



SIN AS UNIVERSAL REALITY AND THE REIGN OF DEATH AS
ITS CONSEQUENCE

An Exegetical Study of Romans 5:12

THOMAS LEONARD NDAMA

VID SPECIALIZED UNIVERSITY

STAVANGER

MASTER`S THESIS (MATRS6000)

MASTER IN THEOLOGY AND RELIGIOUS STUDIES

SUPERVISED BY PROFESSOR JOSTEIN ÁDNA

WORD COUNT: 29916 WORDS

25TH MAY 2020

Abstract

This study deals with an exegesis of Rom 5:12 as a biblical text presenting a concept of sin as universal reality and the reign of death as its consequence. Its research question is, “how is the connection between Adam’s sin and the universal fact that ‘all sinned’ according to Romans 5:12, and what is the character of this universal sin?” With this question, the study scrutinizes the relationship between a sound exegesis of Rom 5:12 and the concept of universal hereditary sin through procreation – retained in Lutheran tradition. In so doing, exegetical and hermeneutical methods have been applied to Rom 5:12 with consideration to the three modes “behind, in, and in front of the text.” Recognizably, the apostle Paul was well acquainted with the Old Testament, particularly, Gen 2-3 and early Jewish writings in his expression about sin. Nevertheless, he goes further than the existing traditions that interpreted Gen 2-3 and upheld the Deuteronomistic tradition by defining sin primarily as transgression of commandment(s). For Paul, sin is a supra-individual power that reigns through death by which all humanity – understood as “flesh” – is inescapably exposed to sin. Moreover, the apostle’s concern in Rom 5:12 is about the universality of death as a consequence of one man’s (Adam’s) sin, but nothing is told concerning hereditary sin through procreation. Adam’s sin becomes either a model due to the free will alive in everyone, or an involuntary choice, but bearing no inherited guilt to the rest of humanity. It is just through Adam in whom sin found the first entry into the world and, consequently, death came through and triumphs over all humanity. However, as far as sin and death are considered by the apostle to be evil powers, human beings are incapable of overcoming them by themselves. It is only through faith in Jesus Christ by whom victory can be gained: baptism as the first part of regeneration as dying to sin with Christ and being renewed in His resurrection.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I express my sincere gratitude to the Almighty God for His endless love and sustenance that have enabled me to pursue my study program successfully at VID Specialized University, Stavanger. Glory be to Him forever! I extend my gratefulness to the leadership of VID Specialized University and its «Global Mission and Theology Scheme» for accepting my application, keeping and supporting me with access to various sources and facilities throughout my study program. My appreciation too to professors and the staff at whole for their daily noteworthy roles and service.

Moreover, this thesis could not be possible as it appears without the inexplicable contribution of my principal supervisor Professor Jostein Ådna: I am sincerely, very grateful for his excellent guidance and tireless commitment, support, useful criticism, inventive thoughts as well as his encouragement to me. Long live my supervisor!

Further, I recognize and appreciate an academic input attained from the Postgraduate Hebrew Reading Group (קְרִיאת תּוֹרָה) and the VID's research group: "Classical Religious Texts and Global Contexts" with its subgroup entitled "COLLECT: Colloquium on Epistemology, Context, and Text in African Biblical Interpretation."

I extend my sincere gratitude to the leadership of Tumaini University Makumira, Arusha Tanzania for its recommendation and support to the extent of I being able to apply successfully for this study program. Further, I direct my heartfelt gratitude to my diocesan leadership currently headed by Bishop Dr. Abednego N. Keshomshahara: the North Western Diocese of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania (NWD-ELCT) for permitting me to pursue this study program.

My deepest appreciation goes to my beloved parents: Mr. Leonard Thomas Ndama and Mrs. Sabina James Hamuka for their endless prayers, encouragement and advice to their son. I am so proud of their incalculable attention. I appreciate too for the kindness shown by the rest of my family (siblings), related families and in particular, my fiancée Joy Edward Malema for her perpetual prayers, endurance, care and encouragement during my studies.

Last but not least, I am very thankful to my fellow students both Norwegians and Internationals at the campus, friends and Stavanger International Church (SIC), for their generosity and inspiration throughout my stay in Stavanger.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgments	iii
Abbreviations.....	vi
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and motivation for the study	1
1.2 Research question.....	2
1.3 Research Methods	2
1.4 Research Sources.....	3
1.5 Research Context.....	4
1.6 Research Outline	4
Chapter 2: Sin in the Old Testament and early Judaism	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 The Old Testament	5
2.2.1 Genesis 2–3	6
2.2.2 Different notions of sin in the Old Testament	10
2.2.2.1 <i>A deeply rooted sinfulness among humans</i>	10
2.2.2.2 <i>Sin as transgression of commandments</i>	13
2.3 Early Judaism	14
2.4 Tentative conclusion	19
Chapter 3: Exegesis of Romans 5:12 within its context.....	21
3.1 Contextual delimitation of Romans 5:12	21
3.1.1 Immediate context.....	21
3.1.2 Broader context.....	22
3.2 Textual-critical note and translation of Romans 5:12	23
3.3 The position of Romans 5:12 within the textual unit Romans 5:12-21	24
3.4 Exegesis.....	27
3.4.1 Overview	27
3.4.2 Detailed exegesis	28
3.5 Summary of the exegesis and a tentative conclusion	46
Chapter 4: History of exegesis of Romans 5:12 with its implications	48
4.1 Introduction	48
4.2 Romans 5:12 in the pre-Augustinian era.....	48

4.3	Romans 5:12 by Saint Augustine, Pelagius and Chrysostom	51
4.4	Romans 5:12 in the Reformation era.....	55
4.5	Romans 5:12 in the Post-Reformation time to the current time.....	58
4.6	Tentative conclusion	60
Chapter 5: Research findings, contextual application and conclusion.....		63
5.1	Introduction	63
5.2	Research findings	63
5.3	Contextual application.....	65
5.4	Conclusion.....	65
Bibliography		67

Abbreviations¹

AD:	Anno Domini.
BDAG:	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>A Greek- English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BHS:	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i> . Edited by Albrecht Alt. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977.
Cf.:	Compare.
EDNT:	<i>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. ET. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-1993.
KKKT:	Kanisa la Kiinjili la Kilutheri Tanzania (English trans. <i>The Evangelical Lutheran Church of Tanzania</i>).
ET:	English Translation.
LXX:	The Septuagint.
NETS:	<i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . Edited by: Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NRSV:	<i>New Revised Standard Version</i> . New York: American Bible Society, 1989.
NT:	The New Testament.
OT:	The Old Testament.
RPP:	<i>Religion Past & Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion</i> . 13 vols. + Index vol. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz et al. Leiden: Brill, 2007–2013.
RSV:	Revised Standard Version.
TDNT:	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976.
v.:	verse.
vv.:	verses.

¹ Most of abbreviations for the primary sources and the secondary sources are taken from sections 8.3 and 8.4 respectively in Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation for the study

From my childhood, I was raised up and nurtured as a Christian by my parents who are committed in the teachings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania. With such an upbringing, I have grown up being taught the fundamental teachings of the Christian faith. Among other teachings, the most controversial one that has stirred me to undertake this study is, specifically, the Lutheran teaching about the hereditary sin since the first man – Adam. This is because I was taught that “I am a sinner, born in sin.” Of course, I was frightened and at the same time remained uncertain: How comes that a trespass of one person (Adam) could lead all humanity into bearing his status while everyone has a free will? The response I received at that time from the catechist was that my father and mother have inherited such sinful state from their parents backward and thus imputed to me through procreation.

Further, throughout the confirmation class, the catechist insisted that any good adherent of faith in Jesus Christ needs repentance and Christian baptism for the forgiveness of the inherited sin and actual sins as far as a person lives. Conversely, in the liturgical parts for the Sunday services, I have been well-versed with the confession of sin that (...) *mimi niliye maskini na dhaifu, na kuzaliwa katika hali ya dhambi*² literally translated as “(...) I am poor and weak, born in a tragedy of sin.” The reason that was given to me for being born in such tragedy is because of the old Adam, but by baptism my inherited sin became remitted; the old Adam has died, and a new Adam has become alive in me. Regarding my age in that time with less rational and theological capacity, what was taught to me, became my general world view – yet, uncertainly – of humanity that all humans have inherited Adam’s sin.

After joining the University’s studies in theology, I kept my inquisitiveness into proper search for answers. While studying Systematic theology with its branch known

² It is the confession found in the Swahili Lutheran Book of Worship and Hymns called *Tumwabudu Mungu Wetu: Msifuni Mungu, Mfalme wa Mbingu na Nchi!* Toleo la pili (Arusha, Tanzania: KKKT, 2017), 251 which is used throughout the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Tanzania and originated from the book of Concord, specifically the second chief article of faith in the Augsburg Confession and the Smalcald articles of original sin. For more details, see Robert Kolb and Timothy J. Wengert, eds, *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church* (Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 2000), 36-38, 310-311.

as Dogmatics, I have realized that the teachings and confession in my Lutheran church about hereditary sin are influenced by the apostle Paul's notion of sin stated in Rom 5:12 which was interpreted by Saint Augustine in the fifth century³ and fundamentally, perpetuated and retained in Lutheran tradition from the sixteenth century onward.⁴ As a Christian, I am motivated to know how it could be possible for the apostle to objectify personal sin (Adam's sin) – as it is claimed in Rom 5:12 – to depravity of all humanity and, consequently, a universal spread of death. For this reason, I am now inquisitive to an in-depth understanding of an intended implication of Rom 5:12.

1.2 Research question

Considering what is stated in the preceding section, what concerns me is to understand properly what the apostle Paul writes in Rom 5:12. According to this text, sin found its way into the world through one man, i.e., Adam (cf. Rom 5:14), and, as a consequence, death, using sin as its vehicle, also came into the world. Beyond this it is further clear from the text that death has a universal position corresponding to the fact that all human beings have sinned. However, what needs a profound investigation is how the connection between the sin of Adam and the universal sin(fulness) of humanity is to be understood. Hence, we must ask what the phrase that connects the statement “all sinned” with the preceding parts of the verse, ἐφ’ ᾧ, actually means and expresses. Consequently, my research question is: How is the connection between Adam's sin and the universal fact that “all sinned” according to Romans 5:12, and what is the character of this universal sin?

1.3 Research Methods

This study applies the biblical-exegetical and hermeneutical methods of investigation on the text Rom 5:12. As John H. Hayes and Carl R. Holladay argue, exegesis, specifically biblical exegesis, is “a systematic way of interpreting a text,” purposefully, “to reach an informed understanding of the text.”⁵ For that expression, it is then an ongoing process that does not aim to establish the meaning of a text, but rather to

³ Bradley L. Nassif, “Toward a ‘Catholic’ Understanding of St. Augustine’s View of Original Sin” in *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 39, no. 4 (1984): 287-299, 290-293; John Norman Davidson Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. (London: Adam & Black, 1977), 363.

⁴ See Kolb and Wengert, *The Book of Concord*, 36-38, 310-311.

⁵ John H. Hayes and Carl R. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner’s Handbook*, 2nd Ed. (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987), 23.

understand it.⁶ Considering the argument of Hayes and Holladay, then, I opt for using the historical-critical methods in three spheres: the world behind, in, and in front of the text in order to be informed of what Rom 5:12 meant in that time and to the contemporary time.

With regard to hermeneutical analysis of the text, I reflect on the previous scholarship having the same topic and text in concern like that of Saint Augustine, Martin Luther and current scholarship including commentaries to shed light on how the text has been historically and contextually interpreted in relation to how the text interprets itself. This is to find out what an applied message or knowledge to the contemporary context regarding to the question in concern might be.

1.4 Research Sources

The nature of this study is a non-fieldwork oriented, and therefore basically its materials are drawn from the existing written materials reflecting on exegetical and hermeneutical sources in both previous and contemporary scholarship, being categorized into primary and secondary levels. The primary sources are *Novum Testamentum Graece*⁷, *The Greek New Testament*⁸, *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*⁹, and English versions of the Bible and extra-canonical books. The secondary sources are scholarly books, commentaries, articles, lexicons, dictionaries, as well as the encyclopedias having the same theme or topic and based on the primary sources of the study.

Further, I will have to precisely cross check on the Jewish literatures such as Wisdom literature, Dead Sea Scrolls, Rabbinic literature and other related and significant writings of the Second Temple period for acquisition of some insights about the study. This is because, as Menahem Kister insists, “In Paul’s case, Jewish concepts played a significant role in shaping some central features of his theology.” He adds that

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, 28th Revised Edition. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012).

⁸ Barbara Aland. *The Greek New Testament*. 4th Rev. Ed. Edited by Barbara Aland ... [et Al.]. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993).

⁹ *BHS*.

“(…) reading Paul in the light of the Dead Sea scrolls and rabbinic writings is important both for understanding Paul as well as for dating and interpreting rabbinic parallels.”¹⁰

1.5 Research Context

Regarding the research title, this study is aware of the continuity of both biblical Testaments¹¹ and, hence, it treats the NT noticeably as part of the common reception of the Old Testament whereby the apostle already had knowledge of the OT before he developed his theological concern. Comprehensively, the study concerns primarily with the text, Rom 5:12, nevertheless, multi-contexts will be encompassed for sake of acquiring further knowledge for contextual application; apologetically and pedagogically.

1.6 Research Outline

The study is of five chapters of which after this introductory Chapter One follows Chapter Two, treating the topical-oriented Old Testament, early Judaism and, as far as relevant, traces of post-biblical Jewish tradition. This survey is anticipated to shed light on how the question in concern was or is treated and understood and to discern possible allusions or echoes that might be founded in Rom 5:12. Chapter Three deals with an exegetical analysis of Rom 5:12. Further, Chapter Four surveys a history of exegesis of Rom 5:12 with its theological implications. Chapter Five consists of the research findings, contextual application of the knowledge attained, and conclusive remarks.

¹⁰ Menahem Kister, “Romans 5:12-21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage” in *Harvard Theological Review* (HTR) 100:4 (2007): 391-424, 391.

¹¹ See Peter Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2018), 6.: “*The theology of the New Testament must be developed as a biblical theology of the New Testament that is open to the Old Testament, as a subdiscipline of a whole-Bible biblical theology encompassing both Testaments.* Such a biblical theology also strives for a theology of the Old Testament that is open to the New Testament, achieving its goal by working through the entire biblical tradition” (italics in Stuhlmacher).

Chapter 2: Sin in the Old Testament and early Judaism

2.1 Introduction

Considering the nature of my research question, the focus of the study is not on the solution of sin; rather, it is on the matter of sin itself and how Paul grounded it from Adam to the rest of humanity in Rom 5:12. Thus, there is a need to consider a source of his train of thought by reflecting on what was understood concerning sin and its origin prior to and at his time, as pointed out in a quotation taken from Menahem Kister in section 1.4. In addition, he asserts that “Jewish writings sometimes supply precedents for Pauline motifs, conceptions, and terminology, and therefore help in analyzing the elements of Paul’s system.”¹² Kister’s assertion correlates with James Barr’s claim concerning the foundations of Paul’s understanding of Adam’s Fall and its diverse consequences. Barr’s claim on this matter credits higher possibility to later strata of the OT even the ongoing biblical tradition – throughout the OT and Early Judaism. The same claim is made by James D.G. Dunn and David A. deSilva too.¹³ Nevertheless, in order to have a comprehensive knowledge of Paul’s argument in Rom 5:12, I turn my attention towards an understanding of sin in the OT and early Judaism as presented below.

2.2 The Old Testament

The OT applies several Hebrew terms to speak of sin. However, the three are considered by many OT’s scholars as critical in defining the notion of sin, namely, פשע, חטא and יִזְעַר of which all of them are articulated in relational not ontological sense while imposing a burden to human being as his or her own responsibility and snare against God.¹⁴ The Greek translation of the LXX operates with correspondence to variety of terms; as *ἁμαρτία* that means sin, *ἀδικία* meaning unrighteousness, *ἀνομία* simply

¹² Kister, “Romans 5:12-21,” 392.

¹³ James Barr, *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 16-18.; Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans and Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998), 82ff.; David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation* (Illinois: Downers Grove & Nottingham, England: IVP Academic, 2004), 48.

¹⁴ T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner, *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, electronic ed. (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001), s.v.; Alexandra Grund, “Sin, Guilt, and Forgiveness: IV. Old Testament.” *RPP* 12 (2012): 22-24, 22; John E. Toews, *The Story of Original Sin* (Cambridge, UK: James Clarke & Co., 2013), 91-92.

meaning unlawfulness, *ἀσέβεια* implying ungodliness, and *κακία* inferring to bad.¹⁵ Nevertheless, the Hebrew technical term with its various derivatives which became used to connote sin is חטא basically translated as “miss the mark” as it is written in Judg 20:16; Prov 19:2. The comprehensive term that is argued to and could consist a whole process of transgression, consequences (state of guilt) and its punishment is חַיִּיב generally translated as *iniquity* or *guilt*. These can be seen in Hos 7:1; 13:12; Ezek 21:30-34; 44:10.¹⁶ Therefore, to sin, as T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner assert, “is to go astray (*sûr*), vainly to wander as a result of one’s pretended autonomy (Is. 53:6), to slide down the road to ruin (Prov. 9:18) or to backslide, forsaking the Lord and following other gods.”¹⁷

2.2.1 Genesis 2–3

The story of sin has a long history back to the Genesis story of the Fall. The NT expression of sin is founded on Adam’s Fall narrated in Gen 2-3 and geared further through the traditional interpretations of Gen 2-3 prior to and during the NT era (see section 2.3 below). The story of the Fall is defined in terms of God’s commandment (Gen 2:16-17):

And the Lord God commanded the man, “You may freely eat of every tree of the garden; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall die” (NRSV).

Gordon J. Wenham observes that the two trees mentioned to be present in the Garden of Eden have vital concerns; the tree of life confers immortality while the tree of knowledge of good and evil gives access to wisdom. The restriction of not eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil was purposefully to spare man from “human autonomy and an independence of the creator incompatible with the trustful relationship between man and his maker which the story presupposes.”¹⁸ The commandment which was given to Adam in the Garden had explicitly a threat within

¹⁵ For an overview of the applied terms, see Grund, 22. Cf. Toews, 93.

¹⁶ Grund, 22. (All references above to biblical texts are taken from Grund’s article.)

¹⁷ Alexander and Rosner, *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*, s.v.

¹⁸ Gordon J. Wenham, David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D.W. Watts, and Ralph P. Martin. *Genesis 1-15*. Vol. 1. Word Biblical Commentary (Michigan: Zondervan, 1987), 87; See also, Toews, 6.

it, namely, death after transgressing it; “(...) for in the day that you eat of it you shall die.” (v.17b).

However, Gerhard von Rad raises the question whether death should be understood as a punishment for a transgression or not. He ultimately finds the reply in Gen 2:7 with the notion that man could in any way die or change because of being created from the earth and that, if he could eat from the tree of life then, he was to live forever. Therefore, the toilsomeness and wretchedness as the consequences of transgressing the God’s commandment would persist until he returns again to the earth.¹⁹ With this notion then, it is apparent that physical life of human beings was mortal from the beginning, but it depended on their access to the tree of life Gen 2:9, cf. vv.16-17, meanwhile, after the Fall (3:22), their access to it became abandoned.²⁰ So, death came in through Adam’s sin because God, as a punishment, makes the decay character of the world and life in the world strong (Gen 3:17-19). In other words, death which was not explicit to Adam became forced into his consciousness after the Fall, and “he must let this knowledge overshadow his entire life.”²¹ Consequently, human existence became full of hopelessness compelled against the power of evil with an inevitable end subjected to the splendor of death because of hardship and wretchedness.²²

Further, Wenham highlights that the concept of death told by the narrative implies the spiritual death; the independence of humanity from God who gives life. Being expelled from the Garden of Eden signifies the alienation of humanity from God, and leads “to experience a living death.”²³ Such an assertion in Wenham’s argument is articulated too in Lev 13:45-46; Num 5:2-4; 1 Sam 15:35 while Ps 36:9-10 [8-9] tells of the fountain of life in which men could be drinking is found only in the house of God; “only the presence of God did man enjoy fullness of life. To choose anything else is to choose death (Prov 8:36).”²⁴

Furthermore, von Rad asserts that Gen 2-3 is dismissed in the rest of the OT such that nothing is told by the prophet, psalm or any narrator referring to the story of

¹⁹ Gerhard von Rad, *Genesis: A Commentary*. 3rd Rev. ed. Old Testament Library (London), (London: SCM Press, 1972), 95. Cf. Wenham, *Genesis*, 83.

²⁰ Cf. Toews, 97.

²¹ von Rad, *Genesis*, 95.

²² *Ibid.*, 94, 101-102.

²³ Wenham, 90.

²⁴ *Ibid.*

the Fall. The reason given is that the recipient or reader could not be happy with it, rather, searching for the good future and thus, the Yahwistic tradition focused on it when it tells of Abraham and Moses.²⁵ Nevertheless, Wenham points out that Gen 2-3 functions as “a paradigm of sin, a model of what happens whenever man disobeys God.”²⁶ In expressing why Gen 2-3 is a paradigm, he argues that it is because of its assertion about the reality of sin; “what constitutes sin and what sin’s consequences are.”²⁷ Disobedience to the only divine commandment renders an essence of man’s first sin while the consequences are both physical and spiritual. The spiritual consequence is considered to be seen immediately after the transgression as alienation from God (expulsion from the Garden); nevertheless, the physical ones including pain, suffering and death are said to be evident in a long run.²⁸ Wenham goes further in regarding Gen 2-3 as a paradigm of sin by stating that it is paralleled in expression with the great theological traditions of the rest of OT such as the covenant theology particularly in Deuteronomy with an insistence that disobedience to God’s commandments would bring the curse and ultimately death (Deut 30:15-19). The theme is expressed also in the prophets, like Isa 24:4-6; Jer 21:8, as well as in wisdom tradition in which the theme is articulated in magnitude:²⁹ “There is a way that seems right to a person, but its end is the way to death” (Prov 14:12 [NRSV], cf. 16:25).

Ultimately, Wenham finds – after having wider implications in various traditions – Gen 2-3 as both paradigmatic and protohistorical.³⁰ Also Zimmerli understands this narrative as paradigmatic and observes that Gen 3 is to be read not in

²⁵ Ibid., 102. Cf. Walther Zimmerli, *Old Testament Theology in Outline* (Atlanta, Ga: John Knox, 1978), 168; Wenham, 90-91. For Wenham, the story was highly articulated in the later Jewish and, particularly Christian theology whereby the dire consequences of either Adam’s or Eve’s transgression is acknowledged and perpetuated (cf. Sir 25:24; Rom 5:12; 4 Ezra 7:118), however other tradition especially of the Jews continue to consider Gen 3 as a model (paradigm) as it is vividly expressed in Apocalypse of Baruch 54:19. (see in section 2.3).

²⁶ Wenham, 90.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., 91: Wenham, on the one hand, surveys various elements (like water, jewels, cherubim, gold) in the story in relation to what could be found in sanctuaries, tabernacle and temples, and ultimately he comes to understand the story – as a paradigm of sin – in a universalistic sense implying “Adam” as every man in Israel. On the other hand, he understands the story as a real event with real people after reading the genealogy of Gen 5 in which Adam is linked with Noah. Also, the current pain, toil and death in the view of the author of Genesis are heritable to humanity, not personal sin. Blame is to be ascribed to the first couple’s disobedience simply because the affirmation that everything created was good in Gen 1:31 is reverted and given a reason in Gen 2-3 (cf. 6:11) for why the world fails to exhibit such perfection today. This is what Wenham calls a protohistorical account of man’s origins and his sin; the rest of human race inherited the grave consequences from the disobedience of their protoparents.

isolation; rather, it has echoes with what is narrated in Gen 4:1ff.; 6:1-4 and 11:1ff. giving a whole sequence of stories about sin whereby man is portrayed to reject his creatureliness with the eagerness of being like the giver (God).³¹

Toews raises a question about whether the term “sin” is used in Gen 3 or not. His question is similar as Barr’s.³² Toews discerns that it is not used in Gen 3 nor is the word “original sin” used in the story, or anywhere in the Bible. Rather, “the form of Genesis 3 is a crime and punishment narrative that is told in two parts: 1) the transgression, vv. 1–7, and 2) the punishment, vv. 8–24.”³³ However, John Collins stands against Barr and Toews, referring to God’s question in Gen 3:11, and he parallels with the text in Eccl 7:20 by which his concern is to repudiate the limitation of the term sin to a single vocabulary. Collins sums up his argument that the term used in the Fall can be referring to “sin,” “disobedience,” and “transgression” as it is used in Wis 2:23-24; Sir 25:24; 2 Esd (4 Ezra) 3:6-8; Rom 5:12-19 and 1 Tim 2:14.³⁴ Moreover, Toews rejects even the idea of ascribing the tragic story of the sin of Cain as inherited from Adam; rather, he views it in an individualistic sense by considering God’s words to Cain in 4:7 “(...) if you do not do well, sin is lurking at the door; its desire is for you, but you must master it” (NRSV). This indicates that man is free from Adam’s sin; he has a free will to choose to do good. Observably, Toews’ idea is of Zimmerli too who recognizes the presence of some distant echoes of the story in Ecclesiastes, but states that the OT at whole never speaks of the doctrine of man’s Fall.³⁵

Affirmatively, Toews adds that the punishment that was given to Adam’s and Eve’s mistrust and disobedience was “expulsion from the garden, which meant the loss of the intimate friendship with God (...) and the loss of the possibility of immortality.”³⁶ In other words, it is the loss of homeness where unity and wholeness (*shalom*) is replaced by fragmentation, and the prospect of immortality is replaced by death. Further, Toews understands that the “Fall” theology is a reading back into Gen 3 introduced by Hellenistic-Gentile re-interpretation of the text. For him, the

³¹ See Zimmerli, 168-169.

³² Toews, 4; Barr, *The Garden*, 6. For Barr, Gen 3 lacks the term sin, “(...) nor do we find any of the terms usually understood as ‘evil’, ‘rebellion,’ transgression or ‘guilt.’”

³³ Toews, 4.

³⁴ C. John Collins, *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary* (Phillipsburg, N.J: P&R Publishing, 2006), 155.

³⁵ Toews, 4; cf. Zimmerli, 168.

³⁶ Toews, 12.

consequences of Adam's and Eve's disobedience should be defined not in an ontological, rather, in relational sense – estrangement from God, from each other, from some animals, and from creation.³⁷

2.2.2 Different notions of sin in the Old Testament

2.2.2.1 A deeply rooted sinfulness among humans

The notion of sin found in the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel portrays that an existing generation was considered to be exposed to either benefits or severe sufferings from any consequence of an action – obedience or transgression respectively – done by the former generation(s).³⁸ This is vivid in Ezekiel when he was told by the Lord God to challenge the inquisitive people with “the abominations of their fathers” (Ezek 20:4). However, the succeeding generation was to be punished by being dispersed and scattered among the nations because of its idolatrous practices which were of the same category as what their fathers/ancestors did (Ezek 20:23-24).³⁹ Mark J. Boda adds that their punishment that included curse and death instead of goodness and life (cf. Lev 26; Deut 28-30) was the result of a defilement of similar category committed by their ancestors before the Lord God in the wilderness.⁴⁰ Further, in Ezek 18, the succeeding generations were understood to inherit the forefathers' sins but at the same time, each person – in spite of inheriting such condition – was to be judged by God independently depending on how he or she responds to God. Boda's understanding is of what told by Longenecker that Ezekiel's message puts more emphasis on an individual's responsibility within an inherited depravity.⁴¹

Yet, prophet Isaiah treats the notion of sin in a relational way such that in 6:5 he confesses his sin before the Lord God for his unclean lips because of being part of a nation dwelt with unclean lips. He names his uncleanness as unholiness and thus “the unholiness of his own person was doubled, in consequence of the closeness of the natural connection, by the unholiness of the nation to which he belonged.”⁴² His

³⁷ Ibid., 13-14; see also Heikki Räisänen, *The Rise of Christian Beliefs: The Thought World of Early Christians* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 2010), 135.

³⁸ Mark J. Boda, *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedy in the Old Testament*. Vol. V.1. Siphrut (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009), 198, 279-280.

³⁹ Ibid., 280.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Ibid.; Richard N. Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Greek Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2016), 430.

⁴² Carl Friedrich Keil and Franz Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 7 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 127.

prophecy is as that of prophet Hosea (2:16-17 cf. 2:23) being in relational way through which the major concern is the mistrust of people to the Creator God; they subdue and put trust to themselves economically; pride (Isa 1-5), to other gods (baal), and to other nations like Egypt and Assyria for political and war affairs (cf. Isa 30:1-2; 31:1).⁴³ The transgression of King Hezekiah is one of examples, who trusted other nations rather than God, and consequently, would lead to the downfall of the kingdom, and the remnant and his generation would be destroyed.⁴⁴ Isaiah portrays further on how these people were pervading against Yahweh with their mouths, lips and their traditions (Isa 29:13) and therefore, his prophecy calls the people to return in heart (repentance), put trust to Yahweh and obey His commandments (30:15, 18).⁴⁵

The prayer of prophet Daniel (9:4-19) focuses on the transgression of the Law and the call for repentance whereby Daniel confesses his sin before God (v. 4a), and later confesses the communal transgression (vv. 4b-19). The confession – comparable to Ezra 9:6-7, 1 Kgs 8:47, and Bar 2:12 – starts with acknowledgment of personal and collective guilt against “the commandments and ordinances of God” and His servants (prophets), and the consequences namely, deportation.⁴⁶ Daniel’s prayer has similar theme as prophet Nehemiah’s concern in 9:5-37 that people transgressed the Law and thus, they were to worship God and confess their sin for the sake of restoration. This was done by fasting and prayer grounded in the Scriptures (Deut 10; 2 Chr 6; 1 Kgs 8; Lev 26) and confession.⁴⁷

There was also a recognition that disaster could be ascribed to the earlier sins (Psalm 25:7; Job 13:26), an individual’s transgression to affect the surrounding community (Genesis 12:17, Joshua 7:1ff.; 2 Samuel 24:10ff.; Jonah 1:4ff.) and subsequent generations (Leviticus 26:39; 1 Kings 21:28f.; Lamentations 5:7).⁴⁸ Particularly, Ps 51:7 (in *BHS*) is the passage by which king David confesses his guilt (עוֹן) and sin (חַטָּא) before God. The question comes on how to discern semantically the

⁴³ See, Boda, 198ff.; Zimmerli, 191-192; Cf. 188ff. for discussion about Hosea’s prophecy; people transgressed the “fundamental precepts of Yahweh and acted contrary to his commandments” by turning to their own ways.

⁴⁴ Boda, 198.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 200-201.

⁴⁶ Paul L. Redditt, “Daniel 9: Its Structure and Meaning.” In *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (2000): 236-49, 243. Accessed on April 20, 2020. www.jstor.org/stable/43722642.

⁴⁷ See Mark J. Boda and Frank Lewis, *Praying the tradition: The origin and use of tradition in Nehemiah* 9. (Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999), 1; cf. 43ff.

⁴⁸ Grund, 23. (All biblical references are drawn from Grund’s article.)

verbs: הוֹלֵלְתִי and יִמְתְּנִי used in articulating his confession. Analytically, הוֹלֵלְתִי is the verb in passive, pual, perfect, singular, first person common of הָלַל translated as *be born, be labored* meanwhile יִמְתְּנִי is a verb: piel, perfect, active, 3rd person, singular, feminine of יָמַת meaning *conceived, bred*. However, the choice of either of the verbs “decides the question whether by עוֹן and חַטָּא is meant the guilt and sin of the child or of the parents.”⁴⁹ Expressively,

חַטָּא (to burn with desire) has reference to that, in coition, which partakes of the animal, and may well awaken modest sensibilities in man, without עוֹן and חַטָּא on that account characterizing birth and conception itself as sin; the meaning is merely, that his parents were sinful human beings [sic], and that this sinful state (*habitus*) has operated upon his birth and even his conception, and from this point has passed over to him. What is thereby expressed is not so much any self-exculpation, as on the contrary a self-accusation which glances back to the ultimate ground of natural corruption.⁵⁰

At last Keil and Delitzsch understand Ps 51:7 as a propagation of hereditary sin more uniquely in the whole OT by portraying David as sinful in correspondence to Ps 58:4; Gen 8:21, also, as an unclean one springing from an unclean echoing to Job 14:4, flesh born of flesh.⁵¹ Nonetheless, the OT apart from this passage, deals with the issue of sin outwardly; it does not delve into the secret of the phenomenon while leaving “its natural foundation, its issue in relation to primeval history, and its demonic background undisclosed.”⁵² In spite of that affirmation, they discover that the individual responsibility before judgment is retained such that the sin-pervaded nature of humanity becomes outwardly manifested as far as a person allows himself or herself to be determined by it and resolves in accordance to it through his or her own actual sin(s).⁵³

Further, the prophecy of Jeremiah is characterized by the prophet’s suffering – reflected as Yahweh’s suffering too for his people – rooted in the people’s sinfulness against Yahweh’s Law. Yahweh’s response is by hatefully punishing them with war, famine, and pestilence (28:8, cf. 12:7-8).⁵⁴ The deep concern about how sinful Judah is, is depicted in Jer 13:23 in which the prophet is sorrowful of her, for she is incapable

⁴⁹ Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament.*, vol. 5: 367.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Zimmerli, 205-206.

of changing her wicked ways far better than the leopard to change its spots or the Nubian (Ethiopian) blackness of his skin. Thus, there is no escape for Judah from Yahweh's punishment because her wickedness has turned to be her nature.⁵⁵ Further in Jer 17:9 portrays how the heart⁵⁶ of a person is deceitful (כִּזְבוֹן). Here, the prophet alludes to Jacob (cf. Hos 12:3-4) – who strove to attain Yahweh's blessing – when he speaks of the Jews' deceitful heart, as “their forefather whose deceit, but not whose faith, they followed.”⁵⁷ However, not only the heart is deceitful but also it is incurable/disastrous (אִנְיָ), and whoever puts trust in his or her own's heart is regarded as foolish (cf. Prov 28:26).⁵⁸ Observably, the individual's responsibility is still retained too in Jeremiah's prophecy.

2.2.2.2 *Sin as transgression of commandments*

Here, the major focus is on the Deuteronomistic time in which the Israelites were to obey the commandments given by God on the mount Horeb (Deut 1:6) in connection to the great promise of the land. Exhortations were made for people to adhere and obey the commandments of God (see Deut 5:6-21; Jos 24; 1 Kgs 2:2-4; 2 Kgs 17:13).⁵⁹ Obedience to the commandments could result into blessings and favor from Yahweh to His people unlike disobedience that yielded curses and punishment, specifically in the form of deportation. This can be witnessed by some few examples like kings Asa, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and Josiah in 1 and 2 Kings who are distinguished for their obedience to the commandments of Yahweh unlike Manasseh who is portrayed as the godless king.⁶⁰ Thus, Zimmerli asserts that

the actual verdict of this Deuteronomistic accounting of the history of Israel is that the people have been disobedient. This disobedience is not a timeless universal truth; it expresses itself in concrete historical events.⁶¹

⁵⁵ Ibid., 205.; Keil and Delitzsch, *Commentary on the Old Testament*, vol. 8: 150.

⁵⁶ James Swanson, *Dictionary of Biblical Languages With Semantic Domains : Hebrew (Old Testament)*, electronic ed. (Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997), s.v. who articulates the term heart (לֵב) as “the source of life of the inner person in various aspects with a focus on feelings, thoughts, volition, and other areas of the inner life.”

⁵⁷ Robert Jamieson et al., *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments*, On spine: Critical and explanatory commentary (Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997), s.v.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Zimmerli, 178.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 177; Cf. Grund, 23; Räisänen, *The Rise*, 134.

⁶¹ Zimmerli. 178. The disobedience told here is mainly on the first commandment of God by which after a severe temptation, people (usually, the leaders) became idolatrous and got intermarried with the Canaanites that put Israel into snare against God. With echoing to the primal history of man in

Informatively, Zimmerli affirms that the OT tells of commission of sin as a matter of human responsibility despite of how severe the temptation – which sometimes makes sin appear inescapable – is. He concludes with an idea that the guilt of a person has no connection to the preceding nor the succeeding generations rather, every person is intimately bound up in sin.⁶²

2.3 Early Judaism

Gary Anderson observes that “the tendency to see the widespread myth of Adam in the Second Temple sources is connected with the pivotal role of Adam in the Pauline epistles (Rom. 5; 1 Cor 15).”⁶³ Hitherto, Adam’s Fall was largely recognized in ancient Judaism but not all schools of the time held up on such a notion. On the one hand, there was a strand of tradition that focused on the demonic realm in articulating the myth of the Fall, and among them were *Jubilees 10:1-14*, *the book of Watchers* (1 Enoch 6-11; 15:8-16:1), *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (like Testament of Dan 5:1), and *the Dead Sea Scrolls* putting an emphasis on the myth of the fall of the Watchers whereby the fallen angels (cf. Gen 6:1-4) after having sexual relations with the daughters of humans, resulted into primal sin.⁶⁴ On the other hand, some apocalyptic sources such as 2 Baruch 54:15-19 and 4 Ezra 3:21; 7:118-131 attributed the action of the first humans as the cause for the present sinful status of humanity that consequently led to the narrowed, sorrowful and toilsome entrance to the world full of dangers and great hardships for a person to live therein.⁶⁵

Among other early Judaism writings that have interpreted the Gen 2-3 in relation to sin as transgression of commandments is the *Life of Adam and Eve* written in Hebrew ca. 100-200 AD and later on translated into Greek. It mentions Eve as blameworthy and responsible for sin (see 3:1; 5:2 cf. 33:1-2; 34:1-3; 35:1-3). She is portrayed in multiway: as the wrongdoer who wickedly “transgressed God’s ways, as Adam’s deceitful wife, and as an errant woman who was attracted to the sins of the flesh.”⁶⁶ Further, the consequences of transgression was the loss of the glory of God

Gen 3, Zimmerli concludes his point that the “inability and unwillingness to hearken obediently to Yahweh are let stand as the great riddle of human life.”(179).

⁶² Zimmerli, 171; cf. Grund, 23.

⁶³ Gary A Anderson “Adam and Eve” in *RPP* 1 (2007): 49-50, 50.

⁶⁴ Anderson “Adam and Eve”, 50; Räisänen, 137-138. Cf. Zimmerli, 61, 169.

⁶⁵ Anderson, 50; cf. Räisänen, 138.

⁶⁶ Toews, 33f.

(16:1-3). In the Apocalypse of Moses, Eve is presented as the vessel and spokesperson of the devil (16:5; 21:3), and the transgression narrated in Gen 3 is retold with illicit sexuality or sexual temptation. Nevertheless, the so-called *desire (epithymia)*⁶⁷ which was initially mentioned as “poison of wickedness” – placed in the fruit which was eaten by Eve – is defined as the origin of every sin (19:3). It is through her by which the unlawful desire became introduced into the world too. The Greek version of *Life of Adam and Eve* reverts the idea of the former, such that Eve is considered as “an ethical and moral figure, as Adam’s devoted and dutiful wife, and as a person who receives divine visions...”⁶⁸ However, such a later worldview is argued to be of later development perpetuating the womanist and feminist worldviews against males’ worldview.

Further, Adam in Sirach is optimistically articulated; he is considered as a glorious human being despite that he lacked fullness of wisdom. Nothing is mentioned about temptation, disobedience, sin, and expulsion in the Garden, nor death is considered as the punishment for Adam’s and Eve’s disobedience (cf. Sirach 17:1-17).⁶⁹ For Sirach, human mortality and knowledge of good and evil as it is told in Gen 1-3 are ascribed to God; death on the one hand is “part of God’s design for the first human couple, not a punishment for sin.”⁷⁰ On the other hand, Sirach’s understanding in 15:11-20 (cf. Deut 30:11-20) portrays that humans were created with free choice for either life or death depending on either obedience or disobedience of God’s Law, correspondingly. In that sense, he concludes that original sin is a bizarre notion; there is no biological or social traits to predispose people to disobey God and choose sin. Hence, there is no longer significance of the sin of Adam than the sin of everyone who transgresses the Law.⁷¹ Nevertheless, Sirach gives also the contradictory statement in 25:24 “From a woman is the beginning of sin, and because of her we all die” (NETS).

⁶⁷ M. D. Johnson, “Life of Adam and Eve: Theological Importance.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 2: Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985): 249-295, 252-253.

⁶⁸ Toews, 35.

⁶⁹ Toews, 17.

⁷⁰ Ibid.; Cf. John J Collins, *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls (London: Routledge, 2002), 31. Accessed on 19/4/2020 from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.vid.no/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e093mww&AN=68091&site=ehost-live>.

⁷¹ Toews, 20; Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 31. Sirach’s perspective does not consider the interval between the time of creation and the time of the Torah to be given at Sinai. For him, there was the law given to humanity from the beginning, making everyone be accountable for his or her own deed or choice.

That assertion is parallel with a fragmentary wisdom text from Qumran (4Q184) despite the fact that the Qumran text is more general for the wicked woman; it does not refer to Eve nor address the ultimate origin of sin and death. Sirach's claim is said to remain as an anomalous in pre-Christian Judaism and in his context of teaching with incoherence to theological system.⁷²

Concerning the Rabbinic writings, Anderson points out that they reject a tradition which considers Genesis 2-3 as the text attributing greater burden of guilt to Eve as source of human Fall. For them, Adam was responsible for Eve's transgression as far as he was the one who gave the highly fenced law to her. The result was of three dimensions in Adam's person: "his luminous flame became vanished, he forfeited his immortality, and his gigantic size dwindled."⁷³ Despite of having such consequences in Adam's person still there were variations among the Rabbinic sources regarding an understanding of Adam's Fall and its consequences – death to his posterity. One of them claims that "God ordained death for all human beings in proleptic reaction to the hubris of Hiram and Nebuchadnezzar, who considered themselves 'gods' (Gen R. 9:5)."⁷⁴ Kister⁷⁵ presents another Rabbinic writing expressed by Rabbi Yose in the Sifra passage as it is reported in b. Yoma 87a⁷⁶ which bears a strong notion about Adam's Fall and its consequence (death) not only to himself but also to succeeding generations. Moreover, the Rabbinic teaching about creation is commonly understood that the human (Adam) was originally created with two inclinations: good and bad. Such an understanding is arrived by the Rabbis after referring to the Hebrew word וייצר as it appears in Genesis 2:7 being translated as *and he formed*. They claim further that "...

⁷² Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 30.

⁷³ Anderson "Adam and Eve", 50.

⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁷⁵ Kister, 393-394. cf. Exod. 20:5-6 and Deut. 5:9-10; 12:28.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 393: "[A] Happy are the righteous! [B] Not only do they acquire merit for themselves (זכין לעצמן) but they also acquire merit for (זכין or מזכין) their children and their children's children to the end of all generations; [C] For Aaron had several sons who deserved to be burnt like Nadab and Abihu ... but the merit (זכורת) of their father helped them. [A'] Woe to the wicked! [B'] Not only do they acquire condemnation for themselves (חבין לעצמן), but they also acquire condemnation for (חבין) their children and their children's children to the end of all generations; [C'] Many sons did Canaan have who were worthy to be ordained like Tabi, the slave of Rabban Gamaliel, but the guilt of their ancestor caused them (to lose the chance)."

the form ייצר was interpreted as a hint of the original presence of two inclinations in the human: the *yetser ha-tov* and the *yetser ha-ra*.⁷⁷

Back to the historical writings, the book of Jubilees basically retells the story of Adam and Eve in Gen 3 with an assertion that the consequence of Adam's and Eve's transgression of God's commandment was not the universal sin; rather, it was "the loss of speech of all animals and birds so that they could no longer communicate with one another as they used to in 'one speech and one language'" (cf. Jub 3:15-35).⁷⁸ Further, in the Jewish Antiquities by Josephus (37-100 AD) the story in Gen 3 is retold in such a way that the serpent appears as jealous of Adam and Eve such that if they were to obey God's commandment, they could acquire blessings. Thus, the serpent brought temptation to them so that they were to experience calamity after their disobedience. Ultimately, after they disobeyed by eating the forbidden tree, they got intelligence, an intelligence which was not from God. At this point Toews highlights that "wisdom attained without God leads to irretrievable disaster."⁷⁹ Adam was punished by God due to his heed to the counsel of a woman. However, in Josephus' view, Adam and Eve lost just the good life, not immortality.⁸⁰

In the Dead Sea Scrolls, the story of sin is told with two explanations; on the one hand, it is based in Gen 6 by which the sexual relations done by the sons of God and the daughters of men resulted into the reproduction of super-human beings and later on, because of their stubborn behaviors, they were considered as evil spirits ascribed to the cause of sin in the world.⁸¹ On the other hand, an articulation of sin is directed from the creation story in Gen 1 with a quite diverse explanation of charge for sin as it is retold in *the Community Rule* (1QS). In it (cf. 3:12-25), God is said to create two spirits for humans; the one is of truth and light while the other is of injustice and darkness. Accordingly, they both possess super-human qualities playing out when good and evil are at conflict. Therefore, the problem of sin is ascribed to God's creation of two spirits in Gen 1 and not to the marriage articulated in Gen 6 nor to the disobedience of Adam

⁷⁷ Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, *The Creation of Man and Woman: Interpretations of the Biblical Narratives in Jewish and Christian Traditions* (Netherlands: Brill, 2000), 119. Cf. Räisänen, 136 about the idea of creatureliness.

⁷⁸ Toews, 23.

⁷⁹ Ibid, 24.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Toews, 24; See also, Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 29.

and Eve in Gen 3.⁸² The rest of the Scrolls share the same themes which were found in other Second Temple literature such as 4Q504 coherent with Sirach 17 with a major concern that Adam had knowledge and wisdom since his creation before the Fall and that he is the model and hero not the problem for the Jewish people.⁸³

Nevertheless, in the first century AD, the apocalyptic writings, specifically 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, emerged in attempting to understand the catastrophe of the 70 AD. This led to theological questioning about the sin of Adam and its consequences. In 4 Ezra 3:4-27,⁸⁴ Adam is depicted from the beginning that he was burdened with an evil heart as the result of being created by God with such a weakness which left him in a vulnerability of transgressing the commandment of God. The so-called “disease” of the evil heart since Adam is considered to be a “permanent condition of humanity” (cf. 3:22, 25-26; see also 7:63-72), and the Torah, which was intended to cure it, became ineffective because of human unfaithfulness to it.⁸⁵ With reflection to the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in 70 AD, the reason given is that the residents of it “transgressed the Torah just as Adam and his descendants had done.”⁸⁶ Adam became recognized as the first sinner who introduced death into the world (7:118⁸⁷). Nevertheless, the response of the angel – acknowledged by Ezra too – rejects any notion of original sin by putting emphasis on the human free will and individual’s responsibility to obey the Law and abandon the evil heart (see 7:127-131).⁸⁸

Second Baruch is less pessimistic of humanity compared to Fourth Ezra. Baruch portrays that humans still have possibility to obey the Torah as how Moses did because of the free choice.⁸⁹ This is vivid in his assertion that “Adam is therefore not the cause,

⁸² Toews, 25.

⁸³ Ibid., 26. Cf. Collins, *Apocalypticism*, 33f.

⁸⁴ “For the first Adam, burdened with an evil heart, transgressed and was overcome, as were also all who were descended from him” (3:21 cf. 3:7-8). See B. M. Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra: The Ezra Apocalypse.” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1 edited by James H. Charlesworth (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983): 517-559, 529.

⁸⁵ Toews, *The Story of Original Sin*, 28; cf. the section on “Theological importance” in Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra”, 520-521.

⁸⁶ Toews, 28.

⁸⁷ “O Adam, what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants.” See Metzger, “The Fourth Book of Ezra”, 541.

⁸⁸ Toews, 29-30.

⁸⁹ See the section on “Theological importance” in A. f. J. Klijn, “2 (Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch” In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1 edited by James H. Charlesworth (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983): 615-652, 618-619.

except only for himself, but each of us has become our own Adam ” (2 Baruch 54:19).⁹⁰ For Baruch, Adam chose not to submit to the commandment of God; being the father of all, Adam’s disobedience yielded death to all even the devotees of the Torah, but as far as there is a free choice for every individual person (cf. 2 Baruch 48:40-47), Adam and Eve are not to be blamed for the sin of their later generations. Everyone else – despite of Adam being the author of death (17:2-3) – born from him is responsible for his or her own verdict and eschatological fate (54:15-19).⁹¹ In a general view, the apocalyptic writings, specifically 4 Ezra and 2 Baruch, do not perpetuate the idea of hereditary sin from Adam to his posterity. It is the responsibility of an individual person for his or her own sin (see 4 Ezra 7:127-131; 2 Baruch 48:42).⁹²

2.4 Tentative conclusion

The discussion presented above portrays that there is an indecisive notion of hereditary sin from Adam in the OT and early Judaism unlike what is told in Christian theology. Some writings, like those representing wisdom literature, do consider Adam as a heroic figure, wise man, and the first patriarch of the Jewish people, neither as the father of sin nor the origin of death. Wisdom literature considers Cain as the starting point of the story of sin, meanwhile, the Dead Sea Scrolls present the source of sin as either “marriage” of “the sons of God” and “the daughters of men” in Genesis 6 (cf. *1 Enoch*, *Jubilees*, *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*), or God is considered to be responsible for the creation of an evil spirit (cf. Gen 1), and this evil spirit is responsible for sin. One tradition that comprises the writings of *Jubilees*, *Josephus*, *Life of Adam and Eve* puts its focus to Eve and her disobedience to God in the Garden with the sense of sexual desire. However, the apocalyptic writings (4 Ezra, 2 Baruch) do reject the idea of hereditary sin. The general view was that nothing is considered as ontological condition of human nature inherited from previous generations; rather, the belief was stressed on a relational understanding of sin as far as every individual person had a free will to choose what to do.⁹³

⁹⁰ Ibid., 640.

⁹¹ See Toews, 30-32.

⁹² Ibid., 32; cf. Matthias Henze, “‘4 Ezra’ and ‘2 Baruch’: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature.” In *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, no. 1 (2012): 181-200, 190-192. Accessed April 19, 2020. Doi:10.2307/23488218.

⁹³ Toews, 37.

With such an understanding from both the OT and early Judaism, then, the apostle Paul in his theological development was not alone; rather, there were already grounded theological ideas and teachings before and at his time that had strong roots in people's lives despite of some of them being contra to the other. Thus, the apostle's views as Dunn argues, "were not uninfluenced by its earlier participants."⁹⁴ With such an observation, the assertion of Kister – as I have notified prior in section 1.4 above – and of many other scholars⁹⁵ that the Pauline train of thought concerning the notion of sin can be traced back from the Old Testament and early Judaism, becomes relevant. Nevertheless, the question remains on how then, we are to understand Rom 5:12. This question needs an exegetical analysis as it is done in the following Chapter, below.

⁹⁴ Dunn, *The Theology*, 90.

⁹⁵ Among many others; see, Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 312.; Dunn, *The Theology*, 82-90.; deSilva, *New Testament*, 48-49.; Barr, *The Garden*, 16-18.; Frank J. Matera, *Romans*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2010), 127-129.

Chapter 3: Exegesis of Romans 5:12 within its context

3.1 Contextual delimitation of Romans 5:12

Under this section, I start the Chapter by identifying first the textual unit to which Rom 5:12 belongs. Having identified it might be suitable then to analyze the theme and intent of the text within its scope and how it functions within the textual unit and the epistle at whole. This can work out by identifying the immediate and broader contexts of the text as analyzed below.

3.1.1 Immediate context

Rom 5:12 is logically a passage that belongs to the textual unit of Rom 5:12-21 whereby commentators have entitled it by different titles but having the same connotation namely, the contrastive comparisons about the effects brought by Adam versus Jesus Christ.⁹⁶ Regarding the texts before and after, I have observed that the text is not a genuine, self-contained unit until it is accomplished in verse 21. The reason for v. 12 be accomplished in v. 21 is portrayed in section 3.3 below.

However, I concur with some commentators⁹⁷ who argue that the text has elements that refer back to the verses or passage before and introduces what follows. This is due to the preposition *διὰ* with a demonstrative pronoun *τούτο* in accusative at the beginning of the verse which either gives grounds by indicating the purpose for which something exists, meaning *because of, for, for the sake of*, or giving reason and inferences with a translation; *therefore, for this reason*.⁹⁸ With this understanding, v. 11 concludes and brings to an end the textual unit that begins in 5:1 with the articulation that believers can now boast in God for having peace with and reconciled to Him through Christ's obedience which has countered Adam's transgression. V. 12

⁹⁶ Just to mention a few commentators; Ben Witherington III and Darlene Hyatt, *Paul's letter to the Romans: A socio-rhetorical commentary* (Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004), 141.; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols: Vol. 1. International Critical Commentary, 1975–1979, reprinted with corrections (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001–2002), 269; Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Leicester: Apollos, 1988), 227. Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 83.

⁹⁷ Among others, see, Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83; Morris, *Romans*, 228; Cranfield, *Romans*, 269.

⁹⁸ A. J. Hess, “*διὰ*” in *EDNT*, vol. 1: 296-297, 297.; Timothy Friberg, Barbara Friberg and Neva F. Miller, *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, Baker's Greek New Testament library, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 2000), 108. See also, BDAG, s.v.: the preposition with accusative implies a causal sense.

introduces a new textual unit (vv. 12-21), giving a ground of what is stated in vv. 1-11. Moreover, 6:1 introduces another textual unit starting with a rhetorical question.⁹⁹

3.1.2 Broader context

Concerning an overview of the major sections of the letter to the Romans, I have found various suggestions by different commentators. Among others, David A. deSilva has twelve major parts¹⁰⁰ while Richard N. Longenecker has divided the letter into ten major sections,¹⁰¹ and Leon Morris analyzed the letter into seven major sections.¹⁰² Further, Stanley E. Porter has sectioned the letter into five major parts as Peter Stuhlmacher did with some differences from one another in subsections.¹⁰³

In this thesis, I have considered the structure of the letter in harmony with Stuhlmacher as far as it has been used in studying the letter during my study course. The text, which is in study, is located in the major first part after introductory part that is 1:18-8:39 “The Righteousness of God for Jews and Gentiles” under the subsection named “The Righteousness of God as the Righteousness of Faith and the Ground of Reconciliation.” Nevertheless, the textual unit that is 5:12-21 in which the study text belongs is named “The Reign of Grace”¹⁰⁴ portraying the contrastive comparison between the effects of Adam’s trespass and of grace through Jesus Christ to the rest of humanity.

V. 12 functions as an introduction to the contrastive comparison made through the whole textual unit specifically in verses 18, 19, and 21. Moreover, the textual unit functions as the completion of the theme raised up from Romans 1:18 concerning the righteousness of God to all humanity attained not by Law as Jews hoped for or rational searching as Gentiles did but through faith¹⁰⁵ in Jesus Christ who has reconciled us with God by His righteous act (5:18). The coherence of this argument is vivid as what Stuhlmacher highlights on the four catchwords – sin, grace, Law, and righteousness –

⁹⁹ See, Matera, 136; Morris, 228; Cranfield, 269; Hendriksen, 176.

¹⁰⁰ deSilva, 605-606.

¹⁰¹ Longenecker, *Romans*, 6-7.

¹⁰² Morris, *Romans*, 33.

¹⁰³ Stanley E. Porter, *The Apostle Paul: His Life, Thought, and Letters* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2016), 317.; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 14-16.

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, 14-15.

¹⁰⁵ John Barton, ed. *The Cambridge companion to biblical interpretation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 284.

the apostle Paul used in his discussion throughout 1:18-5:21.¹⁰⁶ Further, the conclusion given in 5:12-21 acts as the pivotal part to the next three chapters (6-8) of the epistle in which the chapters “clarify how the conclusion fares in the face of the continuing realities of death, sin and flesh.”¹⁰⁷

3.2 Textual-critical note and translation of Romans 5:12

This section deals with discerning – from all the available readings of the verse – the original wording, author and version being either accessible or inaccessible at our disposal, as deSilva asserts,

Textual criticism is the discipline of discerning, from all the available variant readings of a particular phrase or verse, what is most likely to have been the original wording, the wording of the actual author, whose original version is otherwise inaccessible to us.¹⁰⁸

With consideration to Nestle-Aland,¹⁰⁹ v. 12 has a critical sign indicating an omission of an articular noun *ὁ θάνατος* (death) in the second last clause by the majuscules codices D, F, G, the minuscule 1505, Old Latin witnesses and the church father Ambrosiaster. The witnesses for the omission regarded the second appearance of such an articular noun as redundant and need to be omitted simply because the preceding phrase already mentioned it.¹¹⁰ Robert Jewett has considered the omission as either a transcription error, or it might be omitted to fit the Greek tendency for economy of words as far as *ὁ θάνατος* is already mentioned in the previous phrase and thus, it continues to act as the subject of the verb *διήλθεν*.¹¹¹ Jewett’s argument bears the same claim as Thomas R. Schreiner argues that “the preponderance of the external evidence, however, suggests that the term should be included, and the omission is to be explained

¹⁰⁶ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83.

¹⁰⁷ Barton, 284.

¹⁰⁸ DeSilva, 300.

¹⁰⁹ Nestle-Aland²⁸, 490-491.

¹¹⁰ Longenecker, *Romans*, 421.

¹¹¹ Robert Jewett, *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2007), 369.

as a peculiarity of the Western text.”¹¹² Further, Jewett gives the witnesses on the side of inclusion of *ὁ θάνατος* in the phrase.¹¹³

Observably, I consider the witnesses for the omission as too weak to establish their claim regarding to their age and the quality of manuscript being one of the criteria for textual criticism¹¹⁴ and with reference to the Nestle-Aland’s text having negative apparatus as it is in *The Greek New Testament* without any indication for omission.¹¹⁵ I treat the Nestle Aland’s text as original one because the inclusion side is stronger enough to retain the text and so then, the omission in my view can mislead the interpreter with a difficulty to discern the logic of the phrase: of what subject – either ἡ ἁμαρτία or ὁ θάνατος – corresponds to the verb διήλθεν. I am mindful that the apostle’s argument is of the fact that “death is the result of sin”¹¹⁶ as it is stated from Genesis 3 by which Adam’s Fall is narrated and passed through history to the time of the apostle Paul. With all such considerations above, the text appears to remain unchanged thus, ready for exegetical analysis.

With consideration to the lexicons, dictionaries as well as grammars, as it is articulated in the detailed exegesis, I have translated the Greek text, v. 12 Διὰ τοῦτο ὡσπερ δι’ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσηλθεν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν, ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον· as *Therefore, just as through one man sin came into the world, and death through sin, and so, death spread to all men, because all sinned –*

3.3 The position of Romans 5:12 within the textual unit Romans 5:12-21

Rom 5 is at large extent argued to be divided into two parts: vv. 1-11 and 12-21.¹¹⁷ Precisely, v. 12 in the textual unit of Rom 5:12-21 is positioned as an anacoluthon – this is the reason I promised (3.1.1 above) to fulfill it concerning v.12 be accomplished in v.21. Before exposing how it is, there is a need to know the meaning of the term

¹¹² Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, Baker exegetical commentary on the New Testament, vol. 6 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 1998), 280.

¹¹³ Ibid., 369 a. Some of the mentioned witnesses are: ⋈ A B C K L P 33 *Maj Lect vg.*

¹¹⁴ Nestle-Aland²⁸, 799-780.; DeSilva, 301.

¹¹⁵ Aland, *The Greek New Testament*, 531.

¹¹⁶ R. Bultmann, “θάνατος, θνήσκω, ἀποθνήσκω, συναποθνήσκω” in *TDNT*, vol. 3: 7-25, 15.; Schreiner, *Romans*, 277.

¹¹⁷ Among many others, see Morris, *Romans*, 217, 227.; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 78, 83.; James D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38 (Dallas, Texas: Word, 1988), 242-244.; Cranfield, *Romans*, 255.; Dunn, *The Theology*, 94.; deSilva, 605.

anacoluthon. Ethelbert William Bullinger notifies that the term anacoluthon is etymologically a Greek term, ἀνακόλουθον that means “not following”, a negation of ἀκόλουθος (*following*):

This figure is so-called, because the construction with which a proposition begins is abandoned; and, either for the sake of perspicuity, emphasis, or elegance, the sentence proceeds in a manner, different from that in which it set out.¹¹⁸

Bullinger adds that an anacoluthon can also be used deliberately to draw and hit the reader’s attention in eye-catching, and so the argument passes on to that to which the attention is to be given.¹¹⁹ Taking Rom 5:12 in its textual unit – 5:12-21, the apostle uses this figure in v.12 and find its accomplishment in vv. 18, 19 and 21 with contrastive comparisons. The reason why the apostle employs here an anacoluthon, has been articulated by many scholars; C. E. B. Cranfield observes that the apostle’s intent was to spare from the danger of being misunderstood by his audience if the verses in between before the apodosis – acting as the qualifications of the contrastive comparison between Adam and Christ– had not been rendered. For him, despite the fact that the anacoluthon presents here a real theological difficulty still, it plays a significant role to the right understanding of the whole textual unit.¹²⁰

Stuhlmacher observes that the apostle’s usage of an anacoluthon was to show how late the Law came in to help compared to the time of sin’s entrance into the world, and how weak the Law to save a sinner and render righteousness (cf. Gal 3:21; Rom 7:14ff.; 8:3).¹²¹ In Stuhlmacher’s assertion referring to verse 13: “the Law thus conveys a forensic concept to sin, but it does not help to overcome it.”¹²² The arguments of Cranfield and Stuhlmacher have the same connotation which is also similar to many other commentators.¹²³

¹¹⁸ Ethelbert William Bullinger, *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible* (London; New York: Eyre & Spottiswoode; E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1898), 720.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*; cf. Catherine Soanes and Angus Stevenson, *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*, 11th ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), s.v.

¹²⁰ Cranfield, 273. Here, we are to consider the function of the verses 13-17 and 21, see section 3.3 below.

¹²¹ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 86.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 87.

¹²³ Among others, see, Matera, *Romans*, 136.; John Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. The New International Commentary on the New

An anacoluthon is introduced in v.12 with the conjunction ὥσπερ and goes further until it becomes realized – with the marker of apodosis (οὕτως καὶ)¹²⁴ – in the three contrastive comparisons between Adam and Christ, in vv. 18, 19 and 21. The first place (v.18) of comparison contrasts Adam’s trespass that resulted in condemnation (death) for all human beings by Christ’s act of righteousness which brought righteousness of life for all human beings. The second contrastive comparison is realized in v.19 contrasting the disobedience of Adam that made many be sinners versus Christ’s obedience in which many will be made righteous. The third comparison is in v.21 that contrasts the reign of sin through death caused by Adam versus the reign of grace through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

However, vv. 13-14, 20 deal with the function of the Law such that vv. 13-14 portray how the Law makes sin accountable, but such negativity is solved in vv. 18, 19 and 21. Further, v. 20 expresses the purpose of the Law to come: in order that (ἵνα) the trespass might increase. Conversely, vv. 15, 16-17 contain inferences from the lesser to the greater regarding the sin of Adam and salvation through Christ such that in v. 15 the inference is made by taking Adam’s trespass that resulted in death to many to be lesser than the abundance of grace of God for the many through Christ. And vv. 16-17 concern the reign of death caused by Adam being lesser than what will be the reign in life through Christ to the believers. By such a structural argument of the text unit, it is plain to discern that what was Adam’s sin and the subsequent consequences are now resolved by Christ’s actions. For more details, see the exegetical part in this chapter in which the text is furtherly, examined. In a summary way, I have numerically, structured the text within its textual unit, as follows;

1. Contrastive comparison between Adam and Christ (vv. 12, 18, 19, 21)
 - 1.1 Anacoluthic beginning of the comparison: ὥσπερ ... (v. 12)
 - 1.2 The realization of the comparison (vv. 18, 19, 21).
 - 1.2.1 Consequences of Adam’s trespass versus Christ’s righteous act (v. 18)
 - 1.2.2 Impacts of Adam’s disobedience versus Christ’s obedience (v.19)

Testament (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1968), 180-181; William Hendriksen, *New Testament Commentary: I: Romans Chapters 1-8*. Vol. 1. (Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1980), 176. For Hendriksen, the apostle employs an anacoluthon just to enlarge first on “the universality of sin” before the apodosis.

¹²⁴ See the discussion about the marker for the apodosis in section 3.4.2 below.

- 1.2.3 The reign of sin versus the reign of grace (v. 21)
- 2. Functions of the Law on humanity's sin (vv. 13-14, 20)
 - 2.1 The Law makes sin countable (vv. 13-14)
 - 2.2 The Law increases the trespass (v. 20)
- 3. Qal-wachomer¹²⁵ inferences (vv. 15, 16-17)
 - 3.1 Adam's trespass being lesser important than God's grace (v. 15)
 - 3.2 Reign of death being less active than that of God's grace (vv. 16-17).

3.4 Exegesis

3.4.1 Overview

The major theme of the textual unit, 5:12-21 is solidarity of all humanity in Adam and in Christ¹²⁶ which is amplified with the reign of grace.¹²⁷ Knowing that Paul has given a solution in the later solidarity against the former which seems to be a tragedy, the major focus in this part is to deal exegetically with the former regarding the apostle's train of thought that is the solidarity of all humanity in Adam. We might ask: How did such solidarity become possible in the apostle's thought?

Thus, the deep concern is on 5:12, specifically by examining the three grammatical issues that might shed light on how a translation of the whole passage can be made, namely, the genuine translation of καὶ οὕτως, the nature of ἐφ' ᾧ, and the syntactical force of πάντες ἥμαρτον. This is for the sake of uncovering what Paul had in his mind to convey to his audience about sin claimed to be a depravity to all humanity through one man, and, thereby, understanding correspondingly the contrastive comparisons made in the verses 18, 19, and 21. The rest of the textual unit will briefly be discussed as far as the structure above in section 3.3 is considered. At last, I curiously search to grasp his theological thought about Adam's sin in relation to the rest of humanity.

¹²⁵ It is one of the rules or techniques used in Midrashic interpretation implying that "what applies in a less-important case applies all the more in a more-important case". See Matthew S. DeMoss, *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of New Testament Greek*, (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2001), 106.

¹²⁶ See among others, Morris, *Romans*, 227.; Cranfield 269.

¹²⁷ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83-84.

3.4.2 Detailed exegesis

Under this part, I opt to divide v.12 further into four subsections as the way to scrutinize it and respond to the three mentioned grammatical issues. The subsections are named as; 12a, 12b, 12c and 12d as shown below.

1. Contrastive comparison between Adam and Christ (vv. 12, 18, 19, 21)

1.1 Anacoluthic beginning of the comparison: ὥσπερ ... (v. 12)

12a: Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν

The preposition διὰ followed by the accusative case has several implications as I have shown in section 3.1.1 above. At this point, I concur with other commentators who have observed that the preposition διὰ together with the demonstrative pronoun τοῦτο at the beginning of the verse gives grounds of what is spoken before: either to the argument in 5:8-11,¹²⁸ 5:1-11¹²⁹ or to the broader context founded from 1:18-5:11.¹³⁰ Stuhlmacher's reference of διὰ τοῦτο to the foregoing argument in 1:18-5:11 is reached after he considered the four catchwords namely, sin, grace, Law, and righteousness seen from 1:18 on.¹³¹ The three suggestions appear to be convincing but I side with Longenecker that Paul's usage of this preposition here at the beginning of v. 12 was purposefully to build on what he had said in vv. 1-11 namely, grace, righteousness, and life whereas in vv. 12-21 he begins to spell them out in a "reflective discourse" on the story that underlies all of Christian proclamation."¹³² With such observations, then the appropriate translation of διὰ τοῦτο is, *therefore*.

Conversely, the conjunction ὥσπερ can be simply translated as (*just*) as being generally functioning as a "marker of similarity between events and states."¹³³ In a comparative sense, ὥσπερ stands at the first part to introduce a protasis that is to be completed by the apodosis beginning with οὕτω(ς) meaning *thus*. However, it can be

¹²⁸ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83.; Morris, *Romans*, 228. For Stuhlmacher, διὰ τοῦτο is translated as *therefore* and he considers both the prepositional phrase and the parallel between vv. 8-11 and 18-21 as the decisive factors for the whole discourse of vv. 12-21 to be part of the discourse of vv. 8-11.

¹²⁹ Morris, *Romans*, 228.; Cranfield, *Romans*, 269-272. Cranfield gives his stance that Paul by using διὰ τοῦτο indicates the conclusion that is to be made in verses 12-21 from the preceding argument in verses 1-11 that is, "those who are righteous by faith are people whom God's undeserved love has transformed from the condition of being God's enemies into that of being reconciled to Him, at peace with Him."

¹³⁰ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83.; Morris, *Romans*, 228.

¹³¹ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 83.

¹³² Longenecker, 428.

¹³³ BDAG, s.v.

used to connect the preceding part with the proceeding one with an emphatic sense as it can be read in Matt 6:2; Acts 3:17; 1 Cor 8:5.¹³⁴ For the text in study, the former usage is suitable simply because the verse introduces the contrastive comparison of Adam’s and Christ’s realms to the rest of humanity. Noticeably, the position of an anacoluthon is more debatable of whether the apodosis – responding to the introduced protasis by ὥσπερ – can be found in v. 12 or the later verses. In response to that debate, Cranfield highlights the discussion held and agreement reached since the ancient times to the present era such that Origen, Augustine, the Vulgate, Calvin, RSV, NRSV just to mention a few, agree that the apodosis for the introduced ὥσπερ clause in 5:12 is not found in v. 12; rather, it is in v. 18.¹³⁵ He also gives some argumentative points against the contra views raised by contemporary scholars like Barrett¹³⁶ who consider and translate v. 12 as if it has both protasis and apodosis. Cranfield defends v. 12 as an anacoluthon by considering the following points: the Greek distinct usage of καὶ οὕτως and οὕτως καὶ, the emphatic position of δι’ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου in v. 12a that demands emphatic answer from the apodosis clause, and a connective construction with διὰ τοῦτο in v. 12a from what has been said in vv. 1-11 that might blunder if v. 12 has to be non-anacoluthon. Thus, in his words:

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) καὶ (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)’.¹³⁷

Cranfield’s argument mingles with some other commentators¹³⁸ who recognize that the apostle Paul begins to speak about something on the basis of the reconciliation that human beings have graciously received in vv. 1-11, and, eloquently, never gets around to completing his sentence. Stuhlmacher thinks that the apostle takes up first the thesis that the Law – as was considered by both Jews and Jewish Christians – could “provide a way out from the Adamic fate of guilt.”¹³⁹ Observably, it is grammatically

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Cranfield, 272.

¹³⁶ Barrett translates Rom. 5:12 as “Therefore as through one man sin entered the world (and through sin came that man’s death), so also death came to all men, because they all sinned.” See, Cranfield, 272 n. 3.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 272 n. 5.

¹³⁸ Among them, see Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 86.; Morris, *Romans*, 228-229.

¹³⁹ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 86.

substantial to uphold as Cranfield and other related commentators, that the response to the anacoluthon raised in verse 12 is far beyond the verse itself.

However, δι' ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου is a prepositional phrase in genitive case. The preposition διὰ when connected with genitive case, can imply several meanings,¹⁴⁰ but in this phrase we can argue that it is the instrumental use with genitive of a person¹⁴¹ – ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου implying the means or channel through which the action is done or something happens, with a translation *through, through the mediation of*. Further, the word ἐνὸς is the adjective in genitive case originally from εἷς being a numeral term, *one*.¹⁴² The noun ἀνθρώπου in genitive masculine is simply translated as *of man*. However, with further consideration the term ἄνθρωπος can be understood from different perspectives; either

as species ... distinct from animals (Mt. 12:12), angels (1 C. 4:9), Jesus Christ (Gl. 1:12) and God (Mk. 11:30 and par.); *or it can be used with special emphasis on the transitoriness and sinfulness of human nature as subject to physical weakness (Jm. 5:17) and death (Hb. 9:27), as sinful (R. 3:4; 5:12), full of evil (Mt. 10:17; Lk. 6:22), loving flattery (Lk. 6:26) and subject to human error Gl. 1:1, 11 f.; Col. 2:8, 22).*¹⁴³

The later usage was common in the OT as it is in Ps 8:4; 2 Sam 24:14 and with some Greek writers like Menander; ἄνθρωπος ὢν ἡμαρτον as well as Herond, Hippolitus, Philo. However, in the NT as whole, the term is used to pinpoint the limited nature of human intellect and behavior being unable to comprehend God and His revelation.¹⁴⁴

Even so, the apostle Paul's usage is of different expressions with either antithetical adjectival or adverbial attributes connoting either to “man's physical and mortal side” or to “his Godward, immortal side.”¹⁴⁵ This is vivid for passages in Rom 6:6; Col. 3:9; Eph. 4:22 when he uses the antithetical phrases; παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and

¹⁴⁰ Oepke, “διὰ” in *TDNT*, vol. 2: 65-70, 65-67.

¹⁴¹ *Ibid*, 66.

¹⁴² *BDAG*, s.v.

¹⁴³ J. Jeremias, “ἄνθρωπος” in *TNDT*, vol. 1: 364-367, 364.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid*.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, 365.

ὁ καινὸς ἢ ὁ νέος ἄνθρωπος to denote the unconverted man being sinful, and converted man to Christ – the renewed being, correspondingly.

The phrase ἡ ἁμαρτία contains the definite article ἡ and noun ἁμαρτία; the article is of singular in nominative case, feminine used in a definitional way to individualize the noun.¹⁴⁶ Further, ἁμαρτία is the noun in feminine singular simply translated as *sin* but it has got several definitions. Timothy Friberg highlights ἁμαρτία;

(1) of an act, a departure from doing what is right, equivalent to ἁμάρτημα *sin, wrongdoing* (1J 5.17); (2) as the moral consequence of having done something wrong *sin, guilt* (AC 3.19; 1J 1.7); (3) as the nature of wrongdoing viewed as the rejection of God by self-assertive human beings *sin, evil* (RO 5.12, 13; cf. 1.21); (4) especially in Johannine usage as a moral condition of human beings in revolt against God *sin, being evil, sinfulness* (JN 9.34; 15.24); (5) especially in Pauline usage as an abstract moral principle or force personified as evil in character *sin, evil* (RO 6.12); (6) especially in Hebrews as a deceiving power personified as leading human beings to guilt and destruction (HE 3.13; 12.1).¹⁴⁷

Conversely, Fielder points out that the primary definition of the term ἁμαρτία refers to “a *failure* to achieve a standard (whether culpable or unintentional) in the broadest sense, both as deed and as the nature of the deed.”¹⁴⁸ Generally, the understanding of the term especially in the NT, as it is mentioned by Friberg above, is said to be influenced by the LXX.¹⁴⁹ In the LXX, ἁμαρτία is used as a synonym of ἁμάρτημα standing for the Hebrew term חַטָּאת and עֲוֹנוֹת, often for חַטָּאת and occasionally for עֲוֹנוֹת with different implication from that of Aristotle¹⁵⁰ whereas the religious and moral concept of guilt became attached with the term; “there is seen in it an evil will and intention, i.e., a conscious apostasy from and opposition to God.”¹⁵¹ In other words, the NT’s usage of the term implies an “offence to God with emphasis on guilt.”¹⁵² Tellingly, ἁμαρτία (*sin*) is used in NT in tripartite forms namely: *sin* as an

¹⁴⁶ W. Elliger, “ὁ, ἡ, τό” in *EDNT*, Vol. 2: 489-490, 489.

¹⁴⁷ Timothy Friberg et al., *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, Baker's Greek New Testament library, vol. 4 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 2000), 45.

¹⁴⁸ P. Fiedler, “ἁμαρτία” in *EDNT*, vol. 1: 65-69, 66.

¹⁴⁹ Stählin, “The Linguistic Usage and History of ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα and ἁμαρτία before and in the NT,” in *TDNT*, vol. 1: 293-296, 295. Cf. section 2.2 above

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 294: Aristotle defines ἁμαρτία as a “missing of virtue, the desired goal, whether out of weakness, accident or defective knowledge”. Such Aristotle’s definition is said to be guilt free; “wrong without κακία.”

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, 295.

individual act that is congruent to ἀμαρτημα; sin as a determination of the nature of man; and as a personal power. The NT concept of sin is founded on the second and third forms whereas its primary stress is that “sin is a magnitude which determines man and humanity in the sense of distance from God and opposition to Him.”¹⁵³

Noticeably, out of 173 occurrences in the NT of which 48 times are in the Pauline epistle to the Romans; the term occurs 42 times in chapters 5-8.¹⁵⁴ The apostle speaks of sin in a singular form as it is used specifically in Sir 21:2; 27:10¹⁵⁵ as well in the Qumran literature such as 1QH 4:29f; cf. 1:27. The center attention intended by the apostle in Rom 5-8 is “sin as (demonic) power in contrast to the proclamation of Christ.”¹⁵⁶ Moreover, Paul’s usage of the term in singular form is usually preceded by the article which according to Stählin is not very common nevertheless, he gives a comprehensive argument regarding this particular usage of the term that

the initial reference is simply to the personal appearance of sin; it came into the world (R. 5:12). Originally it was νεκρά (7:8), but ἡ ἀμαρτία ἀνέζησεν through the ἐντολή or the νόμος (v. 9). It receives from this the impulse (v. 7, 11) to deceive man (v. 11; also, Hb. 3:13) and to “beset” him (Hb. 12:1, εὐπερίστατος); it dwells in him (R. 7:17, 20); it brings forth παθήματα (v. 5) and ἐπιθυμία (v. 8); and it thus becomes a demonic power ruling over him. Man is ὑφ’ ἀμαρτίαν (R. 3:9; Gl. 3:22; cf. R. 11:32); he is sold to it as a slave (R. 6:16, 20; 7:14; also Jn. 8:34; cf. Gl. 2:17); he serves according to its law (6:6; 7:23, 25; 8:3); he loans it his members as ὄπλα ἀδικίας (6:13). Its sphere of power is the σάρξ, where it exercises its dominion (κυριεύει, 6:14; βασιλεύει, 5:21; 6:12), which culminates in its giving man the wages (6:23) of death (5:21; 7:11; cf. Jm. 1:15). But through and with Christ man dies to sin (R. 6:2, 10), and is thus νεκρός for it (v. 11) and liberated from it (v. 7, 18, 22). Sin itself is condemned (8:3). Nevertheless, the battle against it must not cease (Hb. 12:4).¹⁵⁷

Furthermore, the apostle employs the term with implication to individual sins for the most part only in quotations as it can be read in Rom 4:7f corresponding to Isa 27:9, and borrowed formulae as it is in 1 Cor 15:3; Gal 1:4 and Col 1:14. With such usage, Rom 7:5; 2 Cor 11:7 and Eph 2:1 are exempted.¹⁵⁸ Regarding to sin as “a

¹⁵³ Ibid.

¹⁵⁴ Fiedler, “ἀμαρτία”, 66.

¹⁵⁵ “As from before a snake, flee from sin, for if you approach, it will bite you; it’s teeth are lion’s teeth, destroying people’s lives.” (21:2). “A lion lies in wait for prey, so sin for people who practice injustices.” (27:10). All those translations are accessed from <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/>.

¹⁵⁶ Fiedler, “ἀμαρτία”, 67. Cf. Stählin, 296.; Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 311-312.

¹⁵⁷ Stählin, 295.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 295.

determination of the nature of man,” the apostle uses the term in plural but considered as comprehensive term similar to the singular.¹⁵⁹ This usage is argued to be a complete transformed implication from that of Plato’s usage of ἀμαρτία – as the defective nature of man – rather, for Paul and the NT at large use the term to denote the determination of human nature in hostility to God.¹⁶⁰

The phrase εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσηλθεν personifies sin as something or particular being having a locomotive capacity. Accordingly, the preposition εἰς always goes with accusative case that can be of different purposes but generally, to indicate “motion into a thing or into its immediate vicinity or relation to something” meaning into, in, towards, to, up to.¹⁶¹ The word κόσμον is a noun in accusative case from the noun κόσμος that renders several meanings; *world, universe, ornament, totality* but the primary meanings as it is in Greek usage according to Balz are “arrangement” and “order.” He gives a statistical appearance of the word:

Κόσμος appears 186 times in the NT with clear emphasis in the Johannine literature (78 occurrences in John, 23 in 1 John, also 2 John 7) and in Paul (37 occurrences, of which 9 are in Romans, 21 in 1 Corinthians, 3 in 2 Corinthians, 3 in Galatians, and 1 in Phil 2:15). In addition the Synoptics have 15 occurrences (of which 9 are in Matthew); 5 each are in Hebrews, James, and 2 Peter; Colossians has 4; Ephesians, 1 Timothy, 1 Peter, and Revelation each have 3; also Acts 17:24.¹⁶²

It is argued that the first person to designate the word κόσμος with an implication of “total world” with inference to the order integral in it, was Pythagoras in the 6th Century B.C. His designation resulted to the understanding that

the total world, when considered in spatial terms as world, is called κόσμος in the sense of “universe” “inasmuch as in it all individual things and creatures, heaven and earth, gods and men, are brought into unity by a universal order.”¹⁶³

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 295-296. Cf. 1 Cor. 15:17; Rom. 3:20; 6:6a; 7:7; 8:3.

¹⁶⁰ Stählin, 295.

¹⁶¹ BDAG, s.v.

¹⁶² H. Balz, “κόσμος” in *EDNT*, vol. 2: 310-313, 310.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

However, in the NT, the term κόσμος has several meanings; despite of its basic meaning as the world, it can signify the “totality of everything created by God, (...) the dwelling place of humankind and the totality of humanity or of human interrelationships.”¹⁶⁴ To be more precise and relevant to my study, the apostle’s view of the world is of four Greek expressions¹⁶⁵ and in Rom 5:12 his thought about the world is the created entity consisting of people alone. He also aligns with the OT and early Judaism on confessing that God is the creator (1 Cor 8:6) and thus, the world is God’s creation (Rom 1:20, 25).

Moreover, the apostle’s notion of the world is gravely articulated in relation to the entrance of sin with its consequences, death and decay by showing how the created world became far from God, being pressed under futility, transience and at last to God’s judgment.¹⁶⁶ The notion is vivid in his arguments found in 1 Cor 1:21 and Rom 1:19-25, through which Stuhlmacher asserts, “the apostle shows that people – the Gentiles – have forfeited their original opportunity of knowing God from the works of creation.”¹⁶⁷ He adds that Paul’s notion about the world is influenced by the early Jewish wisdom theology such as Wisd 13:1-14:31.¹⁶⁸ It is in this motif in which Paul the apostle views the world in a pessimistic way as it is filled up with chaotic disorder resulted from a consequence of sin and of judgement upon human beings who appear to be insubordinate of God.

εἰσῆλθεν is the verb, which is in aorist, active with indicative mood, third person singular of the verb εἰσέρχομαι that means *to move into, enter in or into a particular place or space*.¹⁶⁹ Hence the verb in aorist as it is recommended grammatically to be translated in simple undefined past tense then, it can imply εἰσῆλθεν as he or she or it *came in or entered into*. From the phrase at whole, this verb has an imputed subject within it that is sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία). It then gives the meaning that sin entered or came into the world of human beings as far as the whole phrase above is in order.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 310-311.

¹⁶⁵ Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 302. The four Greek expressions used by the apostle are ἡ κτίσις that means “the creation”, ὁ κόσμος simply means ‘the world’, τὰ πάντα meaning “all things” comprising the whole universe and its people, and ὁ αἰὼν that means “the (present) age.” The argument about my text is in the second expression which prioritizes for people alone.

¹⁶⁶ Balz, “κόσμος”, 312.

¹⁶⁷ Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 303.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 303.

¹⁶⁹ BDAG, s.v.

12b: *καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος*

The phrase above is introduced by the conjunction *καί* simply meaning *and* which coordinates logically similar ideas or parts of sentences or clauses or grammatical elements to a previous idea or grammatical element. It was originally an added adverb purposefully to strengthen or intensify function with an English translation *and, also or even*.¹⁷⁰ Further, the phrase *διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* is of the same discussion done in analysis of v. 12a above on how the preposition *διὰ* with genitive case is used – here, used instrumentally or as means or medium – and also the really meaning of feminine noun *ἁμαρτίας* in genitive case, singular.

ὁ θάνατος is the noun with definite article in nominative case, singular masculine, meaning *death*. It is the phenomenon opposite to life (*ζωή*) that has a long history of its expression. In the classical time, death was articulated by Euripides and Plato to the extent of influencing all Greek thinking.¹⁷¹ Plato treated the concept of death with a positive attitude towards life that death can be a test of life affecting only the body (*σῶμα*), and simply because the material body is regarded as evil then, the philosopher considers death – dying as an act in which the soul (*ψυχή*) gets liberated from the body. With a great hope of the future though covered with uncertainty, the philosopher did not get afraid of the end of physical existence, namely, death.¹⁷²

Moreover, in the Hellenistic time, there were various sects regarding the view and articulation of death in relation to life; the Stoics regarded death as a natural phenomenon being an *ἄδιάφορον* (indifferent thing¹⁷³) connected to ethical dimension whereby an individual person must accept it as such. Human being in this view is regarded to be free in respect of death, not bounded by guilt and sin. He can master the terrors of death due to the fact that it does not assume the character of a judgment on him.¹⁷⁴ The Stoic influence can also be observed in Pauline writings like in Philippians 1:20-26, 1 Corinthians 7:20-23, 25-38 when he speaks about the *adiaphora* such as life and death, marriage, circumcision.¹⁷⁵

¹⁷⁰ K.-H. Pridik, “*καί*” in *EDNT*, vol. 2: 227-228, 228.

¹⁷¹ Bultmann, “*θάνατος*”, 8-9.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 10.

¹⁷³ J. Paul Sampley, ed., *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A handbook* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003), 384.

¹⁷⁴ Bultmann, 11; Sampley, Paul, 388-389.

¹⁷⁵ Sampley, 386-387.

For the Neo-Platonists, bodily life is regarded as death (θάνατος) for the soul (ψυχή), it is life that is sunk in wickedness. Further, “the body is for the soul a chain and a grave” whereby the soul attains to its true life as far as it gets off from the body.¹⁷⁶ However, the apostle’s articulation of death has a sense of Neo-Platonism but in a more negative connotation with connection to the flesh (σάρξ). In particular, death is understood as,

the outcome of life lived “in the flesh” under the sway of sinful passions (Rom. 7.5), the outcome of the flesh’s “mind-set” (8.6), the outcome of life lived “in accordance with the flesh” (*kata sarka* – 8.13). (...) as the end of a process of decay, the final destruction of the corruptible (1 Cor. 15.42, 50).¹⁷⁷

Nevertheless, the predominant speaking of death by the apostle¹⁷⁸ mostly, in Romans is that death is “a due punishment” for sins (Rom 1:32 cf. vv. 29-31); a “forfeiture of life” (Rom 7:10), and as “an official sentence” (2 Cor 1:9). With an intimate link between sin and death specifically in Rom 5:12-8:2 implies that “death is the last and worst effect of sin,” echoing to the close link between “Adam and death: death is the lot of Adamic humanity.”

To sum up of what Paul perceives; death is a personified power which “has penetrated to all humanity like an epidemic (Rom. 5:12), and has incited all to sin (1 Cor. 15:56).”¹⁷⁹ This perception is traced back from the Adam’s Fall in Gen 3 that yielded up the entrance of sin in the world and consequently death came to reign through sin among humankind as worthy enough to be punished by death (cf. Rom 1:31; 1 Cor. 15:22).¹⁸⁰ Consequently, life in the present age is inevitable of death as far as it cannot escape flesh and sin. Thus, the origin of death necessitates the inquiry for the origin of sin.¹⁸¹ Observably, concerning the implied kind of death by the apostle – either spiritual or physical, Leon Morris refers to what is stated in Gen 2:17 and discerns that it is better to consider both kinds of death in interpreting the Genesis and Romans texts; “it is physical death as the sign and symbol of spiritual death.”¹⁸²

¹⁷⁶ Bultmann, 12.

¹⁷⁷ Dunn, *The Theology*, 125; cf. Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 308-310 for Paul’s usage of the term σάρξ.

¹⁷⁸ Dunn, *The Theology*, 125-126. (All citations in the paragraph are from Dunn).

¹⁷⁹ W. Bieder, “θάνατος,” in *EDNT*, vol. 2: 129-133, 130.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁸¹ Dunn, *The Theology*, 126; Bultmann, 15.

¹⁸² Morris, *Romans*, 230.

12c: καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν

The phrase above brings back the question of whether the raised protasis from the beginning of the verse gets its apodosis within or outside verse 12. Let us make an inference to the discussion of Cranfield as we have seen above concerning a proper way of formulating the apodosis responding to the protasis, and the Greek distinct usage of καὶ οὕτως and οὕτως καὶ.¹⁸³ With such an inference, it is then appropriate to take together the conjunction καὶ and the adverb οὕτως to infer *and so* or *and thus*.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, the prepositional phrase εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους with accusative case masculine plural has the same implication - εἰς πάντας.¹⁸⁵ The phrase can be translated as *to all men*. So far, the subject of εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους with its corresponding verb is ὁ θάνατος διήλθεν such that the verb is in aorist active with indicative mood, third singular of διέρχομαι that means *to go through, to go about, to spread*.¹⁸⁶ It is a compound verb (διήλθεν) having a prefix δια that “expresses both ‘through’ and completion” based on ἔρχομαι that means “come, go.”¹⁸⁷ To this point, I translate the phrase as *and so death spread to all men*.

12d: ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον·

Noticeably, this phrase has been really debated in terms of how should be grammatically and syntactically analyzed and translated. Let us therefore turn to an analysis of the phrase by considering the common uses of each word contained therein. The word ἐφ’ is the preposition originally from ἐπί. It is the one among the prepositions in the NT found with three cases namely, accusative, genitive and dative appearing statistically, 891 times.¹⁸⁸ Here, the preposition is followed by dative case (ἐφ’ ᾧ) which implies either a locative use of dative by answering the question “where” with *on, in, over, close by, at*, or temporal use of dative with *during, in, at the time of*, or figurative use of dative implying “of sovereignty or oversight” with a translation *over*.¹⁸⁹ However, A. T. Robertson articulates that ἐπί with the genitive connotes “only a partial

¹⁸³ For discussion about ὡςπερ and its rules for construction of protasis and apodosis, see v.12a above.

¹⁸⁴ Cranfield, *Romans*, 272.

¹⁸⁵ Consider the discussion in v.12a above (εἰς τὸν κόσμον).

¹⁸⁶ BDAG, s.v.

¹⁸⁷ U. Busse, “διέρχομαι” in *EDNT*, vol. 1: 322-323, 322.

¹⁸⁸ W. Köhler, “ἐπί” in *EDNT*, vol. 2: 21-23, 22.

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid*.

superposition,” with the accusative signifies “motion with a view to superposition” while with the dative is presupposed to indicate a “superposition for the interest of one”¹⁹⁰ which is also known as *dative commodi* in regular koine Greek grammars.¹⁹¹ For Köhler, the preposition ἐπί in this phrase with relative pronoun ᾧ as dative, singular, neuter meaning *which, what, whom*, is used with a conjunction sense and thus, translated as *because*.¹⁹² Some other commentators like Cranfield¹⁹³, Morris¹⁹⁴ align with the idea above taking ἐπί ᾧ in a causal sense, although they reach such a conclusion after a long discussion as summarily presented below;

Cranfield presents six main lines of interpretation:¹⁹⁵ the first line is to consider ᾧ as masculine with ὁ θάνατος as its antecedent.¹⁹⁶ The second one is to take ᾧ as masculine with ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου as its antecedent, and ἐπί as equivalent to ἐν.¹⁹⁷ The third suggestion is as the second one except the preposition ἐπί taken in a sense of ‘because of.’ The fourth suggested line of interpretation is to take ἐφ’ ᾧ as a conjunction meaning ‘because.’ Nevertheless, Cranfield notifies that the corresponding verb ἥμαρτον is then to be understood as an inference “not to men’s sinning in their own persons but to their participation in Adam’s transgression.”¹⁹⁸ Considerably, Cranfield observes on the fourth line of interpretations as the one being widely supported by many scholars such as Chrysostom, Bengel, Lagrange, Prat, Huby as well as Bruce whose interpretation considers ἥμαρτον as referring to “a collective sin” such that “death has come to all men in their turn because they all sinned collectively in the primal

¹⁹⁰ A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Logos, 1919; 2006), 600.

¹⁹¹ Daniel B Wallace, *Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament* (Harper Collins, 1996), 142.

¹⁹² Köhler, 536.

¹⁹³ Cranfield, 274-278.

¹⁹⁴ Morris, 230-232.

¹⁹⁵ Cranfield, 274-275.

¹⁹⁶ Cranfield shows the weakness of regarding this line of interpretation that despite the fact that it is supported by some scholars including Saint Augustine placing it as a third alternative in his translation, yet, “it is difficult and forced.” For more discussion, see, Cranfield, 275.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 276: Cranfield notifies that, this line of interpretation is associated with Augustine in spite of being not originated from him. Augustine’s designation of two alternative explanations of *in quo* a Latin translation of ἐφ’ ᾧ were either ‘in peccato’ or ‘in Adam’, and simply because the sin which was implied is that of Adam then, according to Cranfield, there was no difference in meaning of the two explanations. After Augustine’s grammatical realization that the relative pronoun ᾧ in masculine could not match in gender with the word ἁμαρτία which is in feminine, then he concluded that ‘in quo’ could appropriately referring to Adam, the idea which affirmed after finding a support from his Hilary, Ambrosiaster (*discussed in Chapter Four*).

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 275.

transgression of Adam.”¹⁹⁹ There are three observations given in favor of this line of interpretation.²⁰⁰ Yet, the fifth line of interpretation is as that of fourth suggestion but the verb ἥμαρτον taken as an inference to “men’s sinning in their own persons independently of Adam, though after his example.”²⁰¹ Finally, Cranfield gives the sixth suggestion as that of fourth suggestion with a notice that the verb ἥμαρτον should be considered as a reference to “men’s sinning in their own persons but as a result of the corrupt nature inherited from Adam.”²⁰² With this line of thought being a clue for translation purported by Cyril of Alexandria, the men’s sinning is argued to be not only merely externally –as being an imitation to Adam’s transgression – but also internally related to it as being its natural consequence. Men do sin in Adam “in a real solidarity with him, as a result of the entail of his transgression.”²⁰³

Ultimately, Cranfield takes his stance – after being convinced by a number of Greek interpreters who have translated ἐφ’ ᾧ as equivalent to διότι²⁰⁴ meaning ‘because’ – that “it is much more natural to understand ἐφ’ ᾧ here as a conjunctive expression.”²⁰⁵ He takes further his argument after surveying the usual Pauline usage of the verb ἥμαρτον in other parts of his epistles like in Rom 3:23 and realized that its occurrence connotes “quite clearly to actual sin”²⁰⁶ as it should be in this v.12 as far as the context does not suggest any unusual sense of the verb as will be analyzed below. Noticeably, Cranfield’s stance implies that death is the one being universal in terms of individual’s sin, not sin as universal or hereditarily passed to the rest of humanity. His

¹⁹⁹ Ibid, 277.

²⁰⁰ Cranfield, 278-279: These observations are; first, consideration to the parallelism drawn by Paul between Adam and Christ – “as Christ is alone responsible for our salvation, so too Adam must alone be responsible for our sin”. The objection suggested by Cranfield is that, Paul stresses on the similarity and dissimilarity between Adam and Christ, and that “Paul must necessarily have held that the guilt which is ours through Adam must also be quite independent of our actual sinning”. Second observation under this line of interpretation is that, the adherents of it have seen a support of their argument favored by vv. 13 and 14 but Cranfield puts an objection with reference to Rom. 1:32 and 2:12a. And the third observation is taken to consider v.19 as the verse to furnish this sort of interpretation.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 275. It is in this line of interpretation which Pelagius is famously known to propagate it. Even so, Cranfield protests it with the reason that “it reduces the scope of the analogy between Christ and Adam ... and fails to do justice to the thought of vv. 18 and 19 and to that solidarity of men with Adam which is clearly expressed in 1 Cor 15.12.”

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ Ibid., 278.

²⁰⁴ BDF, “διότι” in *EDNT*, vol. 1:336 that the word has several meanings once used depending on the intent and location within a phrase or sentence; In clauses intended to substantiate a statement, διότι implies *because* as it is in Luke 2:7, 1 Cor. 15:9. Moreover, at the beginning of a clause where an inference is drawn, it stands for *therefore* as it can be read in Ac. 13:35; 20:26. Further, it can be used to make a confirmatory statement and thus meaning *for, because*.

²⁰⁵ Cranfield., 276-277.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 279.

stance is of Bultmann too who strictly emphasizes that “ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον of Rom 5:12 must bear this sense.”²⁰⁷

Moreover, Cranfield’s idea is of Morris too but Morris doubts if that could be the real meaning of the apostle simply because the verb ἥμαρτον (cf. the discussion below) being an aorist connotes to one action. Morris quotes Barclay that “(...) if we are to give the aorist tense its full value, (...) the more precise meaning will be that sin and death entered into the world because all men were guilty of one act of sin.”²⁰⁸ Morris could expect the present or imperfect tense if the intent of the apostle was to connote on the continuing sins of all people. His argument is grounded on the fivefold repetition “of one act of sin” (in vv. 15-19) and its result to the rest of humanity as it can be reverted to one act of righteousness done by one man Jesus Christ being significant to all with allusion to 2 Cor. 5:14.²⁰⁹ Contra to Bultmann,²¹⁰ Morris asserts that

Now salvation in Christ does not mean that we merit salvation by living good lives; rather, what Christ has done is significant. Just so, death in Adam does not mean that we are being punished for our own evil deeds; it is what Adam has done that is significant.²¹¹

However, Morris’ stance above was criticized already by Erasmus of Rotterdam who considered the next verse, that is v.13 (“sin was in the world before the law was given”), as the clause that gives the reason for the previous statement of v. 12, for which Erasmus discerned that Paul’s intent refers to sin of individuals. He reached such a conclusion after scrutinizing what had been said by Pelagius, Origen, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster and Augustine, and afterwards, came to realize that Augustine’s claim – original sin – resulted from his reading into (*eisegesis*) the text – v. 12, something which is strange. For Erasmus, what precedes and follows the text all refers to the sins of individuals, not hereditary sin from Adam to the rest of humanity through procreation.²¹²

²⁰⁷ Bultmann, 15 n. 69.

²⁰⁸ Morris, 231 n. 54.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 232.

²¹⁰ Bultmann, 15: “for each man death is the punishment of his own sin.”

²¹¹ Ibid., 232.

²¹² Desiderius Erasmus et al., *Annotations on Romans*. New Testament Scholarship (Toronto, Ont: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 1994), 148. Retrieved on 28/3/2020 from <https://search-ebSCOhost-com.ezproxy.vid.no/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=468323&site=ehost-live>.

Accordingly, Jewett gives also two possible understandings of $\tilde{\omega}$ in the context of the whole verse. The first possibility is to understand it as a masculine pronoun that can be traced back to either an implied law, to the death, or to one man, namely, Adam as the source of depravity to all humanity.²¹³ The second possibility is to take $\tilde{\omega}$ as neuter that results into suggesting the phrase $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ be understood in a conjunctive sense – *because* or *since*. With such a later possibility the rest of humanity is either associated with Adam’s sin involuntarily, inheriting Adam’s corrupt nature, with imputed sinfulness instigated by Adam or with the individual’s actual sins committed by following the example of Adam.²¹⁴ Jewett’s interpretation is influenced by the biblical scholar Ernst Käsemann who has interpreted Rom 5:12 on the background of 2 Bar. 54:15, 19 – as I have presented in section 2.3 above – acknowledging Adam’s sin which resulted in death for the rest of humanity, but every person is responsible for his sin. Käsemann reaches such a conclusion after he considers the $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ as reference to the realm in which humans were sinning, namely, the world.²¹⁵

However, Ben Witherington III presents the discussion of the phrase $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ with several possibilities on how it can be translated, and one of them is to consider the phrase as a conjunction, “because” or to consider $\tilde{\omega}$ as a masculine relative pronoun referring either to death or to “one man”.²¹⁶ By referring $\tilde{\omega}$ to death, as other scholars like Bultmann did, Jewett disregards it and argues that “this option creates unsupportable redundancy and seems quite problematic.”²¹⁷ Also, by taking the relative pronoun to “one man” leads to Saint Augustine’s stance of translating $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ as “in whom” (see a discussion in section 4.3 below). Such a supposition to one man is criticized by several commentators, such as Jewett and Cranfield, who have an idea that the translation “in whom” could be applicable if the preposition $\epsilon\nu$ meaning “in” rather than $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}$ meaning “upon” had been used by the apostle.²¹⁸ In addition, Cranfield argues that referring $\tilde{\omega}$ to one man “is too far away to be a natural antecedent,” and, thus, he strongly rejects the Augustine’s line of interpretation.²¹⁹ Moreover, another possibility is that of taking $\epsilon\phi' \tilde{\omega}$ in a consequential sense meaning “with the result that,” as it is

²¹³ Jewett, Romans, 375.

²¹⁴ Ibid.

²¹⁵ Jewett, 376.

²¹⁶ Witherington III, 146.

²¹⁷ Jewett, 375 n. 60.

²¹⁸ Ibid., n. 61; Cranfield, 276.

²¹⁹ Cranfield, 276.

strongly supported by Fitzmyer and criticized by N. T. Wright.²²⁰ However, the conclusion reached by Witherington III is that “the Pauline parallels support the translation ‘because.’”²²¹ Accordingly, I infer from the discussion above that the arguments²²² favoring an understanding of ἐφ’ ᾧ in a conjunction sense – meaning *because, since* – are substantial. See Chapter Four of this thesis for further analysis of how the phrase (and the verse at whole) has been articulated in the history of theology and the implied meanings.

Further, the phrase πάντες ἥμαρτον consists of an adjective and the verb. The word πάντες is an adjective in nominative case, masculine, plural of the word πᾶς meaning *all* or *everyone*.²²³ Nonetheless, the word ἥμαρτον is the verb in aorist active with indicative mood, third person plural of ἀμαρτάνω simply translated as *to miss the mark, err, transgress*.²²⁴ For the sake of having the intended meaning of this verb, some features of the Greek aorist verbs are to be observed. William D. Mounce points out that an aorist refers to “the indefinite tense that states only the fact of the action without specifying its duration.”²²⁵ It usually signifies the perfective action that occurs in the past with several implications; it can be “constative,” meaning that the action is expressed as a whole with imprecise expression of its nature, as in Matt 5:39; Rev 20:4. It can also be “ingressive” giving an emphasis on the beginning of an action whereby the translation is usually grounded with the word “became” as it is in Matt 22:7. Aorist can also be used as “gnomic” to describe a timeless truth usually translated with the present tense in English as it is in 1Pet 1:24. Further, it can be used as “proleptic” to stress with certainty, an action that is anticipated to happen in future as Rom 8:30 portrays.²²⁶ And thus, a general translation of the aorist verbs according to Mounce, should be of the simple undefined past tense in English.²²⁷

Having already in mind the possible undertones once aorist appears, there is then a need to analyze the verb ἥμαρτον which is in aorist within the context of the whole phrase ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Tracing the history of interpretation, a syntactical

²²⁰ Witherington III, 146.

²²¹ Ibid.

²²² Among many, see the discussion above by Cranfield, Jewett, Köhler, Morris.

²²³ Friberg et al., *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, 302.

²²⁴ Fiedler, “ἀμαρτία”, 66.

²²⁵ William D. Mounce, *Basics of Biblical Greek: Grammar*. 4th ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019), 239.

²²⁶ Ibid., 249.

²²⁷ Ibid., 239-240, 244.

force of πάντες ἥμαρτον; Jewett echoing with Stuhlmacher, considers an intent of the apostle in this phrase to be paradoxical in nature insofar as it can be either understood as an expression about how all humanity involuntarily fell victim to sin, under the epidemic of it through what is called the social poison traced from Adam’s sin as it is argued in 4 Ezra 3:21; 7:118, or each person imitates Adam’s disobedience, as far as everyone has a free will as it is in 2 Baruch 54:15-19.²²⁸

With such two suggestions of both Stuhlmacher and Jewett above, the possible grammatical meaning from analysis made by Mounce about the aorist can be either constative or gnomic implication of aorist, correspondingly. This implies that the apostle was perpetuating a paradox from his background by combining a fateful influence from Adam and personal responsibility for actual sins.²²⁹ Accordingly, the syntactical force of πάντες with the verb ἥμαρτον, as it is proposed by Cranfield, has an inference from the prevalence of death in the world such that death was influenced by sin into the world, but its universality was not legalized by actual sins as far as verses 13 and 14 are semantically and syntactically observed. With such argument, all humanity even dead infants are argued to be inclusively identified in Adam’s primal sin due to the universality of death.²³⁰ In this way of understanding, original or hereditary death for all – not original or hereditary sin (guilt) – is implied.²³¹ Thus, a suitable translation of ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον – as I have observed what the grammar and some commentaries assert – is *because all sinned*.

1.2 The realization of the comparison (vv. 18, 19, 21)

After a careful beginning of his comparison and supply of more information (vv.13-14) and defensive argument (vv.15-17) raised in verse 12 about universality of death because of sin – despite of the Jews having the Law and the Gentiles lacking the Law– the apostle brings into reality what he intended to compare contrastively, as it is seen in verses 18, 19 and 21 below. All translations are from NRSV.

²²⁸ Jewett, 376; Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 84. For the sake of quotations of the mentioned texts, see section 2.3 above.

²²⁹ Cranfield, 274; Jewett, 274-275.

²³⁰ Cranfield, 278-279.

²³¹ Cf. Dunn, *The Theology*, 97.

1.2.1 *Consequences of Adam's trespass versus Christ's righteous act (v. 18)*

Ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως καὶ δι' ἑνὸς δικαιοῦματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·

Translation: “Therefore just as one man’s trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man’s act of righteousness lead to justification and life for all.”

Here, the inferential ἄρα οὖν, which is also translated by Jewett, Cranfield and Morris as *so then, consequently*,²³² formulates the apodosis raised in verse 12 by showing the impacts brought by one man’s trespass to the rest of humanity. It is followed by contrasts with the most effective consequences brought by Christ to all humankind. Jewett adds that the inferential opening in this verse functions not as the summarizing part of the preceding verses, but it traces “the consequence in the following comparison between Adam and Christ.”²³³ Morris has the same view as Cranfield that the combination of ἄρα οὖν stresses a strong and formal statement or connection of comparison.²³⁴

Nevertheless, the leading words for the contrastive comparison in this verse are, on the one hand, κατάκριμα (condemnation) and, on the other hand, δικαίωμα (righteous act, decree), that both affect the whole humanity. The good observation is that the Adamic condemnation and damnation is overwhelmed by Christ’s righteous act with inclusion of all believers at the immediate and eschatological time. For that reason, there is no loophole for believers to judge one another in terms of nonperformance of law.²³⁵ Observably, as it is argued by Matera, righteousness for the apostle does not signify “merely a legal status before God; it is entry into the eternal life with God that Adam forfeited.”²³⁶

1.2.2 *Impacts of Adam's disobedience versus Christ's obedience (v.19)*

ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ καταστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί, οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.

²³² Jewett, 385; Cranfield, 269, 288; Morris, 238.

²³³ Jewett, 385.

²³⁴ Cranfield, 288-289; Morris, 238.

²³⁵ Jewett, 386.

²³⁶ Matera, *Romans*, 140.

Translation: “For just as by the one man’s disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man’s obedience the many will be made righteous.”

It is in this verse where Adam’s sin is named παρακοή meaning *disobedience*.²³⁷ Such a word implies that Adam’s sin was voluntary but the subsequent human beings were born into a race which had separated itself from God simply because Adam’s sin constituted them as sinners.²³⁸ It is connected with the verb κατεστάθησαν, a compound one on basis of καθίστημι with prefix κατα expresses, meaning *to set in order, appoint, cause to be*, here in the form of an aorist, passive with indicative mood, third person, plural.²³⁹ Thus, the causality sense is implied – Adam determines his posterity’s lot.

The phrase ἀμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν in aorist is overturned by δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται in future both in passive and has the implication that as through Adamic disobedience many were made sinners, so will many through Christ’s obedience be made righteous (cf. Phil. 2:6-11). It has to do with eschatological fulfillment as far as faith in Christ is observed.²⁴⁰

1.2.3 The reign of sin versus the reign of grace (v. 21)

ἵνα ὡσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ, οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν.

Translation: “so that, just as sin exercised dominion in death, so grace might also exercise dominion through justification leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

For this verse, the apostle Paul contrasts the two realms of sin and grace such that the authority of God’s grace has surpassed the reign of sin which according to Stuhlmacher “expresses itself in death (...) through the righteousness which is bestowed to those who believe through death and resurrection of Jesus and which leads to eternal life.”²⁴¹ Further, the phrase ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ indicates the

²³⁷ Morris, 240 n. 95: that means “hearing beside”, then hearing amiss, unwillingness to hear, disobedience. Also, in terms of its appearance in the New Testament, it occurs three times in which two times occur in Paul. In the Old Testament it can be found in the texts like Jeremiah 11:10.

²³⁸ Ibid. 240.

²³⁹ Johannes P. Louw and Eugene Albert Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*, electronic ed. of the 2nd edition (New York: United Bible societies, 1996), 127.

²⁴⁰ Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 88.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

never-ending reign of the divine grace over reign of sin which is of temporary duration.²⁴²

3.5 Summary of the exegesis and a tentative conclusion

This chapter has been in search to understand Rom 5:12 by letting it interpret itself through examining the three aspects therein, namely, a genuine translation of καὶ οὕτως, the nature of ἐφ' ᾧ, and the syntactical force of πάντες ἥμαρτον. The results are as following; καὶ οὕτως is argued to be distinctively observed from the Greek uses of it versus the οὕτως καί whereby the former does not grammatically introduce an apodosis. It is only the later (οὕτως καί) said to introduce the apodosis and it can be translated as *so then, consequently* while καὶ οὕτως should be translated as *and so, and thus*.²⁴³

Moreover, the nature of ἐφ' ᾧ is diversely debated but the consulted sources have shown several implications of such a combination like causal use and conjunctive sense.²⁴⁴ Regarding the grammatical concern of the phrase in this verse, it is worth suggested to apply the conjunctive sense with the meaning *because*. When such a translation is syntactically connected with πάντες ἥμαρτον meaning “because all sinned,” two observations can be implied: either, Adam’s sin became imputed to all humanity involuntarily and led them to incur death, or every person incurs death due to the fact that he or she voluntarily sinned or sins with exemplary way of that of Adam as long as the free will is alive. Such observations are reached after considering various types of aorist²⁴⁵ such that the verb ἥμαρτον is to be treated either in a “constative” sense or in “gnomic” sense. The concern is about the universality of death, not hereditary sin from Adam through procreation (see *next Chapter below*).

Regarding the function of the text, I have observed that the text in concern has double functions; on the one hand, it gives the ground for what is argued before (vv. 1-11) by the phrase διὰ τοῦτο. On the other hand, it introduces the contrastive comparison with ὥσπερ being a profound concern to the whole textual unit 5:12-21. Concerning the intention of the apostle in v. 12, I accord with Cranfield who observes that the apostle’s intent is “firmly centered on Christ, and Adam is only mentioned in order to bring out

²⁴² Cranfield, 294. Cf. W. Bieder, “θάνατος”, 130-131.

²⁴³ See the discussion above as it is mainly articulated by Cranfield, 272.

²⁴⁴ Consider the discussion portrayed above about ἐφ' ᾧ.

²⁴⁵ I have observed the Greek usage of aorist and its implication as it is presented by Mounce, *Grammar*, 239-240, 244, 249.

more clearly the nature of the work of Christ.”²⁴⁶ For Cranfield, the comparison in this verse was deliberately to put emphasis on “the universal range of what Christ has done” by Christ’s victory over effects of depravity caused by Adam to the rest of humanity.²⁴⁷ In the broader sense, then, despite the fact that Christ and Adam are dissimilar, the comparison made within the textual unit serves to show the likeness noticeably traced between them as far as the textual unit corresponds to the Christ-and-all-men relationship and the Adam-and-all-men relationship by which the later is surpassed by the former due to the phenomena of sin and death.²⁴⁸

Noticeably, the apostle views humanity and its earthly life in a pessimistic way and points his train of thought to soteriological expression through Jesus Christ.²⁴⁹ By so doing, he brings the negative aspects which are always dreadful and make the human life be meaningless by stressing on Adam as the ancestor of all humankind, whose influence on the rest of humanity is radically irresistible. Adam’s trespass becomes either a model or an involuntary choice. However, sin is presented as the cosmic power through which even death came to reign over human fate destructively. Further, the apostle treats these two phenomena – death and sin – in the way that the former becomes the consequence of the later. The strict comparison he is making between Adam and Christ being the original men who determine humanity, surpasses the Jewish conception of Adam, sin, death and life. For him, they are cosmic powers.²⁵⁰

²⁴⁶ Cranfield, 281.

²⁴⁷ Ibid.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 295.

²⁴⁹ Matera, 141-142.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 15.

Chapter 4: History of exegesis of Romans 5:12 with its implications

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the history of how Rom 5:12 has been interpreted, and theologically and doctrinally applied throughout the centuries. Richard N. Longenecker categorizes the main alternatives in the following way:

(1) a “realist” or “seminal union” theory (i.e., the collective whole of humanity actually sinned “in Adam”), (2) a “representative” or “federal headship” theory (i.e., the whole of humanity was represented “by Adam in his sin”), (3) an “influence” or “example” theory (i.e., humanity has been influenced for the worse “by Adam’s sin”), or (4) an “inherited depravity and mediated guilt” theory (i.e., all people have inherited the depraved condition brought about by Adam’s sin and have become personally guilty by their own expression of that inherited state of depravity).²⁵¹

In terms of theological reflection too, my curiosity concerns the main questions surrounding the text. Firstly, how is all humanity related to Adam? Do we have to do with a relation primarily on a representational basis or just in a “real” or “seminal” connection? Secondly, should the rest of humanity be considered guilty of Adam's sin, its own sin, or both, and what might be the consequences for each deduction? It is now time to trace the history of interpretation as a search for responses to my curiosity.

4.2 Romans 5:12 in the pre-Augustinian era

Concepts of fallen humanity in the Western Christianity before Saint Augustine are said to be grounded on what was perpetuated by the two church fathers, namely, Ambrose and the so-called Ambrosiaster designated by Erasmus.²⁵² Nevertheless, Origen²⁵³ is

²⁵¹ Longenecker, *Romans*, 423.

²⁵² Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, 353; Joshua Papsdorf, “Ambrosiaster in Paul in the Middle Ages.” In *A companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages* (Brill, 2013): 51-77, 53. Papsdorf asserts, Ambrosiaster is just mentioned exclusively as an exegete, and predominantly as a reader and interpreter of Paul. Also, Kelly claims that Ambrosiaster was the Roman exegete whose teachings anticipated Augustine’s at large.

²⁵³ For the biography of Origen, see, Bengt Hägglund, *History of Theology* (St. Louis, Mo: Concordia Publishing House, 1968), 63-68. For him, “the visible world was created as a consequence of the fall, in order to punish and purify man ... God created the visible world, but only for the purpose that man might receive instruction within it” (p. 66).

the one said to influence Ambrosiaster in his writings and later to Pelagius.²⁵⁴ Origen interprets the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον in Rom 5:12 as *in this, that all sinned*.²⁵⁵ Such an interpretation implies that the rest of humanity after Adam sinned in imitation of him, “a teaching of personal sin of imitation.”²⁵⁶ Further, Origen’s commentary on Romans has other material containing an alternate explanation of Rom 5:12. Such an alternative explanation stresses “inherited consequences of humanity’s physical solidarity with Adam.”²⁵⁷ In explaining it, Origen cites the text of Heb 7:9-10 as an aid of giving more explanation of the phrase ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον as “in whom all sinned.” To be more clear, he analogically draws from the case of Levi that all of humanity in a similar way was “in Adam’s loins and could have been collectively expelled from Paradise with Adam.”²⁵⁸ However, both alternatives of Origen have influenced the succeeding interpreters of the text such that the former was adapted by Pelagius while the later was perpetuated by Ambrosiaster and Augustine, as it will be presented below. Moreover, Thomas P. Scheck observes that Origen does not say “all human beings ‘sinned’ in Adam but that they ‘fell’ with or in Adam” due to the pre-natal inclusiveness of all humanity in him even during his Fall from the heavenly place.²⁵⁹

Ambrose understood the root cause for the first humans – Adam and Eve – for losing their supernatural blessedness to be “pride,”²⁶⁰ while for Ambrosiaster it was “idolatry.”²⁶¹ Having in mind the solidarity of the human race with Adam, Ambrose concludes that “Adam existed, and in him we all existed; Adam perished, and in him all perished (...) In Adam I fell, and in Adam I was cast out of Paradise, in Adam I died.”²⁶² Further, Ambrose’s general doctrine was that “while the corrupting force of sin is transmitted, the guilt attaches to Adam himself, not to us.”²⁶³ He adds that

²⁵⁴ For the biography of Pelagius, see, Hägglund, *History of Theology*, 132-133; P. Scheck, “Pelagius’s Interpretation of Romans,” In *A companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages* (Brill, 2013): 79-113, 81-82.

²⁵⁵ Scheck, *Romans*, 106.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 107.

²⁶⁰ Kelly, 353. Ambrose notifies that for pride Adam “wanted to claim for himself something which had not been assigned to him, equality with his Creator”.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.* Here, Ambrosiaster states that Adam’s intention in listening to the Devil was that the eating of the forbidden tree could change him to “become God.” However, the result was opposite; he became pressed under the power of the Devil, and his soul sinned. Thus, the consequence of his action corrupted his flesh and under Devil’s power, his flesh became a “flesh of sin.”

²⁶² Kelly, 354.

²⁶³ *Ibid.*

although an individual person is still born with a sinful tendency, there is a contrast between personal sins and hereditary sin. For this reason, the inherited corruption is a propensity to sin, not a positive guilt.²⁶⁴ Tellingly, he affirms, “this hereditary sin (...) is a wound which makes us stumble, but need cause us no anxiety at the day of judgment; we shall only be punished then for our personal sins.”²⁶⁵

Yet, Ambrosiaster being exposed to the existing Old Latin version of the Bible with improper rendering of Rom 5:12,²⁶⁶ followed up the existing interpretation by translating ἐφ’ ᾧ as *in whom* (in quo) and translating the phrase ἐφ’ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον as “in whom all sinned,” that means in Adam.²⁶⁷ However, he is said to interpret Paul’s text with the notion of differentiating the sin of Adam from personal sins, as he asserts that “(...) all have sinned in Adam as though in a lump; for he himself was corrupted by sin, and those whom he begot were all born under sin; we are all sinners... we are all [descended] from him.”²⁶⁸ Ambrosiaster adds that “there is also another death, which is called the second death – in hell; we do not suffer this through sin of Adam, but from the opportunity [he created] we procure it through our own sins.”²⁶⁹ Informatively, the general view held by Western Christianity prior to the time of Augustine was that individuals are not punished for Adam’s sin; rather, they are punished for their own sins,²⁷⁰ as it is asserted by Ambrosiaster, in the same view with Ambrose: “You perceive that men are not made guilty by the fact of their birth, but by their evil behavior.”²⁷¹ Concerning the meaning of baptism as a means of remission of sin and guilt, Ambrosiaster argues, “baptism is therefore necessary, not as abolishing inherited guilt, but as delivering us from death and opening the gates of the kingdom of heaven.”²⁷²

²⁶⁴ Ibid., 355.

²⁶⁵ Ibid.

²⁶⁶ Ibid., 354; Toews, *The Story of Original Sin*, 69f. Here, in correspondence to what is claimed by Kelly and Toews, I recall Chapter Three regarding the understanding of ἐφ’ ᾧ, specifically the second main line of interpretation as proposed by Cranfield.

²⁶⁷ Kelly, 354.

²⁶⁸ Quoted from Erasmus et al., *Annotations on Romans*, 145.

²⁶⁹ Ibid.

²⁷⁰ Kelly, 355.

²⁷¹ Ibid., 356.

²⁷² Ibid.

4.3 Romans 5:12 by Saint Augustine, Pelagius and Chrysostom

The Christian view on human condition and Fall underwent a transition at the time of Augustine (4th – 5th centuries), especially during his attack on Pelagius' concept of the free will and its effectiveness to do good even without divine intervention.²⁷³ For Augustine, the concept of humanity was expressed as “a lump of sin,” incapable of taking any initiative to save itself; rather, it is wholly dependent on God's grace.²⁷⁴ This Augustinian understanding was strongly opposed to Pelagius' understanding. For Pelagius, “each person comes into the world as a neutral creature possessing only what God created.”²⁷⁵ He furthers his argument that “Adam's trespass affected only Adam, and did not seminally influence the human race. Adam introduced physical and spiritual death and set in motion a habit of disobedience.”²⁷⁶ But disobedience comes not through physical descent, rather, by custom²⁷⁷ and example.²⁷⁸ In his words, Pelagius thunders that

nothing good, and nothing evil, on account of which we are deemed either laudable or blameworthy, is born with us, but is done by us: for we are born not fully developed, but with a capacity for either conduct; we are formed naturally without either virtue or vice; and previous to the action of our own proper will, the only thing in man is what God has formed in him.²⁷⁹

Hence, according to Pelagius, sin then “is not a fault of nature but of the will.”²⁸⁰ That means, “sin consists only of what man does, and because of this it cannot be transmitted by heredity, it cannot be implicit in nature.”²⁸¹ Augustine appeals to the Scripture, particularly to Rom 5:12, in refuting Pelagius' claim by asserting that “the entire human race sinned in Adam, and that this original sin alone suffices to damn even

²⁷³ Hägglund, 134.; cf. T. L. Carter, *Paul and the Power of Sin: Redefining 'beyond the Pale'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 5.

²⁷⁴ Toews, 76.

²⁷⁵ Nassif, “Toward a ‘Catholic’ Understanding of St. Augustine's View of Original Sin,” 289.

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

²⁷⁷ Hägglund, 134.

²⁷⁸ Cf. Cranfield's fifth suggested line of interpretation in section 3.4 (ἐφ' ᾧ) above, that considers personal responsibility for re-enacting Adam's sin because of the free will.

²⁷⁹ I have found this quotation about Pelagius' assertion in Nassif, 289.

²⁸⁰ Hägglund, 133. Pelagius added that “Small children, who are unable consciously to choose that which is evil, are therefore free of sin (...) baptism need not imply deliverance from sin” (134).

²⁸¹ Ibid., 133. See also Toews, *The story of Original Sin: Counteracting the concept of sin raised by Augustine*, Pelagius in his exposition of Romans 5:12 denied the hereditary transmission of sin by claiming that Paul's intent was to imply social inheritance such that “humans sin by voluntary imitation of Adam's sin, never by a fault inherent in human nature” (76-77).

unbaptized infants.”²⁸² Concerning a human free will Augustine responds that such a free will has lost the power or freedom of not to sin (*posse non peccare*) but it is of the freedom to sin (*posse peccare*). In his words,

we do not say that by sin of Adam free will perished from the nature of men, but that it is capable of sinning (...) but that it is not capable of living well and piously, unless the will of man has itself been liberated by the grace of God.²⁸³

Further, in his appeal to the scriptures, Augustine became influenced by Ambrosiaster’s commentary on Rom 5:12 in spite of Ambrosiaster’s concept about original sin being not the same as, or even similar to, that of Augustine’s definitive stance.²⁸⁴ Tellingly, Augustine finds in Ambrosiaster’s commentary, the philosophical concept of the so-called traducianism in which he understands an individual’s soul to be derived from the parents’ souls, and thus even parents’ sins are transmitted to their offspring.²⁸⁵ Further, Augustine finds not only the traducianist concept but also the idea of sinning *in massa* whereby “the sin of Adam and his guilt are transmitted, or propagated, through the act of procreation.”²⁸⁶ Such a conclusion reached by Augustine after examining Rom 5:12 does not imply that he was unaware of “Paul’s original aim in writing the letter;”²⁸⁷ rather, his interpretation of the text – alluding to Rom 7:14-25; 2:11-16 – “was determined more by the need to counter Pelagius than by his own understanding of the letter’s historical context.”²⁸⁸ However, Augustine is said to be divided in his mind between the traducianist and various forms of the creationist theory of the soul’s origin. For the traducianist position, the taint is transmittable directly from a parent to a child “in the sexual intercourse even of baptized persons”²⁸⁹ while according to creationist theory: “the freshly created soul becomes soiled as it enters the body.”²⁹⁰

²⁸² Hägglund, 134.

²⁸³ Nassif, 293.

²⁸⁴ Steven R. Cartwright, *A Companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*, vol. 39 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 63-64.

²⁸⁵ Kelly, 345, 363.

²⁸⁶ Panayiotis Papageorgiou, “Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and its Consequences,” in *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 39 (1995): 361-78, 362.

²⁸⁷ Carter, *Paul and the Power of Sin*, 5.

²⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

²⁸⁹ Kelly, 363.

²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

One of the critics of Augustine's idea at his time was Julian of Eclanum who went against Augustine's traducianism. Julian's criticism was grounded in the tradition of creationism that "God created from nothing a new soul for every individual human being at the moment of the conception, or in the womb of the mother, or at the moment of being born."²⁹¹ However, in his writing, Julian affirms that "this soul is in no way indebted to the flesh or to the human seed as such and has nothing to do with them."²⁹² He furthers his argument by stating that "sexual reproduction is only limited to the body ... and at the level of the soul only God is actively creative."²⁹³ Turning to the claim of the original sin, Julian after placing sin on the level of the soul, gives his stance that

sin is always the result of the moral action of a rational being. Committing sin is due to one's own responsibility; it is the consequence of a bad use of reason and will. This bad use, however, must be situated on the level of morality and not on that of the created reality.²⁹⁴

Augustine defended his doctrine of original sin against Julian's claims, by twofold basic principles namely, Holy Scripture and experience. With experience, he defends by referring to the daily sufferings of a person from childhood, and infant baptism as the fact that the human soul – named as image of God – "is weighed down by the mortal body" due to the "breaking of the harmonious subordination of the body to the soul by Adam's Fall." Only "God's merciful help can rediscover, reform, and renovate" the lost image of God to a person.²⁹⁵ For the Scriptural basis alongside Rom 5:12, Augustine reflected on Ps 143:4 whereby human life ends into vanity, the idea which confronts the creationists on how to rightly assert it. Ultimately, for Augustine, concrete experience of reality with much human sufferings "shows clearly that the theory of creationism offers no answer to the problem of mental deficiencies" and at

²⁹¹ Mathijs Lamberigts, "Julian and Augustine on the Origin of the Soul" in *Augustiniana* 46, no. 3/4 (1996): 243-260, 246 n. 27. Retrieved on 28/3/2020 from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Julian+and+Augustine+on+the+origin+of+the+soul&btnG=. Cf. Kelly, 345.

²⁹² Lamberigts, 244.

²⁹³ Ibid., 245.

²⁹⁴ Ibid., 247: on this ground, Julian considered it to be an inconceivable idea about a person to be born with an original sin as far as the nature does not possess an original sin, and God is the good Creator who creates good things (beings) in their own. Otherwise, in Augustinian claim, God is responsible for human being to be born with an original sin.

²⁹⁵ Lamberigts, 254 n. 64.

the same time, the Augustinian idea of a transmitted original sin on the basis of creationism can hardly be defended.²⁹⁶

Turning to the Eastern church, the most influential among its representatives was Saint John Chrysostom who denies the attribution of sin to Adam's descendants in his interpretation and exposition of Rom 5:12, 19 and 1 Cor 15:21, 22. For him, "mortality produces a greater urge to sin, thus giving a born bias towards evil to all."²⁹⁷ He argumentatively drafts his notion in terms of question and answer form as he asserts, "(...) what means 'for that all have sinned?'" This: he having once fallen, even they that had not eaten of the tree did from him, all of them become mortal."²⁹⁸ Moreover, Chrysostom's denial of the imputation of Adam's sin to the rest of humanity is grounded from his understanding of Rom 5:19:

"through the wrong-doing of one man many became sinners." That, when Adam sinned and became mortal, those who were descended from him should become mortal also has nothing improbable about it. But how should it follow that from his disobedience anyone else should become a sinner? For unless a man becomes a sinner on his own responsibility he will not be found to deserve punishment. Then what does "sinners" mean here? I think it means those liable to punishment, that is condemned to death.²⁹⁹

By implication, the difference between Augustine's theology of sin and that of Chrysostom is raised up when considering the meaning of infant baptism. Although they both agree that human intellect and will have been corrupted, Chrysostom differs from Augustine by taking such corruption "not to the degree of *non posse non peccare*."³⁰⁰ That means, the corruption has not distorted the "ability not to sin." Further, they both agree on the inheritance of moral corruption to all humanity but for Chrysostom imputed guilt is not included. Moreover, they both agree that mortality and

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 260. It is at this point too by which the crucial question of Pelagius against the theory of traducianism insisted in Augustine's argument, gets its sting: "Even if true, however, would not the theory entail that the offspring of baptized parents are not only free from Adam's taint but inherit their sanctification?" Cf. Kelly, 358.; Toews, 77.

²⁹⁷ Nassif, 295.

²⁹⁸ Ibid.

²⁹⁹ Ibid.

³⁰⁰ Nassif, 297 who has presented that "Augustine taught a four-fold chronological distinction concerning sin: *posse non peccare* ('possible not to sin,' given to Adam prior to the Fall); *non posse non peccare* ('not possible not to sin,' as a result of the Fall on Adam and his posterity); *posse non peccare* ('possible not to sin,' given to the Christian after conversion); and *non posse peccare* ('not possible to sin,' future life in heaven)."

spiritual corruption are humanity's inheritance from Adam, but for Chrysostom personal guilt is not. Therefore, in Chrysostom's view redefined with Rom 5:12, infant baptism is not for remission of guilt of any sins: "Therefore, do we baptize infants although they are not guilty of any sins."³⁰¹ Chrysostom and his fellow Greek Fathers in the Eastern church including Origen, Athanasius,³⁰² Cappadocian fathers, and Latin church fathers like Ambrose and Ambrosiaster, as stated above, are said to hold – contrary to that of Augustine – the theology of sin which affirms that "man's free will remains intact and is the root of actual sinning."³⁰³ It is an optimistic view of humanity with an assertion that "newly born children are exempt from sin"³⁰⁴ and people are responsible for their own acts.³⁰⁵

In sum, Augustinian theology of hereditary sin has two major aspects. First, "the essence of original sin consists in our participation in, and co-responsibility for, Adam's perverse choice. We were with him when he made it, and thus willed in and with him."³⁰⁶ Second, the consequence of Adam's rebellion has resulted in a scarred and vitiated human nature though not a total depravity; "the spark, as it were, of reason in virtue of which he was made in God's likeness has not been completely extinguished."³⁰⁷ However, the theology of sin of the fifth century AD – particularly of Augustine – is argued to be of decisive influence over the doctrine of original sin in the Western (Latin) church through the Reformation era to date.³⁰⁸

4.4 Romans 5:12 in the Reformation era

As I have mentioned above, Saint Augustine was not unaware of the context and major concern of Paul's letter to the Romans, nevertheless, his own theological interpretation of Rom 5:12 has affected at large the next epochs towards an understanding of human condition and original sin particularly during the Reformation period. In this period,

³⁰¹ Ibid., 296.

³⁰² Kelly, 346-348. For Athanasius, "the wretchedness of mankind is directly traceable to our first parents' lapse" (p. 347). However, Athanasius' claim is said to be of unity, or solidarity, of the race with the first man but being not of total depravity, as he argues that "if man has lost the immortality of his body, he retains that of the soul, and his will remains free" (ibid.). In Athanasius' argument, people are free from Adam's actual guilt: moral culpability, and they can live the entire life without sin.

³⁰³ Ibid., 349.

³⁰⁴ Ibid.

³⁰⁵ Ibid., 352.

³⁰⁶ Ibid., 364.

³⁰⁷ Ibid.

³⁰⁸ See Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 86.

Martin Luther has boldly gone further than Augustine and asserts in words echoing with the first chapter of Jeremiah that

the chief purpose of this letter is to break down, to pluck up, and to destroy all wisdom and righteousness of the flesh. This includes all works which in the eyes of people or even in our own eyes may be great works. No matter whether these works are done with a sincere heart and mind, this letter is to affirm and state and magnify sin, no matter how much someone insists it does not exist, or that it was believed not to exist.³⁰⁹

However, Luther's perception about human condition and sin is founded on Augustine's in the sense that sin for Augustine, is "not simply a series of isolated willful acts; it is a real corruption of nature, resulting from the fact that the direction of the will has itself been distorted."³¹⁰ In that sense, "the condition of guilt is inherited, and is removed from the individual through Baptism."³¹¹ With that foundation, Luther asserts that "sin not only refers to outward acts; unbelief and enmity to God form its essence."³¹² For Luther, unbelief "is the basic sin, a turning away from God. The first sin, which included all others in itself, was a doubting of God's Word and a deviation from the divine command (cf. Gen. 3:1ff)."³¹³ Further, in a more radical way than that of Augustine, Luther spoke of original sin as "a hidden evil (*malum absconditum*), an inscrutable mystery, which in secret manner determines the shape of human existence."³¹⁴ He goes further arguing that "original sin is not simply an inclination toward evil, attached to the lower spiritual powers (*concupiscentia, fomes*); it is the corruption of man in his entirety."³¹⁵ In this sense, even the regenerated are pressed under corrupting influence of original sin after their baptism, for baptism removes only the guilt of the original sin. Also, concupiscence is said to be "not merely a force which drives a man to sin; it is in itself sin."³¹⁶ However, original sin as hidden evil and an

³⁰⁹ Jeffrey P. Greenman and Timothy Larsen, eds., *Reading Romans Through the Centuries: From the Early Church to Karl Barth* (Michigan: Brazos Press, 2005), 113-114.

³¹⁰ Hägglund, 136.

³¹¹ Ibid.

³¹² Ibid.

³¹³ Ibid., 229-230.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 230. Here, Luther's understanding is very radically formulated such that original sin for him is a "real corruption of human nature, involving both body and soul, or the entire man." And that "all that is born of father and mother is sin." In addition, Luther considered even baptism to be not sufficient to remove the original sin simply because he believed it to be not simply a condition of guilt but a *corruptio naturae* that can be ceased only when the body is destroyed in the grave.

³¹⁵ Ibid., 231.

³¹⁶ Ibid.

inscrutable mystery, can be only grasped through the “light of the Word” and “this reality can be kept in mind only in the knowledge of faith, in confession and prayer.”³¹⁷

After reading the Letter to the Romans, Luther rejects the doctrine that prevailed in Nominalist soteriology of the late Middle Ages which considered original sin as a privation: “it is deprivation—that original standing Adam had enjoyed with God before the fall no longer obtains. The human will has been weakened, impaired.”³¹⁸ Further, “this is a serious breach that must be restored initially through the sacrament of baptism... supplemented/enhanced through the penitential-Eucharistic channels of sacramental grace.”³¹⁹ Contrary, Luther understood humans who are affected by sin as *incurvatus in se* that means “curved in on themselves.”³²⁰ The reason for his claim is of the same sense as what can be read in Jer 17:9 and Ps 19:12 that “due to original sin, our nature is so curved in upon itself at its deepest levels that it not only bends the best gifts of God toward itself in order to enjoy them ... rather ‘uses’ God in order to obtain them.”³²¹

Another famous Reformation commentator was John Calvin who had the same articulation as that of Luther that death is the outcome of Adam’s “transgression,” “trespass,” or “disobedience” and thus treated it as an inherited depravity, acting as the basis for the individual’s sins and personal guilt.³²² Longenecker presents Calvin’s comment to the phrase “sin entered into the world” (Rom 5:12) with an assertion that there is a need

“to note the order which he [Paul] follows here,” for “he says that sin had preceded and that death followed sin” — and so Calvin argued that as descendants of Adam we do not die “merely because he [Adam] had as it were sinned for us,” but because we express “the *natural depravity*” inherited from Adam, which has “*corrupted, vitiated, depraved, and ruined our nature.*”³²³

³¹⁷ Ibid., 230.

³¹⁸ Greenman and Larsen, *Romans*, 114.

³¹⁹ Ibid.

³²⁰ Ibid.

³²¹ Ibid. This claim of Luther is said to be grounded from what he understood in Rom. 1:20 whereby people instead of letting “God be God”, they project onto Him their own desires and wishes.

³²² Longenecker, 428.

³²³ Longenecker, 428.

After he recognized such an observation, Calvin furthered his argument reflecting on Adam's sin and its result with an assertion that

having lost the image of God, the only seed which he [Adam] could have produced was that which bore resemblance to himself. We have, therefore, all sinned, because we are all imbued with *natural corruption*, and for this reason are wicked and perverse (...) the allusion here is to *our innate and hereditary depravity*.³²⁴

4.5 Romans 5:12 in the Post-Reformation time to the current time

The Reformation period was followed by the time of Lutheran orthodoxy that began around 1600 and was an epoch during which the Lutheran tradition became enlarged. In this period, it was maintained – as Luther had asserted – that Adam's Fall brought about the loss of original righteousness and consequently led to total corruption of man.³²⁵ Nevertheless, the scholars of the time (Chemnitz, Wigand, Hunnius) held the idea that “because of the unity of the race, this corruption has been transmitted from generation to generation via physical birth.”³²⁶ This assertion implies that they kept on the traducianist theory of body and soul as it had been developed by Augustine. Further, death is directly related to sin whereas man constantly “stands under the wrath of God unless he becomes regenerated, he is subject to temporal and eternal punishment.”³²⁷

Theologically, the eve of Enlightenment time (17th century), brought about a critical discussion of the Augustinian concept of original sin whereas, with emphasis on power of reason for most aspects of life, the enlightenment scholars rejected it with their belief that the natural light which man had since creation, did not disappear even after the fall. Therefore, the rational capability would lead a person into doing good and forsaking the bad practices. In summary,

One of the most important prerequisites of the age of the Enlightenment, and therefore for modern thought as well, was the new *concept of learning* (...) Learning was freed from its dependence on theology and scholastic metaphysics and was based on the observations of experience and on rational principles (...) rational knowledge was thought of as being autonomous, immediately

³²⁴ Ibid.

³²⁵ Hägglund, 314.

³²⁶ Ibid.

³²⁷ Ibid.

accessible and fully evident to all, without having been obscured by original sin.³²⁸

In the 19th century, Friedrich Schleiermacher rejected the concept of original sin simply because he believed that sin was not in the field of will but belonged to that of the pious feelings. Thus, it was in man originally but stays as undeveloped nature which becomes developed in the process of man's attainment of a superior consciousness of God, that is a complete sense of dependence to God.³²⁹

Yet, there are various contemporary theologians and traditions (denominations) that have articulated the notion of sin in diverse ways; on the one hand, proponents of the Augustinian train of thought and, on the other hand, those who are favor a contra-Augustinian way of thinking. The so-called "Anabaptism-Mennonite" tradition views the notion of "original sin" stated by Augustine as non-supported by the Scripture simply because a person is said to die once he or she commits sins (Ezek 18:4, 20). Thus, a child shall not incur suffering of any iniquity of a parent and vice versa is true. This implies the rejection of the practice of infant baptism.³³⁰ However, this tradition believes that Adam's and Eve's sin

was real and introduced into the world a powerful tendency or inclination to sin which resulted in universal sinfulness, but it was a sinfulness by choice rather than by nature. The consequence of the sin in Eden was moral, not ontological, that is inherent in human nature. (...). After Genesis 3 each individual has his or her individual "fall," just as did Adam and Eve. (...) human beings retained the image of God and have free will to choose to sin or to obey God.³³¹

Concerning the contemporary theologians, Toews presents on the one hand Donald Bloesch and Wayne Grudem who have taken the stance of Augustine with an affirmation that he interpreted Rom 5:12 correctly and that humans do inherit sin and guilt directly from Adam.³³² On the other hand, among those theologians who articulate the question with no reference to Augustine's notion of original sin, he refers to Cornelius Plantinga, who claims that God desires shalom – "the way things ought to be", and thus, sin "is shalom-breaking; it is whatever disturbs the shalom that God has

³²⁸ Ibid., 336.

³²⁹ Ibid., 356.

³³⁰ Toews, 100-101.

³³¹ Ibid., 100.

³³² Ibid., 102-103.

designed.”³³³ Further, James McClendon has the same stance as the Anabaptist-Mennonite tradition that there is no scriptural evidence for the notion of original sin; “It rests upon historic but mistaken readings.”³³⁴ Another alternative is given by Stanley Grenz who tries to understand sin in communal terms; sin interrupts the community with God – who is a social Trinity. The first sin brought the primordial experience of community into ruin which ultimately resulted into marring the divine image. Nevertheless, he rejects the notion of hereditary guilt.³³⁵

Further, another theologian is Thomas Finger who does not consider the Augustinian train of thought; rather, he defines sin as “a massive corporate power, or interweaving of interrelated powers which opposes God on all social, religious, and personal levels, seeking to bring all creation under the dominion of death.”³³⁶ However, every individual person is responsible for his or her sin as a result of having cooperation with those powers. So far, in his words, “Sin is transmitted from generation to generation not through biological means as in Augustine but by the powers through the social, institutional, and transpersonal dynamics.”³³⁷ Furthermore, to other recent biblical scholars who have worked on Rom 5:12 – such as Rudolf Bultmann, Ernst Käsemann, Peter Stuhlmacher, C.E.B. Cranfield, Robert Jewett, etc. – references have been made already in section 3.4 above.

4.6 Tentative conclusion

With regard to the social situation of the church in Rome,³³⁸ and on what has been brought up by the exegetical analysis in Chapter Three, I concur then, with Toews that

Paul “apocalyptizes” *Sin* in Romans not to develop a universal theology of sin, but to argue 1) that *all* people, Jews and Gentiles equally, are under the power

³³³ Ibid., 105 (all the citations are taken from Toews).

³³⁴ Ibid., 106: McClendon gives alternative understanding of sin: as opposition to the new creation that Jesus brings into the world (2 Cor 5:17); as rupture of relationships among humans, and for fellowship with God; as reversion of “the good proper to organic life and growth” in the “ecological story of life in our biosphere.”

³³⁵ Ibid.

³³⁶ This quotation is found in Toews, 106-107.

³³⁷ Toews, 107.

³³⁸ Here, I align with B. Holmberg, *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal* (Minneapolis, Fortress, 1990) concerning the question of the Jewish-Gentile relations that created a ground – social context in which the apostle designated his theology of the power of sin. Holmberg asserts, “The social situation has to be included if we are to understand the reality the texts speak of, and not simply as a kind of ‘background’ that might be useful to know about, but as a dimension of the meaning itself of this text and reality” (p.156).

of *Sin*, 2) that Messiah Jesus “makes right” and liberates Jews and Gentiles equally from the power of *Sin*, 3) that salvation, peace, and righteousness through Messiah Jesus answers the problem of *Sin* that is fracturing the relationships of Jewish and Gentile believers ... an apocalyptic understanding of Messiah Jesus requires an apocalyptic understanding of Adam’s sin. An apocalyptic Adam is a necessary foil to an apocalyptic Messiah Jesus in Romans 5.³³⁹

Further, I have observed that the apostle in Rom 5:12, within the whole context of the textual unit, “developed the symbolism of law-free Gentile believers within the small, bounded social groups that made up the early church.”³⁴⁰ He portrays “sin as a power actively” threatening to subvert existing boundaries which bounded “the social body of the church and the physical bodies of the believers.”³⁴¹

With such observations, the apostle’s theological language about sin particularly, in Rom 5:12 has been highly debated since the early church by church fathers such as Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster. The debate was subsequently perpetuated by Augustine who was misled by an existed interpretation of the text in the Latin church— cf. Ambrose’s and Ambrosiaster’s interpretation – that has ultimately influenced Western theology of sin by embracing such erroneous interpretation against Pelagius’ stance. The Reformers too especially Luther took Augustine’s stance with further intensity. Such Augustine’s and Luther’s stance concerning Rom 5:12 has been regarded as theological and doctrinal basis for the concept of original sin. It is noticeable that the apostle’s theological intent of bringing “all humanity under the power of sin (...) was primarily concerned to establish that the Torah-observant Jew had no advantage over the law-free Gentile.”³⁴² Moreover, the apostle articulates a concept of creation (particularly, humanity) from the Christological point of view by considering Jesus Christ as “the start of a new humanity; his death was

³³⁹ Toews, 43.

³⁴⁰ Carter, *Paul and the Power of Sin*, xi.

³⁴¹ Ibid.

³⁴² Ibid., 4. Cf. Longenecker, 437, who argues that when Paul used this material in his outreach to pagan Gentiles in the Greco-Roman world, he was “breaking new ground” — not, of course, by inventing a new story for either the first man Adam or the far more important man Jesus, but by bringing the OT story of Adam and the apostolic story about Jesus together in a comparative and universalistic fashion.

a vicarious offering on behalf of all humans.”³⁴³ The resurrection of Jesus is considered to be really a new creation by which the start of a new age for humanity is founded.³⁴⁴

³⁴³ Luke Timothy Johnson, *Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary*, Reading the New Testament series (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2001), 98.

³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 99; cf. 1 Cor 15:23; 2 Cor 5:17.

Chapter 5: Research findings, contextual application and conclusion

5.1 Introduction

Recalling back the study topic and its research question, the primary goal was to let the text interpret itself based on the exegetical methods as applied in Chapter Three. Even so, the three contextual modes have been observed in the study namely, “behind the text,” “in the text,” and “in front of the text” as articulated in Chapters Two, Three, and Four correspondingly. The mode, “behind the text,” has been used to find out how the topic of hereditary sin was understood in the OT and early Judaism prior to and during the time of the apostle that could, to some extent, influence his theological concern. “In the text” is the mode employed to examine an intended meaning of the text within its own context – exegesis, and the third mode “in front of the text” has been undertaken to trace the history on how the text has been interpreted in different contexts from that of the text itself. The results are as presented in the next section below.

5.2 Research findings

Chapter Two has been exploring on what was understood about sin in the OT and early Judaism as possible sources for Paul’s theology of sin. Consequently, many and diverse concepts of sin are observed such that the OT particularly Gen 2-3 articulates some significant impacts of the first humans’ disobedience to themselves and their posterity: expulsion from the Garden, hardship and toilsome living conditions, and the land became cursed. Nevertheless, Gen 3 is seldom referred to in the rest of the OT books except for some echoes in Job, Psalms and Ecclesiastes. The concern is not on hereditary sin but the hereditary consequences, namely, death, life hardship and fractured relationship between humans and God, among humans themselves and between them and the rest of creation. In other words, the story of the Fall is defined in relational terms not in an ontological sense.

Apart from Gen 2-3, an understanding of sin in the rest of OT is strongly influenced by the Deuteronomistic perspective considering the Fall of the first humans as a paradigm with a concept that sin is the transgression of God’s commandments (Torah) but everyone is capable of observing the Torah as far as he or she has an active free will to do so. Further, the notion of sin in early Judaism is articulated in diverse ways as we have seen in section 2.3. The general emphasis is on the individual’s

accountability for his or her sins and their consequences. Nothing is told about hereditary sin through procreation.

The findings in Chapter Three, particularly the three grammatical issues – the genuine translation of καὶ οὕτως, the nature of ἐφ’ ᾧ, and the syntactical force of πάντες ἥμαρτον – as discussed in section 3.4.2, have together described what appears as two major alternative understandings: either, Adam’s sin became imputed to all humanity involuntarily and led them to incur death, or every person incurs death due to the fact that he or she voluntarily sinned or sins in an exemplary way of that of Adam as long as the free will is alive in him or her. Here, the major concern is the hereditary death being inevitable to everyone (even the infants) for it found its first entrance into the world through Adam’s sin and then spread to everyone. As far as death reigns universally as cosmic power, sin as power reigns too in death for every human being as long as he or she is flesh. However, the apostle’s insistence is not on the inherited guilt from Adam’s sin; rather, it is the evil powers in which the rest of humanity are pressed as flesh to live.

Chapter Four has given the result that the history of interpretation of Rom 5:12 since Origen has impacted both the Western and Eastern churches, particularly the interpretation done by Origen who renders two implications. On the one hand, the rest of humanity after Adam has sinned in imitation of Adam’s sin. On the other hand, all humanity inherits the consequences of Adam’s sin because of having solidarity with him during his Fall. The former became perpetuated by Pelagius while the later implication was apprehended by Ambrosiaster who ultimately influenced the Augustinian interpretation with major emphasis on the doctrine of original or hereditary sin through procreation. Even so, Augustine’s adaptation of such an interpretation embraces grammatical misinterpretation of ἐφ’ ᾧ, as we have seen in 3.4.2 (cf. 4.3). Hence, based on a grammatical inappropriateness, Augustine renders an interpretation with hereditary sin to the rest of humanity rejecting the role of human free will at all to do good, but it is left only for bad deeds.

Further, the apostle articulates the notion of sin in an articular sense for the sake of intensifying it far – with reflection on biblical texts such as Gen 3:1-24 and Ps 51 – beyond transgression of a commandment. He recognizes that sin has supra-individual character as a power:

Sin... is the destiny knowingly entered into by Adam and willfully taken over by all people since his transgression (παράβασις) to disregard the will of God and to lead their lives by their own power far away from God; it is guilt and destiny at once, with unmistakable and disastrous consequences which materialize in actions.³⁴⁵

5.3 Contextual application

After attaining an understanding about the text in concern; hereditary death and hardship, not hereditary sin through procreation, then, I get reminded of a possible way to speak of this expression contextually using Ubuntu theology. It is a Christian perception of African Ubuntu philosophy in which the humanity of a person is known in a relational way with the rest of the community.³⁴⁶ With this perception while reflecting on my own experience too as an African, an individual's fault can result to turbulence for the rest of the community, as well, unless it is corrected, either individually and/or collectively. In other words, a family or community can bear the consequences of what is done by one of its members although they might not be guilty of it. However, intermediate measures, either personally or collectively, are needed for getting out of such consequences. In this manner, Adam's sin and the implied consequences can be contextually understood; his posterity has inherited not his sin; rather, they daily experience the consequence – toilsome living conditions and death – which is left for them individually, as personal responsibility to get rid of it.

5.4 Conclusion

Throughout the study, I have observed that the concept of sin in Rom 5:12 is to be understood in a relational and not in an ontological sense, as far as the grammatical issues are concerned. It is only the world that is compelled under evil powers, namely, sin and death since Adam. In its character as flesh (σάρξ),³⁴⁷ the rest of humanity is inescapably exposed to sin. The apostle articulates sin as much more than transgression of commandment(s), rather, as a supra-individual power. Consequently, there is a

³⁴⁵ Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 311.

³⁴⁶ See Michael Battle, *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu* (Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1997), 4-5.

³⁴⁷ Cf. Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 309, who portrays the apostle's view of human "flesh" as the essence of human rebellion against God and his work in Christ.

notion in Rom 5:12 of original sin that is “transferred” to every human being, but, as we have concluded from the analysis of the phrase ἐφ’ ᾧ, the “transfer” does not operate through physical procreation. It is undoubtedly a theological truth that all humanity is left vulnerable under the power of sin which in character reigns in death. Moreover, because sin and death are the ruling powers in the world, according to the apostle, humans are incapable of overcoming them by themselves. Victory can only be gained through faith in Jesus Christ. Starting from baptism as the first part of regeneration, the believer has access to life lived by dying to sin with Christ and being renewed in His resurrection. I finally concur with Jewett and other scholars joining him in the affirmation that Rom 5:12, within its scope, does not primarily “set forth a doctrine of Adam’s sin”; rather, it demonstrates “the scope of the overflowing dominion of grace (vv. 15-17, 20-21) in the ‘life’ of all believers (vv. 17-19, 21).”³⁴⁸

³⁴⁸ Jewett, 370; cf. Toews, 87-88; Longenecker, 431; Stuhlmacher, *Biblical Theology*, 313.

Bibliography

Primary Texts (Text Editions)

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Edited by Albrecht Alt. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1977. (abbreviated *BHS*).

A New English Translation of the Septuagint. (abbreviated *NETS*), Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/>.

New Revised Standard Version. (abbreviated *NRSV*). New York: American Bible Society, 1989.

Novum Testamentum Graece. Based on the work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle. Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, 28th Revised Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.

The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition. Edited by Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar. 2 Volumes. Leiden/Boston/Köln: Brill; Grand Rapids, Michigan/Cambridge U.K.: Eerdmans, 1997-98.

The Greek New Testament. 4th Rev. Ed. Edited by Barbara Aland ... [et Al.]. ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993.

James H. Charlesworth. Ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.

----- *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Vol. 2: Expansions of the "Old Testament" and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985.

Reference works

Alexander, Patrick H. et al., eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*. 2nd ed. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.

Alexander, T. Desmond and Brian S. Rosner, *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Electronic ed. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

Bullinger, Ethelbert William. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. London; New York: Eyre & Spottiswoode; E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1898.

Danker, Frederick W., W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and W. Bauer. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000. (abbreviated *BDAG*).

DeMoss, Matthew S. *Pocket Dictionary for the Study of New Testament Greek*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2001.

- Dictionary of Biblical Languages With Semantic Domains: Hebrew (Old Testament)*. Electronic ed. Edited by James Swanson. Oak Harbor: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.
- Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. ET. 3 Vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-1993. (abbreviated EDNT).
- Friberg, Timothy, Barbara Friberg and Neva F. Miller. *Analytical Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*. Baker's Greek New Testament library. Vol. 4. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books, 2000.
- Kolb, Robert, and Timothy J. Wengert. *The Book of Concord: The Confessions of the Evangelical Lutheran Church*. Minneapolis, Minn: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene Albert Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament: Based on Semantic Domains*. Electronic ed. of the 2nd edition. New York: United Bible societies, 1996.
- Merriam-Webster, Inc. *Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*. Includes index., 10th ed. Springfield, Mass., U.S.A.: Merriam-Webster, 1996, c1993.
- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek : Grammar*. 4th ed. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2019.
- Religion Past & Present: Encyclopedia of Theology and Religion*. 13 vols. + Index vol. Edited by Hans Dieter Betz et al. Leiden: Brill, 2007–2013. (abbreviated RPP).
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Logos, 1919; 2006.
- Soanes, Catherine and Angus Stevenson. *Concise Oxford English Dictionary*. 11th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976. (abbreviated TDNT).
- Tumwabudu Mungu Wetu: Msifuni Mungu, Mfalme wa Mbingu na Nchi! Toleo la pili*. Arusha, Tanzania: KKKT, 2017.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek grammar beyond the basics: An exegetical syntax of the New Testament*. Harper Collins, 1996.

Scholarly Literature

- Anderson, Gary A. "Adam and Eve." *RPP* 1 (2007): 49-50.
- Balz, H. "κόσμος" in *EDNT, Vol. 2*. Edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991: 310-313.

- Barr, James. *The Garden of Eden and the Hope of Immortality*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Barton, John, ed. *The Cambridge companion to biblical interpretation*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Battle, Michael. *Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu*. Cleveland, Ohio: Pilgrim Press, 1997.
- Bieder, W. “θάνατος” in *EDNT*, vol. 2. Edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991: 129-133.
- Boda, Mark J. *A Severe Mercy: Sin and Its Remedy in the Old Testament*. Vol. V.1. Siphrut. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2009.
- Boda, Mark J., and Frank Lewis. *Praying the tradition: The origin and use of tradition in Nehemiah 9*. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1999.
- Bullinger, Ethelbert William. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible*. London; New York: Eyre & Spottiswoode; E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1898.
- Bultmann, R. “θάνατος, θνήσκω, ἀποθνήσκω, συναποθνήσκω” in *TDNT*. Vol. 3. Edited by Kittel, Gerhard, Gerhard Friederich, and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-c1976: 7-25.
- Busse, U. “διέρχομαι” in *EDNT* vol. 1, edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990: 322-323.
- Carter, T. L. *Paul and the Power of Sin: Redefining 'beyond the Pale'*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Cartwright, Steven R. *A Companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*. Vol. 39. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Collins, C. John. *Genesis 1-4: A Linguistic, Literary, and Theological Commentary*. Phillipsburg, N.J: P&R Publishing, 2006.
- Collins, John J. *Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls*. The Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls. London: Routledge, 2002. Accessed on 19/4/2020 from <https://search-ebscohostcom.ezproxy.vid.no/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e093mww&AN=68091&site=ehost-live>.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols: Vol. 1. International Critical Commentary. 1975–1979. Reprinted with corrections. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001–2002.
- deSilva, David A. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods and Ministry Formation*. Illinois: Downers Grove & Nottingham, England: IVP Academic, 2004.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans and Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1998.

- *Romans 1–8*. Word Biblical Commentary 38. Dallas, Texas: Word, 1988.
- Elliger, W. “ὁ, ἡ, τό” in *EDNT, Vol. 2*. Edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider, from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991: 489-490.
- Erasmus, Desiderius, Robert D. Sider, and John B. Payne. *Annotations on Romans*. New Testament Scholarship. Toronto, Ont: University of Toronto Press, Scholarly Publishing Division, 1994. Retrieved on 28/3/2020 from <https://searchbscohostcom.ezproxy.vid.no/login.aspx?direct=true&db=e000xww&AN=468323&site=ehost-live>.
- Fiedler, P. “ἁμαρτία” in *EDNT, Vol. 1*, edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990: 65-69.
- Greenman, Jeffrey P. and Timothy Larsen, eds. *Reading Romans Through the Centuries: From the Early Church to Karl Barth*. Michigan: Brazos Press, 2005.
- Grund, Alexandra. “Sin, Guilt, and Forgiveness: IV. Old Testament.” *RPP* 12 (2012): 22-24.
- Hägglund, Bengt. *History of Theology*. St. Louis, Mo: Concordia Publishing House, 1968.
- Hayes, John H., and Carl R. Holladay. *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner’s Handbook*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987.
- Hendriksen, William. *New Testament Commentary: 1: Romans Chapters 1-8*. Vol. 1. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1980.
- Henze, Matthias. “‘4 Ezra’ and ‘2 Baruch’: Literary Composition and Oral Performance in First-Century Apocalyptic Literature.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 131, no. 1 (2012): 181-200. Accessed April 19, 2020. doi:10.2307/23488218.
- Hess, A. J. “διά” in *EDNT, Vol. 1*, edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1990: 296-297.
- Holmberg, B. *Sociology and the New Testament: An Appraisal*. Minneapolis, Fortress, 1990.
- Jamieson, Robert et al. *A Commentary, Critical and Explanatory, on the Old and New Testaments*. On spine: Critical and explanatory commentary. Oak Harbor, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 1997.
- Jewett, Robert. *Romans: A Commentary*. Hermeneia: A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2007.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *Reading Romans: A Literary and Theological Commentary*, Reading the New Testament series. Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys Publishing, 2001.
- Johnson, M. D. “Life of Adam and Eve: Theological Importance.” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. Volume 2: Expansions of the “Old Testament” and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments*

- of *Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1985: 249-295.
- Keil, Carl Friedrich and Franz Delitzsch. *Commentary on the Old Testament*. Vols. 5, 7 and 8. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Kelly, John Norman Davidson. *Early Christian Doctrines*. 5th ed. London: Adam & Black, 1977.
- Kister, Menahem “Romans 5:12-21 against the Background of Torah-Theology and Hebrew Usage” in *Harvard Theological Review* (HTR) 100:4 (2007): 391-424.
- Klijn, A. f. J. “(Syriac Apocalypse of) Baruch.” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983: 615-652.
- Köhler, W. “ἐπί” in *EDNT*, vol. 2. Edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991: 21-23.
- Krötke, Wolf. “Sin, Guilt, and Forgiveness: I. Terminology.” *RPP* 12 (2012): 19.
- Lamberigts, Mathijs. “Julian and Augustine on the Origin of the Soul.” *Augustiniana* 46, no. 3/4 (1996): 243-260. Retrieved from https://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&as_sdt=0%2C5&q=Julian+and+Augustine+on+the+origin+of+the+soul&btnG=.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *The Epistle to the Romans*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Matera, Frank J. *Romans*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Metzger, B. M. “The Fourth Book of Ezra.” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*. Vol. 1. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983: 517-559.
- Morris, Leon *The Epistle to the Romans*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Leicester: Apollos, 1988.
- Murray, John. *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes*. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1968.
- Nassif, Bradley L. “Toward a ‘Catholic’ Understanding of St. Augustine’s View of Original Sin.” *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 39, no. 4 (1984): 287-299.
- Oepke. “διά” in *TDNT* vol. 2. Edited by Kittel, Gerhard, Gerhard Friederich, and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-c1976: 65-70.
- Papageorgiou, Panayiotis. “Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and its Consequences.” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 39 (1995): 361-78.
- Papsdorf, Joshua. “‘Ambrosiaster’ in Paul in the Middle Ages.” In *A companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*. Brill, 2013: 51-77.

- Porter, Stanley E. *The Apostle Paul: His Life, Thought, and Letters*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2016.
- Pridik, K.-H. “καί” in *EDNT*, vol. 2. Edited and translated by Horst Robert Balz and Gerhard Schneider from *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1991: 227-228.
- Rad, Gerhard Von. *Genesis: A Commentary*. 3rd Rev. ed. Old Testament Library (London). London: SCM Press, 1972.
- Räsänen, Heikki. *The Rise of Christian Beliefs: The Thought World of Early Christians*. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 2010.
- Redditt, Paul L. “Daniel 9: Its Structure and Meaning.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 62, no. 2 (2000): 236-49. Accessed April 20, 2020 from www.jstor.org/stable/43722642.
- Sampley, J. Paul. ed. *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A handbook*. Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2003.
- Scheck, Thomas P. “Pelagius’s Interpretation of Romans.” In *A companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages* Brill, 2013: 79-113.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Vol. 6 *Grand Rapids: Baker Books*, 1998.
- Stählin. “The Linguistic Usage and History of ἀμαρτάνω, ἀμάρτημα and ἀμαρτία before and in the NT” in *TDNT*, vol. 1. Edited by Kittel, Gerhard, Gerhard Friederich, and Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964-c1976: 293-296.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994.
- *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 2018.
- Toews, John E. *The Story of Original Sin*. Cambridge, UK: James Clarke & Co., 2013.
- Wenham, Gordon J., David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker, John D.W. Watts, and Ralph P. Martin. *Genesis 1-15*. Vol. 1. Word Biblical Commentary. Michigan: Zondervan, 1987.
- Witherington III, Ben, and Darlene Hyatt. *Paul’s letter to the Romans: A socio-rhetorical commentary*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2004.
- Zimmerli, Walther. *Old Testament Theology in Outline*. Atlanta, Ga: John Knox, 1978.