.

¹⁹⁸ Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos, The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982), 212.

¹⁹⁹ Moo, 333.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ Schreiner, 279.

First, who is “the one to come (τοῦ μέλλοντος)? Is he Christ, Moses, or another? Second, what is the character of “type,” similarity or contrast?

In the first dispute, some scholars consider “τοῦ μέλλοντος” as Moses. As the representative scholars there are J. A. T. Robinson and Robin Scroggs. Robinson considers the true prefigurement of Adam is Moses because the two were in a Torah relationship with God.²⁰² According to Robinson, Adam is “typical of the man of the future, Mosaic man or perhaps simply ‘the future’.”²⁰³ Scroggs tends to agree with Robinson, saying, “The similarity of Adam and Moses is that both were under the Torah of God.”²⁰⁴ Scroggs regards verse 14 as describing a similarity between the situation of Adam and that of Moses.²⁰⁵ In other words, the parallel between Adam and Moses in the strict sense is the similarity between the situation of Adam and that of Moses. The reason that both Robinson and Scroggs have this view is that grammatically they both see the phrase τοῦ μέλλοντος as the neuter person.²⁰⁶ Concerning another reason, Scroggs says,

The most natural use of the word τύπος suggests a certain similarity between the figures compared. Paul nowhere gives any indication that he wants to show any positive relation between Adam and Christ. . . . In addition, the phrase, if it refers to Christ, is abruptly inserted and hardly serves the purpose of the proposed transition. . . . This interpretation relates τοῦ μέλλοντος more naturally to its immediate context, which is a description of the period ‘from Adam to Moses’. Perhaps, Robinson continues τοῦ μέλλοντος might even refer simply to man under the law, rather than specifically to the person of Moses himself.²⁰⁷

²⁰² John A. T. Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (London: SCM Press, 1957), 35.

²⁰³ John A. T. Robinson, *Wrestling with Romans* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979), 65.

²⁰⁴ Scroggs, 79.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Robinson, *Wrestling with Romans*, 65; Seemuth, 54.

²⁰⁷ Scroggs, 80-81.

Seemuth rightly concurs, saying that Adam, who is given a command from God, is the type of the coming one, Moses, to whom God gives the Law for the People.²⁰⁸ He continually develops his logic and says that the comparisons of Romans 5:15-19 are not primarily between Adam and Christ, but between the transgress and gift. That is, Adam and Christ are never subjects, grammatically speaking, of any of the verses of Romans 5:15-19.²⁰⁹

However, most scholars do not express dissent from considering τοῦ μέλλοντος as Christ. Schreiner insists that τοῦ μέλλοντος should be understood from the perspective of Adam.²¹⁰ He corresponds to Christ in terms of the effect of his actions upon the rest of humanity. Cranfield compares Adam's universal effectiveness for ruin with Christ's for salvation.²¹¹ He also insists that the expression τοῦ μέλλοντος is not related with ὁ ἐρχόμενος in Mt. 2:3 and Lk. 7:20, but is explained on the basis of the contents of this section by itself.²¹² Goppelt maintains that Adam connects with Christ as a true type as in redemptive history.²¹³ Lastly, Dunn states,

Christ is the eschatological counterpart of primeval Adam; Adam is the pattern, or "prototype" (Käsemann) of Christ in that each begins an epoch and the character of each epoch is established by their action. . . . The μέλλοντος has an eschatological ring, but it is the realized eschatology of what Christ has already

²⁰⁸ Seemuth, 102-103, 221.

²⁰⁹ Ibid, 221-222.

²¹⁰ Schreiner, 280.

²¹¹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 283.

²¹² Ibid., 283.

²¹³ Goppelt, 129.

accomplished (as in Gal 3:23; Col 2:17) rather than the eschatology of what is yet to come (as in 8:18).²¹⁴

As stated above, that τοῦ μέλλοντος is Christ is more forceful than that it is Moses. In verse 14 the reference of Moses is not related with “the one to come.” The most important thing is that in verses 12-19 Paul stresses the act of obedience of Christ more than the act of disobedience of Adam; namely, the subject in Romans 5:12-19 is Christ, not Moses.

The second discussion concerns the character of “type.” Which connection do Adam and Christ have, similarity or contrast? Lexically, the primary sense of τύπος means the impression made by a blow or pressure; so either “what is stamped,” “mark” or “hollow form” which leaves an impress, or the “form” or “outline” of what made the mark.²¹⁵ In Pauline doctrine, it is especially used as “‘example,’ ‘pattern,’ and ‘model’” (6:17; Phil 3:17; 1 Thess 1:7; 2 Thess 3:9), and it generally suggests a certain similarity between the original form and the model. In Romans 5:14 it translates as “type,” but it could also be interpreted as “antitype.”

Edwards stresses the act of disobedience and obedience in the connection between Adam and Christ, calling Adam the antitype of Christ. He says, “In all other respects, however, Adam and Christ are antitypes, for the wrong which Adam did in his disobedience, Christ in his obedience did not do; and the good which Adam could not do because of his sin, Christ did in his righteousness.”²¹⁶ He also severs the relationship

²¹⁴ Dunn, *Romans*, 276-277.

²¹⁵ Goppelt, TDNT., 247.

²¹⁶ James R. Edwards and W. Ward Gasque. *Romans*, New International Biblical Commentary, 6 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992), 150.

between Adam and Christ and considers Christ not as a successor of Adam, but his redeemer, who is “not part of the old, [but] redeems the old in the new.”²¹⁷

However, most scholars favor similarity in the relation between Adam and Christ. According to the character of type in verse 14, Morris says that Paul finds a similar pattern in Adam from Christ’s saving work, that is, Christ as the head of the new race, the race of the redeemed, and Adam as the head of the old race, the race of sinners.²¹⁸ Käsemann uses the term “prototype” rather than “antitype, because “antitype” is only used in 1 Cor. 10:11.²¹⁹ Moo also maintains a similarity between Adam and Christ, and about the typological relationship of them says, “The similarity between the two consists in the fact that an act of each is considered to have determinative significance for those who ‘being’ to each. This ‘structural’ similarity between Adam’s relationship to his ‘descendants’ and Christ’s to his underlies all of verses 15-21.”²²⁰ However, it is right that the similarity between Adam and Christ is called an antithetical correspondence.²²¹

The discussion concerning similarity and contrast must be found through the structural investigation of verses 12-19. Bultmann rightly states, “Paul intends first to emphasize the disparity in the similarity.”²²² Most scholars who stress the similarity between Adam and Christ have a similar view. Likewise Moo states, “The actions of Adam and Christ, then, are similar in having “epochal” significance. But they are not

²¹⁷ Edwards, 150

²¹⁸ Morris, 234.

²¹⁹ Käsemann, 151.

²²⁰ Moo, 334.

²²¹ Goppelt, TDNT., 252.

²²² Rudolf Karl Bultmann, “Adam and Christ according to Romans 5.” In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (NY: Harper & Row, 1962), 155.

equal in power, for Christ's act is able completely to overcome the effects of Adam's."²²³ "Type" refers to a figure or event in the past that provides a pattern or model for the new age inaugurated by Christ as a technical Jewish term.²²⁴ When Paul said that Adam is a type of Christ, it is definite that it indicates the similarity of the connection between Adam's universal effect for death of all men and the universal effect of Christ's act for salvation.

²²³ Moo, 315

²²⁴ Osborne, 141.

CHAPTER 4

INTERPRETATION OF ADAM TYPOLOGY THROUGH STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS IN ROMANS 5:12-19

Introduction

Some exegetical and theological issues surrounding the translation of Romans 5:12-19 were examined in the prior chapter. This chapter deals with the translation of the text through exegesis and the structural analysis of the connection between Adam and Christ, known as Adamic typology or structural typology.²²⁵ In other words, because resemblance and difference between Adam and Christ exist in the text as defined by relations of mutual presupposition, it is necessary to understand the meaning of the text through both exegesis and structural analysis.

The Text and Translation for the Structural Analysis of Romans 5:12-19

Translation of Romans 5:12-19

Because translation results from exegesis, scholars show their theological view and assertion in the translation of the Greek text. Any detailed structural analysis of the text requires an exegetical explanation of the text. The translation of Romans 5:12-19 is as follows:

²²⁵ Ole Davidsen, "The Structural Typology of Adam and Christ: Some Modal-Semiotic Comments on the Basic Narrative of the Letter to the Romans," In *New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, 244-262 (Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press., 1995), 250.

- 12 Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον·
12. Because of this, just as through one man sin entered into the world and death through sin, and in this way to all men death spread, because all people have sinned –
- 13 ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ, ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου,
13. for until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no Law.
- 14 ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος.
14. But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one to come.
- 15 Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα· εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.
15. But the gift is not like the transgression. For if the many died through the transgression of the one, how much more the grace of God and the gift through the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, has abounded for the many.
- 16 καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι' ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δῶρημα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατὰκριμα, τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα.
16. And the gift is not like what came through the one who sinned. For on the one hand the judgment resulted in the condemnation caused by one, on the other hand the gift caused by many transgressions resulted in justification.
- 17 εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
17. For if by the transgression of the one man death reigned through the one man, how much more shall those who receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ.
- 18 Ὡς οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατὰκριμα, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·
18. Therefore, as through the transgression of the one man there resulted condemnation to all men, so also through the act of righteousness of the one man there resulted justification of life to all men.
- 19 ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ
19. For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made

ἐνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

sinner, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.

The translation of Romans 5:12-19 poses some slight textual problems. First, verse 12 is missing ὁ θάνατος. The subject ὁ θάνατος is read by **Σ** A B C K P 0220^{vid}, 33, 81, 614, 1739, *Byz*, *Lect*, etc., but is omitted by D F G 2495 and some MSS of the VL.²²⁶ Fitzmyer states that “its omission affected the controversy between Pelagius and Augustine, when *pantes*, ‘all,’ was taken to include infants, a precision that Paul did not envisage.”²²⁷ Therefore, the predominance of the external evidence suggests that the term should be included, and the omission should be explained as a peculiarity of the Western text.²²⁸ Second, in some manuscripts, 614, 1739*, 2495, Origen^{pt} and Ambrosiaster, and some MSS of the VL, the word μὴ is omitted in Romans 5:14, so that the interpretation of the text would read, “even over those who had sinned.” However, the external evidence demonstrates that the superior reading includes μὴ.²²⁹ As some scribes remove μὴ, it seems that they might try to regard the sin of the people who lived between Adam and Moses as the same as the sin of Adam. Third, in Romans 5:14 some manuscripts (B and 2495, as well as Origen), read ἐν instead ἐπὶ within ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι,. The reason might be “a stylistic variant to avoid the double use of ἐπὶ.”²³⁰ Therefore, the change of

²²⁶ Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament; A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (3d Ed.)* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), 512-513; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 413.

²²⁷ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 413.

²²⁸ Schreiner, 280.

²²⁹ *Ibid.*, 281.

²³⁰ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 418.

preposition does not influence the translation. Fourth, in order to make the text grammatically easier, some manuscripts (D F G and some Syriac and Vulgate witnesses) insert the noun ἁμαρτήματος instead of the participle ἁμαρτήσαντος (the one who sinned), but it is rejected as secondary.²³¹ Lastly, in Romans 5:17 the genitive τῆς δωρεᾶς is read in $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$ $\aleph$ A C D G K P 33,81^{vid}, 614, 1739, Byz Lect etc.; and a few manuscripts (6, 88, 104, 1984, and 1985) render it as an accusative. Some manuscripts (Ψ , 0221, 365, 1505, 2495, etc.) add καὶ between δωρεᾶς and δικαιοσύνης, and other manuscripts (B, cop^{sa}, Sahidic, lr, Ambrosiaster) omit the words entirely.²³² However, the wide range of early manuscripts suppose τῆς δωρεᾶς might be the proper reading.

The words ἁμαρτάνω and/or ἁμαρτία are translated with the word “sin.” This is in distinction from the word παράβασις, and παράπτωμα. In the New Testament the word παράβασις generally denotes “sin in its relation to law, to a requirement, or obligation which is legally valid or has legal force,”²³³ and an evil deed in relation to a violation of a law or commandment.²³⁴ Therefore, its translation is “transgression.” NIV and JB translate παραβάσεως in Romans 5:14 as “breaking a command,” and NASB, as “the offense.” However, KJV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, and ASV translate it as “transgression.” The word παράπτωμα lexically means a violation of moral standards, ordinarily of

²³¹ Schreiner, 293.

²³² Metzger, 513; Schreiner, 293; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 420.

²³³ Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Abridged edition. Translated and abridged by Geoffrey Bromiley, v. 5 (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985), 739. TDNT says that παράβασις is correlative to νόμος, and ἁμαρτία is not correlative to it; therefore, in the time between Adam and Moses, ἁμαρτία was present but not παράβασις. However, ἁμαρτία (verse 12), παράβασις (verse 14), and παράπτωμα (verse 15) are essentially synonymous (see Moo, 335).

²³⁴ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 418.

offenses against God,²³⁵ and thus is translated as “trespass,” or “the offence.” NIV, RSV, NRSV, and ASV translate παράπτωμα as “trespass,” and KJV, NKJV, and JB, as “the offence.” NASB, however, translates the term as “transgression.” Above all, the most important reference to the translation of the words, παράβασις and παράπτωμα, is that παράπτωμα in verse 15 indicates Adam’s transgression in verse 14. Therefore, it is possible to translate both as “transgression.” Some scholars insist that in verse 14 sin (ἁμαρτήσαντας, as well as verse 12, ἁμαρτία) and transgression (παραβάσεως, also verses 17 and 18) must be distinguished because their meaning is different. Of course, the literal meaning of the two words is different. However, it is right to see transgression in Romans 5:12-19 as Paul essentially considers παράβασις and παράπτωμα as being synonymous with ἁμαρτία. In verse 14 sin (ἁμαρτήσαντας) and transgression (παραβάσεως) also are used with the same meaning, though neither indicates the same thing. Regarding the connection between sin (ἁμαρτήσαντας) and transgression (παραβάσεως), Adam received a commandment from God (Gen 2:17; 3:17) and violated it. He and his descendants died by his transgression (παράβασις, or παράπτωμα, verses 15, 17). However, because all those who lived in the period between Adam and Moses sinned (ἁμαρτάνω), death reigned over them (verse 14), and because all people have sinned, death spread to all people (verse 12). It is certain that Paul used three words as though they had the same meaning.

In Romans 5:12-19 another four similar words are used: δικαίωμα (verse 16) δικαιοσύνης (verse 17), δικαίωματος (verse 18) and δικαίωσιν (verse 18). The word δικαίωμα lexically indicates a regulation relating to just or right action, or an action that

²³⁵ BDAG, 770.

meets expectations as to what is right or just. In this verse, δικαίωμα is used for the purpose of clearing someone of a violation.²³⁶ Therefore, in verse 16 the meaning of this word is translated “justification,” and is rendered “act of righteousness.” Almost all English versions²³⁷ and scholars²³⁸ agree with this translation, except JB which renders it as “verdict of acquittal.” The word δικαιοσύνη lexically indicates the quality, state, or practice of judicial responsibility with focus on fairness, of juridical correctness with focus on redemptive action, or of upright behavior.²³⁹ In verse 17, δικαιοσύνη was used as the meaning of quality or state of juridical correctness with focus on redemptive action. The word also translates as “righteousness,” which is bestowed by God, by almost all English versions and scholars, except JB which translates it as “saving justice.” The rendering of Romans 5:18 varies in translating the phrases δι’ ἐνὸς δικαιώματος. However, generally English versions and scholars insist on “the act,” one act of righteousness (NIV, NASB), one man’s act of righteousness (RSV, NRSV), one act of righteousness (NASB), and so on. The last word, δικαίωσις means “justification, vindication, or acquittal,” and almost all English versions translate it as “justification.”²⁴⁰

As stated above, the καὶ οὕτως clause does not have the function of the complete comparison clause. Thus, there is a need to distinguish between καὶ οὕτως and οὕτως καὶ. As a conjunction, the translation of καὶ is “and,” and as a demonstrative adverb the translation of οὕτως is “in this way,” or “so.” Interpretation of ἐφ’ ᾧ is interpreted as “in”

²³⁶ BDAG, 249.

²³⁷ NIV, NASB, KJV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, and ASV.

²³⁸ Robinson, Godet, Hodge, Murray, Moo, Dunn, Morris, Schreiner, Cranfield, Käsemann.

²³⁹ BDAG, 247-248.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 250. BDAG translates εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς to “acquittal that brings life.”

or “because of” as a relative pronoun, or “on the ground of the fact that” or “because” as a conjunction. However, the latter is grammatically correct. The relative pronoun ὅς used with ἐπί, is normally translated as “‘for which,’ ‘for the reason that,’ ‘because,’ and ‘for’”²⁴¹ with the preposition, and has a causal idea. It was used as an idiom and does not point to a specific antecedent. Therefore, ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον translates as “because (or for the reason that) all people sinned.”

The problem, whether Romans 5:13-14 is parenthesis or not, influences the translation of the text. To regard verse 12 as a completed sentence means that the thought stays only in verse 12 as a completed statement. However, if verse 12 is an unfinished sentence which does not have an apodosis, it needs the data given in verses 13 and 14. When verse 12 is considered a finished sentence, the thoughts in each verse are disconnected even though each of the verses is closed. But, when “the apodosis begun in verse 12 is broken off and not completed until verse 18,”²⁴² the thought in verses 12-19, so-called Adam/Christ typology, is completed. Therefore, the construction of verse 12 was broken off because of the need for an explanation concerning verse 12. Almost all English versions consider verses 13 and 14 as parentheses, and put a hyphen between verse 12 and verse 13. KJV and NKJV go so far as to put verses 13-17 into parentheses. This shows that 5:12-17 is a continuous thought relating Adam to Christ. Moo rightly refers to the structure of Adamic typology in 5:12-19, stating,

The argument of the paragraph proceeds disjointedly because Paul begins in v. 12a a comparison (“just as” . . .) that he never completes. Instead, he becomes involved in expanding on the first part of his comparison—the sin of Adam (vv. 12d-14). At the end of v. 14, in affirming that Adam is a “type” of Christ, Paul

²⁴¹ BDAG, 727.

²⁴² Schreiner, 272.

hints at the completed comparison, but before stating it he institutes a series of contrasts between Adam and Christ (vv. 15-17). Finally, then, in two roughly parallel statements (vv. 18, 19), the full comparison is made.²⁴³

The Syntactical Structure of Romans 5:12-19

The structure of Adam-Christ typology compares and contrasts two men — Adam and Christ. The relationship between Adam and Christ is characterized by resemblance since the acts of both have consequences for many others. Yet, they are characterized by stark differences since the first one was disobedient, which results in death, while the second one was obedient, which results in life.²⁴⁴ “Type” is the word which characterizes their relationship. If Adam is “type,” Christ is “antitype.” The context of 5:12-19 shows the structural relation between these two entities, that is, a structural similarity and a structural difference. The context sees a difference and similarity between Adam and Christ, between their work and their result. Therefore, the Adam-Christ typology is a structural typology.²⁴⁵

In 5:12-19 there are three classes of the comparative conjunction as the structures to explain the characteristic of Adam-Christ. For the comparison of Adam and Christ or their works the first structure of the correlative conjunction appears in verses 12, 18 and 19 as ὥς [ὥσπερ] . . . οὕτως. These two correlative and comparative conjunctions are used to express a correspondence of similarities between Adam and Christ.²⁴⁶ In verse 12 Paul states the positive comparison with the use of the ὥσπερ clause. However, the clause does

²⁴³ Moo, 316.

²⁴⁴ Davidsen, 249.

²⁴⁵ Ibid., 250.

²⁴⁶ Ibid., 300.

not pass to apodosis, but breaks off in an anacoluthon. The comparative clause is not resumed until verse 18. Concerning this anacoluthon, Cranfield explains that Paul, “realizing the danger of his comparison being very seriously misunderstood ... prefers to indicate as emphatically as possible the vast dissimilarity between Christ and Adam before formally completing it.”²⁴⁷ Goppelt refers to this comparative structure as “the advance presentation which indicates higher correspondence.”²⁴⁸ In the strict sense, the ὥς [ὥσπερ] and οὕτως comparative construction is used two times. In verse 12 Paul compares Adam, as the head and inclusive representative of the human race, to Christ, as the head and inclusive representative of the new human race by the use of the comparative construction. Verse 19 repeats the parallel between Adam and Christ in verses 12-18. Because this comparative construction is the core frame of Adam-Christ typology, in spite of the vast and crucial contrast between Christ and Adam, “there is nevertheless a real likeness between them consisting in the correspondence of structure between the Christ-and-man relationship and the Adam-and-all-men relationship.”²⁴⁹ As (ὥσπερ) Adam’s transgression/disobedience resulted in condemnation to all men (verse 18) and made all sinners (verse 19), causing death to reign, so (οὕτως) Christ’s righteousness/obedience resulted in justification of life to all men (verse 18), and made “the many” (οἱ πολλοὶ) righteous, causing grace, righteousness, and life of Jesus Christ to reign.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁷ Cranfield, *Romans*, 270.

²⁴⁸ TDNT., 8: 252.

²⁴⁹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 295.

²⁵⁰ Davidson, 300-301.

The second structure of the correlative conjunction appears in verses 15 and 16 as οὐχ ὥς . . . οὕτως. This comparative construction is characterized by the introductory οὐχ and is used to express the negative comparison of two objects. Goppelt describes this comparative construction as the antithetical correspondence between Adam and Christ including emulation.²⁵¹ In verses 17 and 18 the same antithesis is used without the οὐχ. This series of antitheses, then, begins directly after the reference of Adam as “type” (τύπος) “of the one to come” (τοῦ μέλλοντος) in verse 14.²⁵² Davidson states, “Expressed in terms of poetic analysis, the work of Christ forms a reverse parallelism, a chiasmus, with that of Adam. Adam’s sin led downward to sin, corruption, and death. Christ’s obedience brought acquittal, counter-action, and restoration.”²⁵³

The correspondence between Adam and Christ in verses 15-19 is the correspondence of their act. However, the contents in their act are antithetical. In other words, Adam and Christ affect “all people.” Adam affects them by transgression/disobedience but Christ by righteousness/obedience. The connection between Adam and Christ can be arranged as follows:

<Antithetical correspondence between Adam and Christ>

Adam’s act	Christ’s Act
1. through the transgression of the one (Adam) (v. 15a)—The many (all men) died.	1. through the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ (v. 15b)—The many in Christ abound in grace.
2. resulted in the condemnation from one (Adam) (v. 16a)	2. resulted in justification (v. 16b)

²⁵¹ Goppelt, TDNT, 8, 252.

²⁵² Davidson, 302.

²⁵³ Ibid., 302-303.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>3. through the one man (Adam) (v. 17a)—Death reigned.</p> <p>4. through the transgression of the one man (Adam) (18a)—Condemnation was given to “the many (all)” in Adam.</p> <p>5. through the disobedience of the one man (Adam) (19a)—“The many” were made sinners.</p> | <p>3. through the one man, Jesus Christ (v. 17b)—Those who receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life.</p> <p>4. through the act of righteousness of the one man (Christ) (18b)—Justification was given to “the many (all)” in Christ.</p> <p>5. through the obedience of the one man (Christ) (19b)—“The many” will be made righteous.</p> |
|---|---|

Therefore, the emphasis in the act of Adam and Christ is on their disobedience/obedience.

The emphasis in the result is on “The many (all men) were made sinners” through Adam’s disobedience, and “The many will be made righteous” through Christ’s obedience.

The third correlative conjunctions for the comparison is εἰ . . . πολλῷ μᾶλλον, appearing in verses 15 and 17. As a combination with adverb and adjective, πολλῷ μᾶλλον, lexically, is used to present a greater, higher degree, or a better reason,²⁵⁴ and generally translates as “much more.” This comparative conjunction also indicates “an element of absolute intensification or escalation” in the structure of Adam-Christ typology.²⁵⁵ Murray sees this structure as *a fortiori*, that is, “the argument is from one manifestation of grace to another.”²⁵⁶ Seemuth also insists that the structure is a “*kal va-homer* argument by saying ‘how much more certain’ rather than the more literal ‘much more.’”²⁵⁷ The opinion of English versions and scholars is divided. For instance, NIV and

²⁵⁴ BDAG, 613-614.

²⁵⁵ Davidson, 303-304.

²⁵⁶ Murray, 192.

²⁵⁷ Seemuth, 86-87.

JB translate (εἰ . . .) πολλῶ μᾶλλον as “how much more (or how much greater—JB),” but NASB, KJV, NKJV, RAV, NRSV, and ESV translate it as “much more.” Dunn, Moo, and Schreiner translate it as “how much more,” but Cranfield translates it as “much more” and Godet as “much rather.”²⁵⁸ The phrase πολλῶ μᾶλλον appears in verses 9 and 10. The parallelism between verses 9 and 10 is used as the purpose to insist the substitution of “reconciled” for “justified.”²⁵⁹ The parallelism, however, between verses 15 and 17 is used as the purpose to insist that believers’ rule in life is better than death’s rule. If it is certain that “the many” died through Adam’s transgression, then it is “much more” certain that not only God’s grace and the gift through the grace of Christ has overflowed to “the many,” but also that “believers” who receive the grace and gift of righteousness reign in life through Jesus Christ.

The Structural Interpretation of Romans 5:12-19

The Structural analysis of Romans 5:12-19

The structure of Romans 5:12-19 is quite complex, and it is not easy to understand that the comparative structure of verse 12 is broken off, and is not completed until verse 18. Romans 5:12-19 is constructed by two major axles, the protasis of verse 12 and the apodosis of verse 18. In verse 12 the protasis beginning with ὥσπερ is not finished in verse 12, but continues in verse 18a. It is made up of a completed comparative clause in verse 18 with the apodosis which began with οὕτως καὶ in verse 12b. Verses 13 and 14 explicate “because all people have sinned” (ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον) at the end of

²⁵⁸ Dunn, *Romans*, 270; Moo, 314; Schreiner, 270-283; Cranfield, *Romans*, 269; Godet, 202-224.

²⁵⁹ Moo, 311.

verse 12. Verses 15-17 explain the difference between Christ and Adam. In verse 18a, then, Paul makes the protasis of verse 12 a brief structure, and now completes it with the long-delayed apodosis.²⁶⁰ Verse 19 repeats and explains verse 18, and shows the connection between Adam's disobedience and the condemnation of all men, and between Christ's obedience and men's justification in life.²⁶¹

<The Structure of Romans 5:12-19>

Protasis, "Because of this, just as through one man sin entered into the world and death" (5:12a)

"and in this way to all men death spread, because all people have sinned." (5:12b)

Parenthesis, "for until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no Law.

But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of the one to come." (5:13-14)

Two negative sentences deriving explanation (5:15-17);

The first premise, "But the gift is not like the transgression." (5:15a)

Explanation, "For if the many died through the transgression of the one, how much more the grace of God and the gift through the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, has abounded for the many." (5:15b)

The second premise, "And the gift is not like what came through the one who sinned ." (5:16a)

Explanation 1, "For on the one hand the judgment resulted in the condemnation caused by one, on the other hand the gift caused by many transgressions resulted in justification." (5:16b)

Explanation 2, "For if by the transgression of the one man death reigned through the one man, how much more shall those who receive the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ." (5:17)

Repeats protasis of 5:12, "Therefore, as through the transgression of the one man there resulted condemnation to all men" (5:18a)

²⁶⁰ Cranfield, *Romans*, 270.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 270.

Apodosis, “so also through the act of righteousness of the one man there resulted justification of life to all men.” (5:18b)

Repeat of the parallel between Adam and Christ in vv.12-18,

protasis “For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners,

Apodosis “so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous.” (5:19)

In verse 12 a comparison commences, but the structure is broken off, and immediately interrupted by the parentheses. The first part of verse 12 says that death reigned over mankind before the arrival of the law (verses 13-14). The second part states the inequality between the fall of Adam and God’s grace/the gift of grace from Christ (verses 15-17). In the last part, the conclusion, the comparison between Adam and Christ is brought to an end (verses 18-19).²⁶²

Entrance of sin into the world—Romans 5:12

Verse 12 refers to the entrance of sin into the world through “one man.” Of course, one man refers to Adam. In verse 12a,b “sin” is the singular noun, namely, sin and death resulting from the action of one man, Adam. However, in verse 12c,d “all” is insisted. The adverb οὕτως insists that all people sinned and died the same way as Adam. The adverb οὕτως shows a comparison between the manner in which death came into the world—through sin of one man—and the manner in which death spread to everyone—through the sin of all men. Therefore, verse 12 shows a chiastic structure.

A Sin entered into the world, through one

B death entered, through sin (of one)

²⁶² Davidsen, 248-249.

B¹ death spread, (through sin)

A¹ (because) all people have sinned

The chiastic structure of the verse shows that death reigned over all people because all have sinned. It also appears that the last clause, ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, has a causal meaning, that is a causal relation between Adam's sin and the sin of all humans. This is supported by most scholars and almost all English versions.²⁶³ Paul shows that death, entering into the world through the sin of the one man, Adam, has led to death for all people. In succession, Paul states the reason why all people die is because all people have personally sinned. Paul's concern here is not with "original sin," which does not appear in verse 12, but with "original death."²⁶⁴ In verse 12 Paul does not clearly say the concrete cause of all people's sin, although the sin of all people (verse 12d) indicates their personal sin—but it is obvious that the sin of all people is not the sin which they commit; therefore, it indicates the fact that Adam's sin is imputed to all people,²⁶⁵ nor the connection between Adam's sin (verse 12a) and the sin of all people (verse 12d). What he has made clear is the relation between sin and death — that the case of every human being is the same as the case of Adam.²⁶⁶ Paul breaks off his initial construction in order to elucidate several points raised in verse 12.²⁶⁷

²⁶³ Fitzmyer, "The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5:12," 325-326.

²⁶⁴ Moo, 322-323.

²⁶⁵ Moo says "Paul in v.12 asserts that all people die because they sin on their own account; and in vv. 18-19 he claims that they die because of Adam's sin." See Moo, 324.

²⁶⁶ Moo, 323.

²⁶⁷ Stanley E. Porter, "The Argument of Romans 5: Can a Rhetorical Question Make a Difference?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110, no. 4 (Wint 1991): 671.

The problem of parenthesis – Romans 5:13-14

Romans 5:13-14 have the role of parenthesis interrupting the completion of the comparison of verse 12. Almost all English versions show 5:13-14 in parentheses with a dash at the end of verse 12. There are two assertions concerning the parenthesis in verses 13-14.²⁶⁸ One view is that the first clause in verse 13 is concessive and emphasizes the contrast between verses 13 and 14 (“though sin was in the world before the law, sin is not taken into account when there is no law; nevertheless, . . .”).²⁶⁹ In other words, in the parenthesis, the reign of death over those who had not sinned (verses 14) is stressed. Supporting this view, Murray states, “This verse (v. 13) stands in close relation to verse 14 and the strong adversative with which the latter begins indicates that the thought of verse 13 is preparatory to that of verse 14 and moves on to verse 14 as expressing what is of particular relevance to the subject.”²⁷⁰ The point of this view is that “Paul raises conflicting points in verses 13b and 14a in order to stimulate his audience to draw an inference.”²⁷¹ Moo states that “Paul may want his readers to understand that only the corporate sinning of all people ‘in and with’ Adam can explain the universality of death.”²⁷²

²⁶⁸ Moo states three possibilities concerning Paul’s digression in verses 13-14; first, the view seeing verses 13-14 as a reinforcement of verse 12; second, as the view focusing on the contrast between verses 13b and 14, but stress that “law” is universal; third, as the view focusing on the contrast between verses 13b and 14, but stress that the corporate sinning of all people “in and with.”

²⁶⁹ Osborne, 140-141.

²⁷⁰ Murray, 187.

²⁷¹ Moo, 329

²⁷² Ibid, 329-331. See Schreiner, 277-279; he also supports of this view.

The second view emphasizes the first clause (13a) and sees the second clause (13b) as concessive (“sin was in the world before the law, even though sin is not taken into account when there is no law; nevertheless, . . .”).²⁷³ This view stresses the presence of sin in the world before the law and does not regard the connection between verses 13 and 14 as a contrast. Cranfield states,

But, if the first sentence of v. 13 is stressed and the second treated as virtually equivalent to a concessive clause, it is then the fact that sin was already present and active in mankind before the law was given that is introduced as explanation of something in v. 12. This second alternative, which seems to be a perfectly natural way of taking v. 13, has the advantage of suiting what on other grounds is the most probable interpretation of the last clause of v. 12.²⁷⁴

However, the difference of these two views is just a matter of emphasis rather than a matter of interpretation. In Romans 5:13 and 14 each verse is led by a conjunction. Therefore, the best solution is to begin the verses with the conjunctions. Each of the clauses has an independent conjunction. The γὰρ (for) beginning verse 13 provides the cause for the last clause of verse 12, not for the second clause. Then the δὲ (but) beginning verse 13b indicates a problem with the statement of verse 13a, and the ἀλλὰ (but) of verse 14 answers the whole of verse 13 and not just the second clause.²⁷⁵ Verses 13, 14 expand on verse 12, especially the latter part of verse 12. Therefore, the second view is a more sensible choice than the first. The declaration that death reigns over all people because they sin on their own account requires more explanation. Sin in the latter part of verse 12 refers to the individual sin which make all people die. Verses 13, 14 concerning this question append the facts of the presence of sin in the world before the

²⁷³ Osborne, 140-141.

²⁷⁴ Cranfield, *Romans*, 282.

²⁷⁵ Osborne, 141.

law and that death reigns over all people from Adam until Moses. It shows that the power of influence of Adam's sin extends over all people.

One of the arguments in verses 13 and 14 is the question concerning "those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam." Some scholars say that they died as a result of solidarity with Adam even though they had not personally sinned.²⁷⁶ Other scholars insist that their sin (ἁμαρτία) is different from Adam's transgression (παράβασις).²⁷⁷ C. K. Barrett insists that their sin is the violation concerning "the law of nature written even in the heart of the Gentiles."²⁷⁸ However, Paul uses this description to emphasize that all people sinned in Adam and death reigned over all people, nobody excepted.

The most debated issue in 5:12-19 might be that concerning "Adam who is a type of the one to come." Some scholars consider τοῦ μέλλοντος as Moses because of the similarity between Adam and Moses: relationship with God in the Torah,²⁷⁹ their situation,²⁸⁰ or receipt of a command and the Law from God.²⁸¹ However, the context of 5:12-19 supports the idea that τοῦ μέλλοντος indicates Christ: the universal influence of Adam's one act prefigures the universal influence of Christ's act.²⁸² Adam is called a

²⁷⁶ Barclay, 81; Morris, 234; Ridderbos, 96.

²⁷⁷ Barrett, *Romans*, 112; Dunn, *Romans*, 276.

²⁷⁸ Godet, 209.

²⁷⁹ Robinson, *The Body*, 35

²⁸⁰ Scroggs, 80-81.

²⁸¹ Seemuth, 102-103, 221.

²⁸² Moo, 334.

type of Christ in terms of the effect of his actions upon humanity. The term τοῦ μέλλοντος is a title for the Messiah.

The comparison between Adam and Christ—Romans 5:15-17

Concerning the purpose of Romans 5:15-17, Cranfield says that the first objective is to drive home the difference between Christ and Adam, before the formal comparison between them is made in v. 18ff; the second is to prohibit a possible misunderstanding of that comparison.²⁸³ Verses 15-17 develop the relation between Adam and Christ, but the comparative relation is very contrasted. Paul refers to three points of direct contrast. The first, in verse 15, is the antithesis between “the transgression of Adam” and “the grace of Christ.” The transgression of Adam caused the death of all people, but the grace/gift of the Christ brought the abundance to the many. Humanity is divided into two groups: those who receive Adam’s effects, and the many who receive the effects of Christ’s atoning sacrifice.²⁸⁴ Adam, as the head of the race, received the effect of his transgression, but Christ, as the head of the race, freely gave his grace/gift. Cranfield defines the gift as the righteous status that God gives to people,²⁸⁵ but Moo insists that the contrast with “trespass” points to an act of Christ rather than the effects of that act.²⁸⁶ The term “gift” is a strong Hellenistic word meaning “the best gifts” and is chosen to emphasize the gift of what Christ has done for “the many.”²⁸⁷ This gift is in verse 17 — “the gift of

²⁸³ Cranfield, *Romans*, 284.

²⁸⁴ Osborne, 141.

²⁸⁵ Cranfield, 284.

²⁸⁶ Moo, 335.

²⁸⁷ Osborne, 142.

righteousness” — given to those who believe in Christ. In the protasis of this verse, “the many” clearly indicates “all people” because Paul has already said in verse 12 that “all died”. But in the apodosis “the many” must be restricted those who “receive” the gift of righteousness given those who believe in Christ.²⁸⁸ The many (all) who belong to Adam are given only the result of death, but there is God’s grace and Christ’s gift for “the many” who have come to Christ, and the gift did “abound” to them.

The second contrast in verse 16 shows the results, that is, the transgression of Adam brought judgment and condemnation, while the gift brought justification from the transgression. Verse 16a compares the gift with transgression as the second of the two statements of the difference between Adam and Christ. Verse 16b explains the reason of verse 16a. Concerning two crucial differences between the judgment which followed Adam’s transgression and the gift of God by Christ, Cranfield states,

The first concerns their external circumstances or contexts: the judgment was the consequence of but one misdeed, but the gift was God’s answer to a numberless multitude of misdeeds, to all the accumulated sins of the centuries. . . . The second concerns the ends to which they lead: the judgment pronounced on Adam issues in condemnation for all men, but the gift of God issues in justification.²⁸⁹

The third contrast in verse 17 continues the results: the rule of death by the transgression of Adam and the rule of those who receive the gift of righteousness by Christ that is life. The condemnation of verse 16 delivered the reign of death, and the justification of verse 16 delivered the grace of God that enables believers to reign in life.²⁹⁰ The terms “grace” and “gift” also develop further the emphases of verse 15. Moo

²⁸⁸ Moo, 336.

²⁸⁹ Cranfield, *Romans*, 286.

²⁹⁰ Osborne, 143.

states, “Verse 17 is the summary and climax of Paul’s explanation of the contrasting effects of the parallel redemptive-historical acts of the two men.”²⁹¹ In regard to verse 17b Dunn explains that it also encapsulates the message on the universal reign of death in verses 12-14.²⁹² Here, however, that universal reign is answered and overturned by the incredible grace of God.²⁹³ Dunn states, “Adam stands only at the beginning of the epoch, even though his action determines the whole epoch’s domination by death. In contrast, the epoch of Christ is not merely initiated by Christ but continues to be determined by Christ throughout its course.”²⁹⁴ Sin and death reigned over all humanity because of “the trespass of the one man.” However, once more that power has been abolished. Grace overturns sin, and life triumphs over death because “the one man, Jesus Christ” has overturned the act of the one.²⁹⁵

The conclusion of Adam-Christ typology—Romans 5:18, 19

At the beginning of a sentence, ἄρα expresses the inference and the transition with οὖν. Therefore, the meaning of ἄρα οὖν leading verse 18 is “as a result,” “therefore,” or “consequently.” The introductory ἄρα οὖν shows that Paul intends for verse 18 to function as a summary of his thought. Paul, in verse 18, sums up all of what he has said in Romans 5:12-17. Verse 18a repeats the essence of the original protasis (verse 12),²⁹⁶

²⁹¹ Moo, 339.

²⁹² Dunn, *Romans*, 281. See Osborne, 143.

²⁹³ Osborne, 143.

²⁹⁴ Dunn, 296.

²⁹⁵ Osborne, 143.

²⁹⁶ Cranfield, *Romans*, 289.

and in verse 12b the οὕτως καὶ clause constructs the complete comparative clause as the apodosis. Paul has already developed in verses 15-17 the basic argument of the one/many parallel between Adam and Christ. Now here he organizes his thought and draws it to a conclusion.

There are two contrasts in each verse. The first (verse 18) contrasts between condemnation which was given to “the many” through the transgression of Adam, and justification which was given to “the many” through the righteous act of Christ. This structure not only completes the contrast begun but not completed in verse 12 but also restates verses 16-17.²⁹⁷ The phrase εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους stresses the universal effects of Adam and Christ. However, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους in the protasis is different from it in the apodosis. The former literally indicates all people without exception, but the latter indicates all people who “receive God’s abundant provision of grace by Christ.” Paul asserts that Adam’s transgression has been instrumental in leading to the “condemnation” of all people. This instrumental connection expands as follows: Adam’s “transgression” – “condemnation” of all; Christ’s “righteousness” – “justification of life.”²⁹⁸ The transgression of Adam indicates no doubt the sin of eating the forbidden fruit. This transgression is not only reason for the condemnation of all people, but also it is the medium of God’s judgment of condemnation upon all.²⁹⁹ However, the imputation of Adam’s sin to all people makes them actual sinners and death reigns over them. Just as “the transgression” of Adam is the cause of condemnation and the reason of eternal death

²⁹⁷ Osborne, 144.

²⁹⁸ Moo, 340-342.

²⁹⁹ Murray, 200.

over all people, “the act of righteousness” of Christ is also the cause of justification which is given to all believers. Through the act of righteousness of Christ justification of life is given to all believers. The imputation of Christ’s righteousness is not only a judicial declaration. It also makes “the many” become actually righteous (verse 19b). Concerning the meaning of “through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous” in verse 19b, Murray says,

Through the expression “constituted righteous” belongs strictly to the forensic sphere, yet we must not overlook the distinctive aspect from which justification is viewed in the use of this formula. Justification is a constitutive act, not barely declarative. And this constitutive act consists in our being placed in the category of righteous persons by reason of our relation to Christ. . . . And just as the relation to Adam means the imputation to us of his disobedience, so the relation to Christ means the imputation to us of his obedience. Justification means our involvement in the obedience of Christ in terms of the same principle by which we are involved in Adam’s sin.³⁰⁰

Some scholars see in the word, δικαίωματος, a reference to Christ’s whole life.³⁰¹

Cranfield states, “We take it that by Christ’s δικαίωμα Paul means not just His atoning death but the obedience of His life as a whole.” However, “the act of righteousness” of Christ here is contrasted with “the transgression” of Adam. In verse 19 Adam’s transgression indicates “an act of disobedience” which makes all people as well as Adam himself die; “the act of righteousness” indicates an act of obedience. Therefore, it more likely refers to the righteous act of Jesus’ sacrificial death.³⁰²

The second contrast of verse 19 uses the same basic structure as in verse 18, but restates the first using different language, with Adam’s “disobedience” making “the

³⁰⁰ Murray, 205-206.

³⁰¹ Ibid., 200-201; Cranfield, *Romans*, 289.

³⁰² Dunn, *Romans*, 283; Osborne, 144.

many” “sinners” while Christ’s “obedience” makes “the many” “righteous.”³⁰³ Paul characterizes Christ’s work as “an act of obedience.” This is suggested by the parallel with Adam’s act of disobedience. The terms, “disobedience/obedience” show that both the transgression of Adam and the righteous act of Christ were done in relation to God’s divine command. However, his focus seems rather to be on Jesus’ death as the ultimate act of obedience.³⁰⁴ The verb κατασταθήσονται in verse 19 is also instructive. Paul says that “the many” were made to share the condition of their prototype: in Adam they “were made sinners,” in Christ they “will be made righteous.” However, concerning this verse, Moo states, “it is better to take it as a “logical” future since Paul consistently looks at justification as something enjoyed in this life in these verses.”³⁰⁵ Therefore, Moo insists that the translation of the verb κατασταθήσονται is not “will be made” but “made,” because people were really “made” sinners through Adam’s act of disobedience just as they are really “made righteous” through Christ’s obedience.³⁰⁶ Christ’s saving work is done in obedience to the Father (Heb. 10:7) and thus stands in contrast to Adam’s disobedience. Similarly, “righteous” contrasts with “sinners.” Christ’s saving work effectively cancels out Adam’s destructive sin.³⁰⁷

³⁰³ Osborne, 144.

³⁰⁴ Moo, 344; Dunn, *Romans*, 284-285, Osborne, 144. However, Cranfield, Godet, Edwards, and Murray see “obedience” of Christ as Jesus’ whole life. See, Cranfield, *Romans*, 290-291; Godet, 225; Edwards, 152; Murray, 205.

³⁰⁵ Moo, 345.

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

³⁰⁷ Morris, 240.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of Romans 5:12-19 through exegesis and by examining critical problems in this much disputed text.

In Romans 5:12-19 the Adam-Christ typology is called structural typology because the meaning of the context is revealed through the structural analysis. This thesis explains the connection between Adam as a type of Christ and Christ himself by studying the structure of the context.

In chapter two, the origin and definition of typology were researched in order to understand Adam-Christ typology and the background and history concerning the use of Adam Christology. This study shows, first, that typology is a way of representing the salvation history of God for believers using historical events of the OT and people and institutions in the Bible. In the NT τύπος means “example,” “pattern,” and “model,” expressing a certain similarity between the original form and the model.

Second, Paul’s Adam Christology has a Jewish background as a result of his Jewish heritage, but Paul is interpreted rather independently from the Jewish tradition. Although Paul lived in a Hellenistic environment and was influenced by it, it is difficult to know to what extent it influenced his Adam-Christ typology.

Finally, the study of Adam-Christ typology was begun in earnest by Irenaeus who made Adam-Christ typology the central characteristic of his Christology. Patristic and Reformation interpretation of Adam-Christ typology was sound. However, various

presuppositions concerning Adam-Christ typology arose after the Enlightenment. Representative men were F. C. Baur and Weiss. Entering the nineteenth century, Adam-Christ typology was investigated by three schools of thought in Germany: the Eschatological School, the History of Religions School, and the Salvation History School. These three schools influenced the nineteenth-century, modern interpretation of Adam Christology.

In chapter three some disputes regarding the structural and grammatical problems of Romans 5:12-19 were examined. First the study found several reasons why it is correct to view Romans 5 as the introduction to chapters 6-8. (1) In topic and content Romans 1:18-4:25 shows that God's saving promises in the OT have been fulfilled and that God's people gain them by faith. However, chapters 5-8 explicate its results with a description of the new life. (2) The style of Romans 5:1 is different from the polemical tone of chapters 1-4. (3) The relative frequency of certain key words in chapters 5-8 is compared with Romans 1:18-4:25.

Second, in verse 12 problems concerning the prepositional phrase Διὰ τοῦτο, the comparative conjunction ὥσπερ and οὕτως, and the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον were examined. It was found that (1) Διὰ τοῦτο indicates 5:9-10, because of the verb tense and theme. It represents reconciliation with God through the righteous act of Christ. (2) The comparative conjunction ὥσπερ is not used as the comparative clause with καὶ οὕτως. The protasis clause introduced by ὥσπερ in verse 12 is severed and not completed until verse 18. καὶ οὕτως is translated "and so" because the clause introduced by οὕτως is a continuation of the protasis. (3) Interpretation of ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον is "because (or

for the reason that) all people sinned.” Here “sin” indicates individual sin, regardless of whether actual individual sins or the individuals’ sin by (in) Adam’s sin.

Third, Romans 5:13-14 (or 17) is in a parenthesis because the protasis in verse 12 is broken off and not completed until verse 18. Verses 13 and 14 function as a parenthesis to explain “death spread to all men because all people have sinned (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον)” in verse 12.

Fourth, “Those who had not sinned in the likeness of the transgression of Adam” in Romans 5:14 is Paul’s rhetorical expression stressing that all people sinned in Adam and death reigned over all people with no exceptions, and it is not necessary to interpret the transgression (of Adam) as different from sin (of all people who lived before the Law of Moses). Finally, “the one to come” (τοῦ μέλλοντος) indicates not Moses but Christ. The connection between Adam and Christ is based on similarity. However, it is an antithetical correspondence.

In chapter four the translation of the text and the structural analysis of the connection with Adam and Christ were examined through exegesis. As a result of the study, three classes of the comparative conjunctions in Romans 5:12-19 were used to explain the characteristic of Adam-Christ typology. They are ὥς [ὥσπερ] . . . οὕτως (3 times), οὐχ ὥς . . . οὕτως (2 times), and εἰ . . . πολλῷ μᾶλλον (2 times). The correspondence between Adam and Christ appears based on similarity. In the context, “through one man (δι’ ἐνός),” which occurs four times in Romans 5:12-19, indicates that both Adam and Christ are stressed, but the results of their actions are antithetical. Likewise, “all people” affected by Adam and Christ are also stressed. The antitheses between Adam and Christ are expressed through correspondences in verse 15, the

transgression of Adam/the grace of Christ and many died/many abounded; verse 16, the judgment/the gift (of Christ from many transgressions) and condemnation/justification; verse 17, the transgression of one man/the abundance of grace and the gift of righteousness and death reigned (over all people)/believers reign in life; verse 18, the transgression of the one man/the act of righteousness of the one man and condemnation/justification of life; verse 19 disobedience/obedience and sinners/righteous. These antitheses stress the act of Adam and Christ, disobedience/obedience, and their result, sinners/righteous. Adam's sin (transgression, disobedience) was imputed to all people (all "in Adam"), and it made them actual sinners. As a result, death was given to all of them. Christ's righteousness is not only imputed to all believers (all "in Christ"), but also makes them become actually righteous. Paul's ultimate purpose through the antitheses is the act of Christ's grace for sinners and righteousness as the result. Therefore, the text of Romans 5:12-19 is grounds for Romans 5:9-10 because verses 12-19 show the righteous act (obedience) of Christ and verses 9-10 show the reconciliation with God through the righteous act of Christ.

Paul stresses the enormous gift and grace of Christ through the comparison with Adam. Paul talks about believers' reign in life, but each one has to receive the grace and the gift of righteousness, which is the result of Christ's obedience (verse 19). It is not an overstatement to say that Romans 5:12-19 is an epic of salvation for humanity, for in it one finds the core of Pauline Christology and soteriology. All people in Christ's grace must thank God.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Achtemeier, Paul J. *Romans*. Interpretation, a Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1985.

Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th rev. ed. United Bible Societies, 2001.

Aland, Kurt, and Barclay Moon Newman. *The Greek New Testament*. 3rd rev. ed. United Bible Societies, 1975.

Barclay, William. *The Letter to the Romans*. Daily study Bible series. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.

Barnhouse, Donald Grey. *God's Grace: Romans 5:12-21; God's Freedom ; God's Heirs*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. New York: Scribner, 1962.

_____. *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Harper's New Testament commentaries. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Barth, Karl. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Translated by Edwyn C. Hoskyns. London: Oxford university press, 1965.

_____. *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*. NY: Octagon Books, 1983.

Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Frederick W. Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Baur, F. C. *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: his life and works, his epistles and teachings*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.

Beker, Johan Christiaan. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Black, Matthew. *Romans*. Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1973.

- Boice, James Montgomery. *The Reign of Grace: Romans 5:1 - 8:39*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.
- Bray, Gerald Lewis. *Romans*. Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, 6. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Brown, Colin. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. Vol. 3, Pritz. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1986.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday, 1997.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Letter of Paul to the Romans: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, 6. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *Theology of the New Testament*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Burkett, Delbert Royce. *An Introduction to the New Testament and the Origins of Christianity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Calvin, Jean, and John Owen. *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Carson, D. A., and Douglas J. Moo. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2005.
- Cranfield, Charles E. B., and W. Sanday. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1975.
- Cremer, Hermann. *Biblico-theological lexicon of New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1872.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup and Paul Donahue. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- Davidson, Richard M. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Tupos Structures*. Andrews University Seminary Doctoral Dissertation Series, 2. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.
- Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- DeSilva, David Arthur. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press., 2004.

- Dodd, C. H. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. The Moffatt New Testament commentary. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1932.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origins of the Doctrine of the Incarnation*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1980.
- _____. *Romans. 1-8*. Word Biblical Commentary, 38A. Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1988.
- _____. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Edwards, James R. *Romans*. New International Biblical Commentary, 6. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992.
- Elwell, Walter A., ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Baker Reference Library. Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 1996.
- _____. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Baker reference library. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2001.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *The Typology of Scripture: Viewed in Connection with the Whole Series of the Divine Dispensations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1975.
- Fee, Gordon D. *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Freedman, David Noel, Allen C. Myers, and Astrid B. Beck. *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Freerksen, J. A. *Outline of Greek Syntax*. Lynchburg, VA: Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1968.
- Godet, Frédéric Louis. *Commentary on Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1977.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. *Typos, the Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Hodge, Charles. *Romans*. The Crossway Classic Commentaries. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1993.

- Hooker, Morna Dorothy. *From Adam to Christ: Essays on Paul*. Cambridge [England]: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated and edited by Geoffrey William Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Early Christian Doctrines*. NY: Harper & Row, 1960.
- Kim, Seyoon. *The Origin of Paul's Gospel*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Abridged edition. Translated and abridged by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Lloyd-Jones, David Martyn. *Romans; An Exposition of Chapter 5, Assurance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1972.
- Luther, Martin, and Wilhelm Pauck. *Luther: Lectures on Romans*. Library of Christian classics, 15. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *New Testament Theology: Many Witnesses, One Gospel*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Martin, Ralph Philip. *New Testament Foundations: A Guide for Christian Students*. Vol.2. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- McGrath, Alister E. *The Making of Modern German Christology, 1750-1990*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2005.
- McNeill, John T., and Ford Lewis Battles eds. *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion* v. 1. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament; A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (3d Ed.)*. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Moule, C. F. D. *The Origin of Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

- Moulton, W. F., A. S. Geden, and H. K. Moulton. *A concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English revisers*. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1978.
- Mounce, Robert H. *Romans: an Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture*. Nashville, TN: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2003.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Nestle, Eberhard, and Barbara Aland. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Stuttgart: Dt. Bibelges, 2001.
- Nielsen, J. T. *Adam and Christ in the Theology of Irenaeus of Lyons*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1968.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Romans*. Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 2004.
- Reasoner, Mark. *Romans in Full Circle: A History of Interpretation*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.
- Ridderbos, Herman N. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.
- Robinson, Thomas. *Studies in Romans: Expository and Homiletical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel, 1982.
- Robinson, John A. T. *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology*. London: SCM Press, 1957.
- _____. *Wrestling with Romans*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1979.
- Sanday, W. and A. C. Headlam. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. The International critical commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1905.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1983.
- Scheck, Thomas P. *Origen and the History of Justification: The Legacy of Origen's Commentary on Romans*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich. *The Christian Faith*. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. 6. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1998.

- Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert. *New Testament Theology*. New York: Macmillan, 1956.
- Stone, Michael E., and Frank Moore Cross. *Fourth Ezra: A Commentary on the Book of Fourth Ezra*. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Stott, John R. W. *Romans: God's Good News for the World*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1994.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- Tobin, Thomas H. *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2004.
- Verbrugge, Verlyn D. ed. *The NIV Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2000.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar: Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Watson, Francis. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Weiss, Bernhard. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.
- Wright, N. T. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Journal Articles

- Bates, Gordon. "Typology of Adam and Christ in John Calvin." *Hartford Quarterly* 5, no. 2 (Wint 1965): 42-57.

- Black, Matthew. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 18, no. 1 (Oct 1971): 1-14.
- Bray, Gerald L. "Adam and Christ (Romans 5:12-21)." *Evangel* 18 (Spr 2000): 4-8.
- Brindle, Wayne A. "Typology." *The Popular Encyclopedia of Bible Prophecy*. Edited by Tim F. LaHaye and Edward E. Hindson, 396-399. Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2004.
- Bromiley, Geoffrey William. "Type." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. 4, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. "Adam and Christ according to Romans 5." In *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, 143-165. NY: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Byrne, Brendan. "'The Type of the One to Come' (Rom 5:14): Fate and Responsibility in Romans 5:12-21." *Australian Biblical Review* 36 (1988): 19-30.
- Cranfield, Charles E. B. "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 22 (Sept 1969): 324-341.
- Danker, Frederick W. "Romans 5:12 : Sin under Law." *New Testament Studies* 14, no. 3 (Apr 1968): 424-439.
- Davidson, Ole. "The Structural Typology of Adam and Christ: Some Modal-Semiotic Comments on the Basic Narrative of the Letter to the Romans." In *New Testament and Hellenistic Judaism*, 244-262. Aarhus, Denmark: Aarhus University Press., 1995.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "The Consecutive Meaning of ἐφ' ᾧ in Romans 5:12." *New Testament Studies* 39, no. 3 (July 1993): 321-339.
- Glenny, W. E. "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40, no. 4 (1997): 627-638.
- Hofius, Otfried. "The Adam-Christ Antithesis and the Law: Reflections on Romans 5:12-21." In *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Edited by James D. G. Dunn, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996.
- Johnson, S Lewis. "Romans 5:12 - An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology." In *New Dimensions in New Testament study*, 298-316. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1974.
- Kertelge, Karl. "The Sin of Adam in the Light of Christ's Redemptive Act according to Romans 5:12-21." *Communio* 18 (Wint 1991): 502-513.

- Kirby, John T. "The Syntax of Romans 5: 12.: A Rhetorical Approach." *New Testament Studies* 33, no. 2 (Apr 1987): 283-286.
- Kister, Menahem. "Romans 5:12-21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage." *Harvard Theological Review* 100.4 (Oct 2007): 391(34). General OneFile. Gale. Liberty University. 3 Feb. 2009, http://find.galegroup.com/itx/infomark.do?&contentSet=IAC-Documents&type=retrieve&tabID=T002&prodId=ITOF&docId=A172168267&source=gale&srcprod=ITOF&userGroupName=vic_liberty&version=1.0.
- Kline, Meredith G. "Gospel until the Law: Rom 5:13-14 and the Old Covenant." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 34, no. 4 (Dec 1991): 433-446.
- Kreitzer, Rarry. "Christ and Second Adam in Paul." *Communio Viatorum* 31, no. 1-2 (Spr-Sum 1989): 55-101.
- Manahan, Ronald. "Christ as the Second Adam." In *Environment and the Christian*, 45-56. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1991.
- Marks, Herbert. "Pauline Typology and Revisionary Criticism." *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 52, no. 1 (Mar 1984): 71-92.
- Muddiman, John. "'Adam, the Type of the One to Come'." *Theology* 87, no. 716 (Mar 1984): 101-110.
- Papageorgiou, Panayiotis. "Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and Its Consequences." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 39, no. 4 (1995): 361-378.
- Pegler, Stephen T. "The Nature of Paul's Universal Salvation Language in Romans." Ph. D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=726432141&sid=13&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009).
- Poirier, John C. "Romans 5: 13-14 and the Universality of Law." *Novum testamentum* 38, no. 4 (Oct 1996): 344-358.
- Porter, Stanley E. "The Argument of Romans 5: Can a Rhetorical Question Make a Difference?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110, no. 4 (Wint 1991): 655-677.
- Pratt, Jonathan Ray. "The Relationship between Justification and Sanctification in Romans 5-8." Ph. D. diss., Dallas Theological Seminary, 1999. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=729761161&sid=12&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009).

- Quek, Swee-Hwa. "Adam and Christ according to Paul." *Pauline studies*, 67-79. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Rapinchuk, Mark. "Universal Sin and Salvation in Romans 5:12-21." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42, no. 3 (Sept 1999): 427-441.
- Roehrs, W. R. "The Typological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *Concordia Journal* 10, no. 6 (1984): 204-216.
- Sapp, David A. "An Introduction to Adam Christology in Paul: A History of Interpretation, the Jewish Background, and an Exegesis of Romans 5:12-21." Ph. D. diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1990. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=765263271&sid=10&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed April 9, 2009).
- Schweinsberg, Laurie. "An Investigation of Paul's Use of the Word "Type" in Romans 5:12--21: Comparison, Contrast, or Both?" M. A. diss., Liberty University, 2007. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=1296098421&sid=14&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009).
- Seemuth, David Paul. "Adam the Sinner and Christ the Righteous One: The Theological and Exegetical Substructure of Romans 5:12-21." Ph. D. diss., Marquette University, 1989. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=745618931&sid=11&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009).
- Sharpe, John L. III. "The Second Adam in the Apocalypse of Moses." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35, no. 1 (Jan 1973): 35-46.
- Thomas, Derek W. H. "The Mediator of the Covenant (2.12-15)." *A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes: Essays and Analysis*. David W. Hall and Peter A. Lillback eds. Phillipsburg, N.J.: P&R Pub, 2008.
- Thomas, Robert. "The Principle of Single Meaning." *The Master's Seminary Journal* 12, no. 1., (Spr 2001): 33-47.
- Vickers, Brian. "Grammar and Theology in the Interpretation of Rom 5:12." *Trinity Journal* 27, no. 2 (Aut 2006): 271-288.
- Vickers, Brian Johnson. "The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: A Study of Key Pauline Texts." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003. In ProQuest Dissertations & Theses, <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=765263271&sid=10&Fmt=2&clientId=20655&RQT=309&VName=PQD> (accessed March 3, 2009).

Weaver, David. "From Paul to Augustine: Romans 5:12 in Early Christian Exegesis." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 27, no. 3 (1983): 187-206.

_____. "The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 among the Greek Fathers and Its Implication for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5th-12th Centuries, pt 2." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (1985): 133-159.

_____. "The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 among the Greek Fathers and Its Implications for the Doctrine of Original Sin: The 5th-12th Centuries, pt3." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 29, no. 3 (1985): 231-257.

Wedderburn, A. J. M. "Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 24, no. 1 (Feb 1971): 74-96.

Wright, N. T. "Adam in Pauline Christology." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* no. 22 (1983): 359-389.