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1. STATING THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the so-called Adam-Christ typology in Romans 5:12-21. The major question which calls for an answer is whether or not it is appropriate and valid to speak of a typology in this passage, if typology means a close resemblance between the two figures being correlated. Obviously we will have to take due cognisance of the history and state of research in this field, since the traditional and still-prevailing view on our passage is that Adam and his deed are typological of Christ and his deed, namely that Christ is the second Adam.

The present study will look at Romans 5:12-21 from another angle, namely analysing the surface structure of the text (i.e. the syntax of the author's thought) and scrutinizing the deep structure of the text (i.e. the semantics or meaning of the author's thought and intention based on an analysis of kernel sentences). This means that our method of exegesis is basically a text-immanent technique of unfolding a text as it presents itself at a specific time in the history of a tradition. This synchronic procedure of investigation should be distinguished from the diachronic approach by which the history of the meanings and concepts in the text is investigated and described.

As far as methodological considerations pertaining to structural analysis are concerned, two observations should be made:

a) A synchronic text-immanent analysis describes a structure rather than the structure of a text. The reason is that such a procedure of analysis does not accommodate sufficient facets of a text as a comprehensive entity, to make a valid claim that THE structure of the text has been discovered and described by the analysis.

b) The sequence in this procedure is firstly the synchronic and then the diachronic investigation. As regards the latter, questions pertaining to Traditionsgeschichte and Religionsgeschichte will be asked and answered. There are specific reasons for following this sequence in methodology, namely

1) The important historical questions about the traditions involved (sources), the history of transmission, redaction, and so on, are
not relevant in the initial phase of text-immanent exegesis. The reason is that at this stage it is irrelevant whether or not the text is an authentic Pauline text. The primary interest now is what has been written and what is the structure and meaning of the text, which has been established text-critically.

2) The historical questions addressed to the text make some contribution to the comprehension and interpretation of the text. These questions, however, put a different kind of question to the text and they represent another intention or interest in exegesis.

3) If, following above considerations, it is found that tradition-history research establishes some relationship between Romans 5:12-21 and other traditions, then the genre, form, structure and content of the existing text at hand would not have been modified or changed at all. Synchronic investigation and discourse analysis operate precisely on this level of the existing text as it lies before us.

4) The basic assumption of text-immanent exegesis is that the text under observation is a complete literary text which can and may be subjected to the same analytical procedure as applied to literature.

5) Discourse analysis, since it is text-immanent exegesis, is as such not concerned with the possible and even probable influences of other traditions on the text during its composition.

Scholars who reverse this sequence in methodology maintain that the historical questions form part of the task of the exegete and that they should therefore come first. But this viewpoint represents a specific theory with respect to what a text is and it expects to attain something other than discourse analysis by its investigation. The primary questions which will be addressed to the text of Romans 5:12-21 appear in the following sequence:

* What is the structure and nature of Paul's argument in Romans 5:12-21?

* What place does Romans 5:12-21 occupy in the macrostructure of Romans?

* Does this passage contain an Adam-Christ typology? Or would it be more correct to assert that the passage contains only antithetical comparisons?

* Are there in the text and the context of this passage elements (such as phraseology, style, arguments) which indisputably indicate that the author was engaged in a polemic and/or instructional discourse with his contemporaries within and outside the Christian
2. DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF ROMANS 5:12-21: TWO MODELS

Our present discussion offers the following details in succession:

a) An analysis of a structure of Romans 5:12-21: Model A

b) Romans 5:12-21: comparisons and/or antitheses

c) Romans 5:12-21 (cola 1-23): Structure of discourse: Model A

d) Model A: Paul's discourse by means of his comparisons and/or antitheses

e) Romans 5:12-21: An analysis of a structure: Model B

f) Romans 5:12-21 (cola 1-23): Structure of discourse: Model B

g) Model B: Paul's discourse by means of his comparisons and/or antitheses.
ROMANS 5:12-21: AN ANALYSIS OF A STRUCTURE: MODEL A

Verse Colon

12 1.1 Διὰ τοῦτο ὢστερ ἡ ἁμαρτία εἴσηλθεν 2.2 καὶ ἐνὸς ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον

2.1 καὶ ὁ θάνατος (εἴσηλθεν)

3.1 καὶ οὕτως ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν

4.1 ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ 2.2 ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου

5.1 ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογείται 2.2 μὴ οὖν τοῦ νόμου

6.1 ἄλλα ἐβασάλευσεν ὁ θάνατος 2.2 ἀπὸ Ἁδάμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως

7.1 δεῖς ἐς τὸς τοῦ μέλλοντος

8.1 ἀλλ' οὖχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα 2.2 οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα

9.1 εἰ γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον 2.2 τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι

10.1 ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπερώτησεν 2.2 καὶ ή δωρεά 4.4 πολλῷ μᾶλλον εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς

11.1 καὶ οὖχ ὡς δι' ἐνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα

12.1 τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρύμα 2.2 εἰς ἐνὸς εἰς κατάραμα

13.1 τὸ δὲ χάρισμα 2.2 εἰς πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα
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14.1 εἰ γάρ ὁ δάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν
15.1 οἱ λαμβάνοντες βασιλεύσουσιν
16.1 ἀρα οὖν ὡς δὲ ἐνὸς παραπτώματος
17.1 οὕτως καὶ δὲ ὡς ὁ ὑπακούων
18.1 ἀπερ γὰρ ἀμαρτωλὸς κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ
19.1 οὕτως καὶ ὁ οὐκαλεῖται κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοὶ
20.1 νόμος δὲ παρεκτήλθεν
21.1 οὗ δὲ ἐπέλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία
22.1 ἐνα ὀσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία
23.1 οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ

14.2 τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι
15.2 τῇ περισσεῖαν
16.2 εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα
17.2 εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς ὁποιαδήποτε ἡμᾶς
18.2 διὰ τῆς κακακοῦς τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου
19.2 διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνὸς
20.2 ἕνα πλεονάση τῷ παραπτώμα
21.2 ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις
22.2 ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ
23.2 διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς
23.3 εἰς ἡμᾶς αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ

.4 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Colon</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Greek Text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>τὸ παραπτώμα</td>
<td>to paraptōma</td>
<td>τὸ χάριμα</td>
<td>to charima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>ὁι πολλοὶ απέθανον</td>
<td>hoi polloi apēthanon</td>
<td>χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ</td>
<td>charis tou theou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἡ δόξα εἰς τὸ χάριτι τοῦ ήνος</td>
<td>hē doxa en to chariti tou henos anthropon lēso Χristou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>ἡ δοξή εἰς τὸ χάριτι τοῦ ήνος</td>
<td>hē doxa en to chariti tou henos anthropon lēso Christou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ἡ δοξή</td>
<td>hē doxa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>κρίμα</td>
<td>krīma</td>
<td>χάριμα</td>
<td>charima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰς ἡνὸς</td>
<td>eis henos</td>
<td>εἰς δικαιόμα</td>
<td>eis dikaiōma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εἰς κατάκριμα</td>
<td>eis katākrima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>εἰς δικαιόμα</td>
<td>eis dikaiōma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>εἰς δικαιόμα</td>
<td>eis dikaiōma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>θάνατος</td>
<td>thanatos</td>
<td>εἰς ζῆς</td>
<td>eis zēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>διὰ ἡνὸς</td>
<td>dia henos</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦ ήνος</td>
<td>dia tou henos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>διὰ τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δόξας τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs charitos kai tēs doxas tēs dikaiosynēs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>διὰ τοῦ ήνος Ισσου Χριστοῦ</td>
<td>dia tou henos Iesou Christou</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ἡ δοξή εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους</td>
<td>hē doxa eis pantas anthropous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἀνακοίνωσις</td>
<td>dia tēs anakoinōsis</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἀνακοίνωσις</td>
<td>dia tēs anakoinōsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας</td>
<td>dia tēs hamartias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς σωτηρίας</td>
<td>dia tēs sōtērias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
<td>διὰ τῆς δικαιοσύνης</td>
<td>dia tēs dikaiosynē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ROMANS 5:15-21 (Cola 8-23) : Structure of discourse : MODEL A

Verse Colon Verse Colon
15a 8 Ἀλλ' οὖς ὡς τῷ παράπτωμα οὕτως καὶ τῷ χάρισμα 16a 11 καὶ οὖς ὡς ὦτ' ἐνός ἀμαρτήσαντος τῷ θανάτῳ παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός, ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ ἐνός, ἐκ τοῦ ἐπερίσσευσεν.
15b 9 εἰς γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἐνός παραπτώματι οὐ πολλοὶ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν.
15c 10 πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ ὁμολογία ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν. 15b 15 πολλῷ μᾶλλον οὐ τῇ καθημερινώς τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς ὁμολογίας τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 16b 12 τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρύμα ἐς ἐνός εἰς κατάκριμα 16c 13 τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα
18a 16 Ἀρα οὖν ὡς ὦτ' ἐνός παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, 18b 17 διὸς καὶ δι' ἐνός δικαίωματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωμαν ἐν ὑς
19a 18 ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου ἀμαρτώλου κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοὶ 19b 19 οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός ὑκαίον καταστάθησονται οἱ πολλοὶ.
20a 20 νόμος δὲ παρεσπάθη ἐνα πλεονάσθη τῷ παράπτωμα 20b 21 οὗ δὲ ἐπελεύσασθαι ἡ ἀμαρτία, ὑπερεπελεύσασθαι ἡ χάρις,
21a 22 ἐνα ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἀμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, 21b 23 οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαίωμα τοῦ ἐνός ζωῆς αὐλῶν διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
MODEL A : Paul's discourse by means of his comparisons and/or antitheses

1. Colon 8
tò paraptōma -- tò chārisma
But the free gift is not at all the same as the trespass (v.15a)

2. Colon 11
henōs hamartēsantos -- tò dōrēma
again, the gift is not at all the same as the act of the one (man) who sinned (v.16a)

3. Cola 9-10
hoi polloi apēthanon -- chāris toû theou eperis-seusen henōs paraptōmati -- hē dōred en tē chāriti toû henōs anthrōpou Iēsou Christou
Cola 12-13
krīma -- chārisma
ek henōs -- ek pollōn paraptōmatōn
eis katākrīma -- eis dikaiōma
because (i.e. the reasons why the free gift and the gift are not at all the same as the trespass and the sin of the one man)

3.1 if many died because of the trespass of the one man, then God's grace and the gift that was (or came) by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, was much more abundant for many men (v.15b and c), and

3.2 the judgement followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the free gift followed many trespasses and brought justification (v.16b and c).

Thereupon, Paul reiterates and elucidates these two reasons by stating that:

Cola 14-15
ebasileusen : -- basileúsousin :
thānatos -- en sōō
henōs paraptōmati -- tin perisseian tēs chāritos
kai tēs dōredas tēs dikaiosūnēs
dià henōs -- dià tou henōs Iēsou Christou

3.11 For if, because of the trespass of the one
3.21 man death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who accepted God's abundant grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ (v.17a and b)

4. Cola 16-17
henōs paraptōmatos -- henōs dikaiōmatos
eis pántas anthrōpous -- eis pántas anthrōpous
eis katākrīma -- eis dikaiōsin zōēs
Consequently then (i.e. the total result of all these things, just as the effect of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the effect of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life to all men (v.18a and b))

Cola 18-19

\[ \text{hamartōloi katestāthēsan} \quad \text{dikaioi katastathēsan} \quad \text{did tēs parakoēs} \quad \text{dīa tēs hupakoēs} \quad \text{toū henōs nathrōpou} \quad \text{toū henōs} \]

because (i.e. the explanation for this) just as many were made sinners through the disobedience of one man, so also many will be made righteous through the obedience of one man (v.19a and b)

5. Cola 20-21

\[ \text{nómos pareisēlthen} \quad \text{tō paráptōma pleōnēsen} \quad \text{epléonasen hē hamartia} \quad \text{hupereperisseusen hē chāris} \quad \text{basileusē}: \quad \text{chāris} \quad \text{en tō thanatō} \quad \text{diā dikaiosūnēs eis zōēn} \quad \text{aīōnion diā Iēsou Christou tou kuriou hemōn} \]

BUT the law was added, so that the trespass might increase (v.20a);

however (dē), where sin increased, grace abounded all the more (v.20b),

so that (i.e. the effect of grace which abounds), just as sin reigned by means of death, so also grace may reign through righteousness to bring in eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ (v.21a and b).
ROMANS 5:12-21: An analysis of a structure: MODEL B

Verse-Colon

12 1.1 ἀλλ' τοῦτο διὰ ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς ἠλθεν
2.2 δὲ ἕνος ἀνθρώπου εἰς τὸν κόσμον

2.1 καὶ ὁ θάνατος (εἰς ἠλθεν)
2.2 διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας

3.1 καὶ οὕτως ὁ θάνατος ἠλθεν
2.2 εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους
3.3 ἐφ' ό πάντες ἡμαρτον

4.1 ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ
2.2 ἀρχὴ γὰρ νόμου

5.1 ἁμαρτία δὲ δύο ἐλλογείται
2.2 μὴ δυτος νόμου

6.1 ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος
2.2 ἀπὸ Ἁδέω μέχρι Μωϋσέως
3.3 καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῇ ὁμολόγησιν τῆς παραβάσεως Ἁδέω

7.1 δὲ ἐστὶν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος

8.1 ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα
2.2 οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα

9.1 εἰ γὰρ οἱ πολλοί ἀπέθανον
2.2 τῷ τοῦ ἐνὸς παραπτώματι

10.1 ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπερίσσευσεν
2.2 καὶ ἡ ὁμολογία
4.4 πολλοὶ μᾶλλον εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς
3.3 ἐν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἱσσοῦ
Χριστοῦ

11.1 καὶ οὖν ὡς δὲ ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα

12.1 τὸ μὲν γὰρ χρίμα
.2 εἰς ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα

13.1 τὸ δὲ χάρισμα
.2 εἰς πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα
14.1 εἰ γὰρ ὁ δάνατος ἐβασάλευσεν
   2 τῷ τοῦ ἑνῶς παναπτύματι
   3 διὰ τοῦ ἑνῶς

15.1 οὐ λαμβάνοντες βασιλεύσασθαι
   2 τὴν περισσεῖαν
   3 τῆς χάρτης
   6 ἐν ἥλιον
   7 διὰ τοῦ ἑνῶς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.
   4 καὶ τῆς ὁμοιότητος τῆς ὑλικαλωσόντης

16.1 Ἀρα οὖν ὦς ὦ, ἑνὸς παρεπτώματος
   2 εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς
   3 κατάκλασιν

17.1 οὗτως καὶ διὰ ἑνὸς ὑλικαλωσότας
   2 εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς
   3 διακαλώσεως κωπήν

18.1 οὗτος γὰρ ἁμαρτωλὸς ητανατάτησαν οἱ πολλοὶ
   2 διὰ τῆς παρακόπης τοῦ
   3 ἑνῶς ἀνθρώπων

19.1 οὗτως καὶ διεκκαλωκατατάθεσαν οἱ πολλοὶ
   2 διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς

20.1 νῦν ὦς δὲ παρεσφάλθεν
   2 ζηνα τλεονύμη τὸ θαμπάτωμα

21.1 οὗ δὲ ἐκλεονύμης ἡ ἁμαρτία
   2 ὑπερεποίησησθεν ἡ χάρις

22.1 ζηνα οὗτος ἐβασάλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία
   2 ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ

23.1 οὗτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ
   2 διὰ τῆς ὑλικαλωσόντης
   3 εἰς τὴν ἑκάστην αἰώναν διὰ
   4 τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.
### ROMANS 5:15-21 (COLA 8-23) : STRUCTURE OF DISCOURSE MODEL B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Colon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17a</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18a</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19b</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20a</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20b</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21b</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MODEL B: Paul’s discourse by means of his comparisons and/or antitheses

1. Colon 8  
   \textit{tò paráptomà -- tò chárismà}
   But the free gift is not at all the same as the trespass (v.15a)

2. Colon 11  
   \textit{henòs hamartíasantos -- tò dôrêma}
   again, the gift is not at all the same as the act of the one (man) who sinned (v.16a)

3. Cola 9-10  
   \textit{hòi polloi apéthanon -- chàris tou theôu eperis-seusen henòs paráptomati -- he dôred en tè cháriri tou henòs anthròpou Iêsou Christôu}

   \textit{Cola 12-13}
   \textit{krîma -- chárismà}
   \textit{ex henòs -- ek pollòn paráptomátôn}
   \textit{eis katákrima -- eis dikaiôma}
   because (i.e. the reasons why the free gift and the gift are not at all the same as the trespass and the sin of the one man)

   3.1 if many died because of the trespass of the one man, then God’s grace and the gift that was (or came) by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, was much more abundant for many men (v.15b and c), and

   3.2 the judgement followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the free gift followed many trespasses and brought justification (v.16b and c).

Thereupon, Paul reiterates and elucidates these two reasons by stating that:

   \textit{Cola 14-15}
   \textit{ebasileusen : -- basileúsousin :}
   \textit{thànatos -- en zôë}
   \textit{henòs paráptomati -- tèn perisseían tès chàritos}
   \textit{kai tès dôreás tès dikaiosínês}
   \textit{dià henòs -- dià tou henòs Iêsou Christôu}

   \textit{Cola 16-17}
   \textit{henòs paráptomatos -- henòs dikaiómatos}
   \textit{eis pántas anthròpous -- eis pántas anthròpous}
   \textit{eis katákrima -- eis dikaiòsin zôës}

   3.1 For if, because of the trespass of the one man death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who accepted God’s abundant grace and the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ (v.17a and b)
3.2 Consequently then, just as the effect of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the effect of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life to all men (v.18a and b)

4. Cola 18-19

hamartōloī katestáthēsan -- dikaioi kastastathē-sontai
diā tēs parakoēs -- diā tēs hupakoēs
tō hēndās anthrōpōu -- to hēndās

because (i.e. the explanation for this) just as many were made sinners through the disobedience of one man, so also many will be made righteous through the obedience of one man (v.19a and b)

5. Cola 20-21

nomos pareisdiction -- tō paraptōma pleondsē
epleōnasen hē hamartia -- hupereperisseusen hē chāris

Cola 22-23

ebasileusen : -- basileūsē :
hē hamartia -- hē chāris
en tō thanáto -- diā dikaiosúnes eis aīn
atōnion diā Tēsou Christou tō kuriu hemōn

BUT the law was added, so that the trespass might increase (v.20a);

however (dē), where sin increased, grace abounded all the more (v.20b),

so that (i.e. the effect of grace which abounds) just as sin reigned by means of death, so also grace may reign through righteousness to bring in eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ (v.21a and b).

3. IMPLEMENTATION OF ANALYSES AND ASSESSMENT OF MODELS A AND B

So far Romans 5:12-21 has been expounded by means of two models of discourse analysis. These two models contain the same division into cola and the same structure of cola (i.e. the embedding within the cola). The clustering of cola differs, however, signifying that the structure of the discourse is described differently by the two models.

The next step in the investigation should be to make an assessment of the two models. A definite choice between the models seems to be inevitable, since the description of the structure by the models differs to such an extent that ultimately the core of the author's argument is described differently. By implementing and assessing
the two models, the exegetical procedure of discourse analysis is also tested. In this process of testing the method and assessing the models, we accept and apply the hermeneutical principle of modern linguistics that any section of literature should be expounded and comprehended in the context of the whole of that piece of literature. Consequently the comprehensive argument in Romans 5:12-21 should be understood in the context of the following train of thought:

1. Romans 1:18-5:11 is a continuous argument in which the author discusses various related matters. These are the apostasy of the whole of mankind (Israel and the Gentiles), their broken relationship with God, God's wrath because of this state of affairs, the restoration of this broken relationship by believing and accepting the righteousness of God which Jesus Christ has accomplished. This remedy, by which a right relationship with God is restored, Paul names δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως.

In Romans 1:18-5:11 Paul explains the various aspects of δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως by means of the antithesis sin - righteousness. The point of departure for his argument and explanation is the premise in 1:17 (a quotation from Hab 2:4). This premise contains two components, namely 'those who have been justified by faith' and '(they) shall live'. In 1:18-5:11 Paul describes the aspects and implications of the first component (those who have been justified by faith). Subsequently, in 5:12-8:39, he works out the aspects and implications of the component 'they shall live'.


2. The present section of the letter (5:12-8:39), which deals with the implications of righteousness by faith, starts with 5:12-21. Here the author makes a comparison between what one man did (referring to Adam) and what another man, Jesus Christ, did (Cranfield 1969:331; Louw 1979b:70). Δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως is highlighted here from the perspective of νόει διὰ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ Cranfield 1969:335f; Feuillet 1970:490).

3. This comparison is introduced in cola 1-6 by a description of the deed of the one man, Adam. The central terms indicating the structure here are ἁμαρτία, θάνατος and νόμος. These terms are linked together into a comprehensive discourse by relational particles such as ὡσπερ, οὕτως (cola 1.1 and 3.1) and the temporal indicators ἀκρι, ἀπὸ . . . μέχρι (cola 4.1 and 6.1).
The clustering of cola and the kernel sentences permit the following construction of Paul's argument:

4.1 Cola 1-2 contain two assertions:
   a) Adam sinned, so sin came into the world.
   b) Sin brought death into the world.

4.2 In colon 3, ήντος is taken up as the complement of ἥσπερ (colon 1.1), thus describing the effects of what was said in cola 1-2, namely, 'therefore (καὶ ήντος) all men were subjected to death because all have sinned: ἑφ' ή πάντες ἥμαρτον'.

4.3 In cola 4-6 the author continues and elucidates his argument by introducing a third component, namely νόμος. The author states: It was not the law that caused sin, because sin was in the world before (ἀρχῇ) the law (colon 4). The proof for this is the fact that men have died since Adam to the time of Moses (when the law was given) (colon 6). People died because they sinned (cola 1-3).

The punishment of sin (viz. death) was total and also affected people who had not sinned in the same way as Adam (col. 6.3). The role of the law with regard to sin was only that sin was not codified (ἐλλογείται) during the time between Adam and Moses (Schunack 1967:88; Bowman 1977:131f.; Louw 1979b:72).

5. Colon 7 elaborates on Adam's role. He was the first one who sinned. He was also a symbol and figure who pointed to and pre-figured what would happen, since he was a τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος (Bultmann 1950:205ff; Althaus 1953:47; Brandenburger 1962:69, 241f; Grabner-Haider 1968:20; Louw 1979b:71). In this phrase ἡσος should be read as καὶ ήντος (Louw 1979b:71), introducing the reader to the next section, cola 8-23, where Christ's role and the ζωή διὰ Θεοῦ Χριστοῦ are described (see above pt.3). Colon 7 is therefore the pivotal point of the whole discourse. This means that whereas in cola 1-6 sin and death were related to Adam, they are now worked out further in cola 8-23 by means of a comparison between Adam and Christ. The issue at stake here is a comparison between the implications of Adam's deed and that of Christ (Müller 1967:73ff; Cranfield 1969:335f; Wedderburn 1971:78f).

6. In cola 8-23 Paul argues that the comparison amounts to an antithesis (Käsemann 1980:151ff). In other words, although there is some resemblance between Adam's deed and Christ's, there is in fact a great difference between the two. Paul repeatedly emphasizes this difference by the following antitheses:

6.1 Cola 8 and 11
The free gift is not at all the same as the trespass; and again, the gift is not at all the same as the one who sinned. The antithesis is that Paul sets the free gift and the gift over against the trespass and the one who sinned.

6.2 Cola 9-10 and 12-13

Paul furnishes the reasons for his assertion that there is a difference between Adam and Christ because he says,

a) if many died on account of the trespass of one man, then the grace of God and the gift through the grace of the one man Jesus Christ became more abundant for many people, and

b) the judgement was the result of one sin and brought condemnation, whereas the free gift followed many trespasses and brought justification.

This argument about the difference evolves around the antithesis trespass/sin - free gift/grace. In comparison with cola 1-6, the argument is, however, taken a few steps further. Certain elements, which correspond to the core of the basic antithesis, now come to the fore. These are:

a) The effects and implications of the one trespass and of the free gift and grace are clearly expressed, namely condemnation and death versus justification and abundant grace and gifts.

b) The second element is the one trespass on account of which many people died and, on the other hand, the gift through the grace of the other one, Jesus Christ.

c) Thirdly, for the first time the author contrasts the free gift with the judgement. He emphasizes in this manner that the judgement following the one sin ended in condemnation, while on the other hand the free gift following the many trespasses/sins ended in justification. By using the antithesis one—many, the author emphasizes the great dissimilarity between and excellence of Christ's deed as compared to Adam's.

7. Cola 14-23

On account of the terminology which is used and the nature of the discourse in cola 14-23, one may assert that Paul expounds and elucidates the difference and antitheses of the preceding section (cola 8-13).

7.1 Cola 14-19
The analyses of a structure by means of the two models indicate that the author at this stage of his argument reiterates and elucidates what he has said already. This means that the content of cola 9-10 and those of 12-13 are repeated in cola 14-15. This repetition and extension serves to emphasize the vital importance of the subject under discussion. It is exactly at this point that the most significant difference between the two models exists.

We now turn to this difference in the structure

7.1.1 According to model A the contents of cola 9-13 are repeated and extended in cola 14-15 (indicated by 3.1\(^1\) and 3.2\(^1\)). This means that Paul underscores in cola 14-15 the reasons why he argued that the free gift and the gift are not at all the same as the trespass and the sin of the one man (cola 9-10).

He stated: If, because of the trespass of the one man (cola 1, 2, 9, 11, 12.2) death reigned (cola 6.1, 9.1) through that one man, how much more will those who accepted God's abundant grace and gift of righteousness (cola 8.2, 10.1-4, 13.1) reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ (cola 10.3, 15.1, 5-7).

7.1.2 Model A indicates that the component in cola 9-13 which cola 14-15 elucidate, is the fact of dominion, that is the power to rule. The author wants to accentuate that the major difference between the trespass and the free gift exists in the effects, namely the dominion of death and the dominion of life respectively (Jacob 1973:34ff).

7.1.3 So far the two models concur. The difference between them exists in the relationship of structure and contents of cola 9-13 plus 14-15 with cola 16-17. This difference is:

Model A presents cola 16-17 as the final conclusion of the whole argument in cola 8-13, elucidated by cola 14-15. This conclusion is constituted by ἀρν ὑμᾶς.

Model B, on the other hand, takes cola 16-17 together with 14-15 as being a repetition and elucidation of cola 8-13. It also takes cola 14-15 as repetition of cola 9-10 and cola 16-17 as repetition of 12-13.

This means that the actual difference between the two models is that model B, unlike model A, indicates that cola 16-17 repeat and elucidate cola 12-13. This assumption must now be tested.

A comparison of the terminology, structure and contents of these two groups of cola results in the following observations:

Colon 12 compared with colon 16 kríma -- ex hēdē -- eis katēkrima
The common terms are: *henós paraptōmatos*, *eis katákrima*, *Colo 13 compared with colon 17*.

The common terms are: *eis dikai (-omatos, -ōsin, -ōma)*.

Conclusion:

1) Regarding cola 12 and 16

The argument of colon 12 is that the judgement was condemnation on account of the one man. In colon 16 it was argued that the condemnation of all people was due to the one trespass.

2) Regarding cola 13 and 17

The author argues in colon 13 that the free gift led to acquittal in spite of the many trespasses. In colon 17 the apostle argues that all people came to justification of life through the one deed of righteousness.

3) There are in fact similarities with respect to the terminology and subject matter of cola 12-13 and 16-17. This agreement lies in the formal structure of thought, namely that cola 12 and 16 contain utterances pertaining to the judgement and the trespass which lead to condemnation. Corresponding to this, cola 13 and 17 contain the author's formulation of an antithesis. This antithesis states that there is a certain correlation between, on the one hand, the free gift and acquittal and, on the other hand, righteousness and justification of life. In other words, in cola 12 and 16 the author explains the component of *sin* in the antithesis, whereas in cola 13 and 17 he touches on the component of *grace* in this antithesis.

4) This observation leads to the conclusion that there is a formal similarity and also partial agreement in the content of the groups of cola. But in discourse analysis such agreement does not justify the linking of cola 12-13 directly to cola 16-17.

The reasons are as follows:

a) When such a connection is made, the significance and function of the linking particles *men gâr, dé* (in cola 12, 13) and *dra oûn, hoûtōs kai* (cola 16 and 17) are not given their due weight. However, these are the very particles which constitute the continuity in the discourse. The grouping of cola 14-15 together with 16-17
ignores too much of the progression inherent in the argument. It is more likely that *ei gar* in colon 14.1 is a conditional particle. This makes provision for the logic of the whole argument so that the antitheses may proceed. In these antitheses the author expresses the excellence of the grace of God by using the particle *pollo mallo* (colon 15.1). The idea of the difference between Adam's deed and Christ's in cola 8 and 11 is therefore reaffirmed only in cola 14-15, where it is expressed in terms of the abundance and excellence of Christ's deed (Cambier 1965:240f.; Müller 1967: 85f; Englezakis 1977:231f).

b) The final conclusion in the argument is introduced by *drasoun* in colon 16. The author explains his final conclusion of cola 16-17 in cola 18-19 by stating:

Christ's deed and its effects are much more abundant than Adam's deed, because Christ's deed cancelled out and completely replaced Adam's deed: the deed of righteousness unto justification of life sets aside the trespass and the condemnation.

c) This final conclusion in cola 16-17 and its substantiation in cola 18-19 are construed by *gár, hōsper ... houtōs*. The same construction is utilized in colon 1.1 and 3.1, 8.1 and 8.2.

On account of the corresponding structure and contents between cola 16-17 and 18-19 these groups of cola are taken together, contributing to the following continuous argument:

**Cola 16-17**

One trespass - one deed of righteousness; for all people - for all people; unto condemnation - unto justification; because (*gár*)

**Cola 18-19**

through disobedience - through obedience; made sinners - made righteous; through one man - through one (man).

Because of this metre in the formal structure, the central terms which the author uses and the continuity in the antitheses, these colon groups belong together. Hence they should be linked directly, and not via the whole argument as in model B (Brandenburger 1962:240f).

d) Our ultimate conclusion is therefore that model B offers a more acceptable description of a structure of Paul's argument in Romans 5:12-21. This legitimizes the assumption that in Romans 5:12-21 Paul emphasizes the *otherness* and *excellence* of Christ's deed over against Adam's because he states that being a condemned
sinner is replaced by being righteous and justified in God's sight. This is made possible by the fact that Adam's disobedience was rendered null and void by Christ's obedience.

7.2 Cola 20-23

Paul now approaches the last part of his comprehensive argument. There is still one component which needs further clarification, namely the law. Earlier in his argument he only touches on this subject (cola 4-5), when he reflects on it in the context of the relationship between sin and the law.

With ἐδὲ he links the present part with the preceding and at the same time makes an adversative declaration, 'But the law was added to all these things' (cola 1-19).

The fact that the law was added, brings about specific consequences for sin and grace. These consequences are once again explained in terms of the excellence of God's deed above the deed of the sin of Adam. Paul wishes to accentuate that what Adam did was counteracted not by the law, but by Jesus Christ who was God's gracious gift to mankind. The law showed us what sin is, but Jesus Christ set men free because he died in their place. This is how people may enjoy eternal life (Louw 1979b:75).

The whole argument is as follows:

The law was added.
So the trespass increased (compare colon 5).
If sin/trespass increased, then grace became even more abundant (compare cola 10, 15).
All these things happened so that (ἂνα) grace unto eternal life may reign instead of sin reigning unto death (compare cola 14-15).
Adam and his deed were overruled by the greater power and excellence of Christ's deed (see cola 9-10, 14-15).

Here, again model A is preferred as a description of a structure of Paul's argument. It links cola 20-23 directly to the rest of the argument, cola 1-19. This is correct because:

a) The same central terms and antitheses function in cola 1-19 and 20-23, namely sin, grace, law, death, life.

b) These terms are used in cola 20-23 in the same structure of argument and in the same antithetical meaning as in cola 1-19. We may accept that Paul obviously wanted to conclude his argument by explaining the role of the law in connection with the righteousness
by faith in Jesus Christ. As such, the component of the law is relevant in Romans 5:12-21, in 1:18-8:39 also in the rest of the letter.

8. Final conclusion of discourse analysis of Romans 5:12-21

8.1 Cola 1-23 describe a structure of the comprehensive discourse-argument in Romans 5:12-21.

8.2 The notion of this passage is death versus life. This notion is explained by utilizing various antitheses whereby Adam, the figure and symbol of sin and death, is compared to and overshadowed by Jesus Christ, the figure of righteousness and life.

8.3 Paul argues and proves that sin brought death, but righteousness through faith brought eternal life through Jesus Christ (see cola 22-23).

8.4 Romans 5:12-21 describes the first implications of dikaiosunē ek pisteōs from the perspective of zōē dià Iēsou Christou.

8.5 Romans 5:12-21 forms the introduction to the exposition of the second component of the central theme in 1:17, namely 'they shall live'. This correlates with 1:18-5:11 where the first component of this theme is expounded, namely 'those who have been put right with God through faith'.

8.6 In cola 1-6 a life which is reconciled to God is contrasted with sin and death (both of which were started by Adam) and law (which God gave to Moses).

8.7 In colon 7, which is the pivotal point of the passage, Adam is described as the one who pointed to and illustrated what would happen.

8.8 In cola 8-23 the author utilizes the antitheses between Adam's deed and Christ's deed and their effects on man, in order to describe the life which has been reconciled to God.

4. ROMANS 5:12-21: DIACHRONIC PERSPECTIVE, THAT IS SOME REMARKS ON A FRAME OF REFERENCE FOR PAUL'S READERS

Since the end of the 19th century various scholars have interpreted Paul's argument in Romans 5:12-21 by means of a religio-historical frame of reference and have also subjected it to a tradition-historical analysis. This school of thought asserted that Paul utilized certain existing traditions, some with a long history, to express his own thoughts. It was considered that Paul even took over the form
and contents of these traditions (Conzelmann 1968:169ff, 176ff, 195ff).

The traditions which could have possibly influenced Paul's thoughts in Romans 5:12-21 are those from Palestinian or Hellenistic Judaism, Gnosticism within Hellenism, mysticism of the East, Iranian religions, Jewish Gnosticism (such as the life of Adam and Eve and the Apocalypse of Moses) (Cullmann 1963:144-50; Fuller 1965:77ff, 101ff; Lombard 1978:150ff).

The exponents of the religio-historical approach observed the nature and role of certain religious figures who played an important role in the religious and theological thoughts within these circles. These figures are, inter alia, the perfect primordial Adam-man, the first heavenly man (thèseos aner such as represented by Gayomant in Iranian thought), the son of man (in Judaism and Jewish apocalypticism), the myth of the redeemed redeemer (of the Gnostics), personified wisdom (such as the logos in Philo's writings), and others.

A brief survey of the religio-historical and traditio-historical approaches to Romans 5:12-21 brings to the fore the following (Lombard 1978:150ff):

1. The most prominent view is that Paul utilized the Gnostic and Iranian myth of the redeemed redeemer or the primordial redeemer to shape his thoughts in Romans 5:12-21 (Bousset 1913, Bultmann 1965).

Extensive research on these hypotheses has indicated, however, that such hellenizing and mythologizing of the kerygma cannot be maintained, since the basic notion of Adam and Christ in Romans 5:12-21 does not fit into these schemes (Davies 1948:31-57, 268; Bornkamm 1952:80-90; Schoeps 1959:115ff; Kuss 1971:292ff, 400ff).

2. Scholars who maintain that the background of Paul's thought stemmed from Jewish rabbinism or late-Jewish apocalypticism are Tennant (1903:363ff); Marmonstein (1931:271ff); Cohon (1948:275ff), Billerbeck (1926, 223ff).

This approach to Romans 5 brought the Old Testament, especially Genesis 3, into focus. It investigated Adam's role in connection with the origin of sin. Obviously the views on Adam as presented in late-Jewish apocalypticism (such as Syrian Baruch, 2 Enoch and IV Ezra) were also scrutinized. Opinions differed on the question whether or not Genesis 3 (together with 6:5 and 8:21) teaches the idea of the fate of Adam's sin, that is original or inherited sin. G von Rad, for instance, observed that Genesis 3 and the rest of the Old Testament only teach the idea of original (inherited) punish-
A study of Rabbinic Literature on the subject of the original sin of Adam (Gn 3 and passages such as Ps 51:7, 58:4; Job 14:4, 33:9 compared with Ps 18:24; 2 Sm 22:24; Jr 31:29f) showed that the formal doctrine of Adam's inherited sin is non-existent within early Rabbinism. Apparently this doctrine found its way into Judaism through the apocalypticism of late-Jewry and other deutero-rabbinic sources. It was not until these late times that the idea of Adam's deed and its effects on his posterity were reflected upon theologically. This is evident in 2 Enoch 6:11; Jubilees 5:1-14, 7:21ff.; Slavonic Enoch 7, 18:2; Damascus document 3:4-7, 4:1ff.; Testaments of Reuben (5:6-7) and Naphtali (3:5); Qumran documents (1QM 13:2, 4, 14:8, lQS 13:18f, 4:12, 22, 26). The tendency which emerged here was a type of speculative metaphysical thinking differing from Genesis 3. In Qumran, Adam was an eschatological figure who was clothed with glory (lQS 4:23; 1QH 17:15).

3. The apocalyptic writings such as The life of Adam and Eve (Robinson 1981), the Syriac Baruch and IV Ezra taught the universality of sin and Adam's hereditary sin and hereditary death, as well as the individual sins of mankind. These ideas were expressed for the first time in Jesus Sirach 25:13-26, specifically verse 24. They appeared subsequently in the Apocalypse of Moses 14, The life of Adam and Eve 3:17f, 35, 44; IV Ezra 7:108ff; Ethiopic Enoch 69:6.

4. Hellenistic Adam-speculations

Of importance here are the metaphysical ideas in heterodox Jewish circles. These mythological speculations were devoted to the powers of the planets, bad angels and spirits and to a certain mysterious Adam. According to Ginza Rabba 254:34ff (a Mandaean document), the fate of mankind was viewed as a consequence of the elements of nature (stoicheia), the forces of the evil world (anankē), fate (heimarmēnē) together with a human figure (anthrōpos) who could even be Mary (see Pistis Sophia in Lidzbarski 1925).

5. Adam mysticism

This movement was prevalent within Jewish Gnosticism. The conviction prevailed in the movement that certain characteristics of God and the Jews should be applied to Adam. Hence Adam became a heavenly being who was a creator, a cosmic figure and a ruler over rulers. He descended from heaven, proclaimed salvation and ascended again into heaven. Examples of this type of Adam speculation are the Magic papyri (Preisendanz 1928:1, 12, 112-15; Peterson 1948:199ff), the Zosimos-material (of which fragments were
found at Nag Hammadi), the Naasene-homilies (Quispel 1953:217; Wendland 1960:161ff.) and the Apocryphon of John (Till 1952:14-23).

6. Philo of Alexandria made a distinction in his Hellenistic Gnosticism between two Adam figures. He took Genesis 1:27 and 2:17 as his sources and identified an Adam figure who was higher in rank, in the image of God and was identical with the logos and Sophia. He is also a redeemer. The second figure of Adam was an empirical mortal being who was the father of man (Legum allegoriae 1, 31; 11, 4ff; De opificio mundi 76 on Gn 1:27).

7. The figure of the son of man also figured in Adam traditions. W Bousset maintained that the son of man is identical with Adam (1907:219; Volz 1934:21ff; Jeremias 1933, 142). S Mouinckel rightly rejected this observation and saw no relationship between these two figures (1959:71ff). This can be accepted on account of the fact that the son of man is an eschatological figure within late-Jewish apocalypticism. Nowhere did Adam act eschatologically (Cullmann 1957:144ff; Fuller 1965:77ff). The primordial man Adam also had nothing to do with the resurrection of the dead with which the son of man is involved. Moreover, the son of man did not act at all in the work of creation, whereas Adam was associated with this.


In the preceding diachronic scrutiny certain features pertaining to Adam which resemble the Christian kerygma came to the fore. These features stem from the Old Testament and late-Jewish apocalypticism and Philo. Some analogies in form and content can be discerned. These are the concept of the sin and sinfulness of Adam, his representation of man (the corporate personality), the descent and ascent of Adam, his redemptive role as heavenly being, his identification with the logos and sophia, his heavenly origin, and so on.

It is, however, no easy task to prove traditio-historical parallels (Richter 1971:164), because of the possibility of falling into anachronisms. This is what happened with Bousset, Reitzenstein and Bultmann with respect to their views on Mandaean influences on Paul's thought.

According to the principles of Traditionsgeschichte the alleged traditions underlying a text should be identified and analysed. At the same time the stage in the historical development of the tradition should be considered and assessed in the correct historical perspective. Once these considerations have received due attention, many of the hypotheses and results of the traditio- and religio-
historical approaches to Romans 5:12-21 turn out to be inappropriate and invalid.

The crucial question of the background and frame of reference for Romans 5:12-21 is therefore still open to dispute. This question is primarily one which pertains to the comprehension of this passage by the original readers. The answer to this question is that the frame of reference for Romans 5:12-21 is exactly the same as for the rest of the letter, namely the Old Testament and God's dealings with old Israel.

On account of and consistent with a text-immanent approach to this passage, this thesis is substantiated by the following observations:

a) Paul wanted to communicate with his readers in intelligible terms. He intended explaining the gospel to his readers. He explained the contents and effects of the gospel (1-8) and its implications for Israel (9-11) and all of mankind (12-15) from the perspective that these whose relationship with God has been put right, will live (1:17).

b) He knew and assumed that his readers were more or less familiar with the contents of the kerygma of the Christ event. He also anticipated that they would be entirely familiar with the terms in which he proclaimed the gospel to them.

This assertion is based on the reasonable assumption that an author would communicate with his readers only within a frame of reference which would have been familiar and intelligible to them. The only such frame of reference was the Old Testament and God's dealings with Israel. Obviously this would have been the model for conveying Paul's message to his readers.

c) That this is indeed the case, is furthermore established by the fact that the Old Testament and God's dealings with Israel function throughout the letter as Paul's frame of reference. He explained his message and substantiated his arguments by utilizing the prophetic words to Israel (1:2-3; Hab 2:4 = 1:17), the history of Israel's unfaithfulness and God's wrath towards them (1:18-3:20), Abraham's history and his faith on a New Testament model (4), the law which God gave to Moses (5:14), God's covenant with Israel (9-11), the models of the Old Testament sacrifice and the temple service (12:1f), and so on. The importance of the Old Testament in Paul's thought can also be gathered from the abundance of citations from and references to the Old Testament, namely 58 (according to the Nestle-Aland 26th Edition and the UBS 3rd Edition). For the rest of the genuine Pauline letters the number is only 34.

It may be asserted that it is highly improbable that the apostle
would have explained his message in the rest of the letter by means of the well-known Old Testament and then, all of a sudden, change in Romans 5:12-21 to another and unfamiliar frame of reference - a frame of reference which was geographically and theologically alien to readers in Rome, Jerusalem and elsewhere.

d) The preceding argument is strengthened if we consider the identity of the readers of Romans. The current debate (Donfried 1974:332-55; 1977:175-200) leads to the conclusion that the letter was written to people in Rome, Jerusalem and to other groups of Christians in the early Christian church. The purpose of writing is formulated in 15:23f, namely the proclamation of the whole truth of the gospel to the Judaean Christians in Jerusalem, the church in Rome and ultimately to those in Spain. Consequently we must accept a very wide circle of readers. This is why the message of the letter is so comprehensive: it was intended to reach and meet the spiritual needs of the Jewish and of the Gentile Christians (Williams 1980:246ff).

Because of this wide and general circle of readers, Paul had to avoid a nuanced frame of reference which would have been understood by people in certain isolated localities only. The above-mentioned frames of reference pertaining to Adam most probably falls into this category, since there is no sufficient documentary proof that they were commonly known throughout Paul's world.

Hence, we may again accept that Paul cast his message into the most obvious and well-known framework. This is the Old Testament which all Christians knew, because it was their written canon.

Moreover, the Old Testament was also the frame of reference of Jesus, the Christ - the one whom Paul proclaimed!

e) If one or a combination of the Adam-speculations served as the frame of reference, then the question arises why Paul would have ignored the most obvious model in order to utilize a more difficult and extraneous one.

It would have been totally absurd to have done such a thing, seeing that any circle of readers was well-informed about the Old Testament and the kerygma of the Christ event.

f) The analogies between Romans 5:12-21 and other extraneous traditions from outside the Old Testament and late-Jewish apocalypticism could be explained just as well (or even better!) in terms of the influence of the Old Testament traditions of Israel on the later traditions mentioned above.

From the considerations and results of tradition - and redaction
history, history of religions and literary criticism, we may hypothetically accept the viewpoint held since the Aufklärung that the Old Testament traditions were influenced from outside. This assumption means, however, no modification of our basic assertion that Paul's frame of reference in Romans 5:12-21 remained the (mixed?) traditions of the Old Testament as they were transmitted to and comprehended by the readers of the Old Testament. These readers included the readers of the letter to the Romans. They all knew these traditions through the Old Testament itself. Any new or additional message would have been directly comprehensible to them if it came to them in these familiar terms.

This is the exact situation which Romans 5:12-21 supposes and suggests.

g) We conclude, therefore, that Paul communicated successfully with his readers in Romans 5:12-21 via the message that God restored their relationship with him through Jesus Christ in whom they believe. They are now enabled to live by faith as people who have been acquitted from sin and guilt. This life in faith by grace is much more abundant than the life in sin and death, because Christ has overruled Adam and his sinful deed whereby death entered into the world and into their lives. Christ, says Paul, is the antithesis of Adam, because he accomplished life in faith by grace whereas Adam brought sin and death.

FOOTNOTES

1. The question here is whether or not ὁσπερ in colon 1.1 introduces an anacoluthon, which is taken up by ὅς in colon 16.1 after the parenthesis in cola 2-15. This complicated issue has a long history in the exegesis of Romans 5:12-21. Scholars who observed an anacoluthon are G Bornkamm (1963:1, 80-85), Kühner-Gerth (1965:1, 265ff), J Cambier (1965:217ff), C E B Cranfield (1975:1, 272f), H Schlier (1977:159), E Küsemann (1980:146f). See H A Lombard (1978:121, 123ff), for a survey of this research.

The other viewpoint is that ὁσπερ in colon 1.1 is complemented by ὑοῦτος in colon 3.1 (Louw 1979b:71). In the present discourse analysis of the structure of the whole argument this question did not create special problems. According to model A, colon 16 constitutes the final conclusion of the argument. This conclusion is comprehensible only if the preceding section of the argument (cola 2-15) is fully taken into account. Exponents of the idea of an anacoluthon do not assert that cola 2-15 are loosely linked with the rest and that this parenthesis is irrelevant for the understanding of the whole argument. On
the contrary, the 'parenthesis' forms part and parcel of the whole argument.

2. The exposition, understanding and interpretation of the phrase eph' hō pontes hēmarton are very problematic and have an extensive history in exegesis. All the scientific commentaries on Romans discuss this problem in depth. Apart from these commentaries, surveys of the history of exegesis of this phrase can be found in works of K H Schelkle (1956:177-95), E Brandenburger (1962:169ff); H Conzelmann (1968:195ff, 207f, 225), W G Kümmel (1970), and H A Lombard (1978:110-24).

According to C E B Cranfield (1975 and 1969:324f.) there are six possible explanations for the phrase. It amounts to taking the phrase eph' hō either as a causal conjunction with the meaning of 'because', 'since', or as a consecutive particle meaning 'on account of', 'therefore' (Craghan 1970:274f, 286).

Linguistically it is permissible to take eph' hō as standing for ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἦτοι which reads 'since', 'because', meaning that in functions as a causal conjunction. The masculine should then be read with its masculine antecedent hō thānatos (see Peshitta version).

Severe criticism should be raised, therefore, against Augustine's solution. He presupposed and inserted the phrase en Adam (in quo) with eph' hō and took hēmarton as a pluperfect. By doing so, he invented the traditional dogma of inherited sin. Such an insertion means, however, reading into the text a doctrinal presupposition. See the important article of W E Phipps (1980:124-33, specifically 128ff).

The consecutive interpretation of eph' hō does not fit into or concur with Paul's whole argument in this passage, since it means that death is the cause of sin. Paul argued exactly the opposite, namely that sin caused and brought death into the world (cola 1.1 and 2.1).
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