AOSIS

HTS Religion & Society Series

Volume 7

Contested body

Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8

Annette Potgieter

HTS Religion & Society Series
Volume 7

Contested body

Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8

Published by AOSIS Books, an imprint of AOSIS Publishing.

AOSIS Publishing
15 Oxford Street, Durbanville 7550, Cape Town, South Africa
Postnet Suite #110, Private Bag X19, Durbanville 7551, South Africa
Tel: +27 21 975 2602
Website: https://www.aosis.co.za

Copyright © Annette Potgieter. Licensee: AOSIS (Pty) Ltd
The moral right of the author has been asserted.

Cover image: Original design created with the use of provided image. The image is https://www.pexels.com/photo/jesus-christ-stained-glass-artwork-208331/, used under the Pexels License (please refer to the Terms of Use).

Published in 2020
Impression: 1

ISBN: 978-1-928523-67-3 (print)
ISBN: 978-1-928523-68-0 (epub)
ISBN: 978-1-928523-69-7 (pdf)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248
How to cite this work: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8', in HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7, pp. i–262, AOSIS, Cape Town.

HTS Religion & Society Series
ISSN: 2617-5819
Series Editor: Andries G. van Aarde

Printed and bound in South Africa.

Listed in OAPEN (http://www.oapen.org), DOAB (http://www.doabooks.org/) and indexed by Google Scholar.
Some rights reserved.

This is an open access publication. Except where otherwise noted, this work is distributed under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 South Africa (CC BY-NC-ND 3.0 ZA), a copy which is available at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/za/. Enquiries outside the terms of the Creative Commons licence should be sent to the Rights Department, AOSIS, at the above address or to publishing@aosis.co.za

The publisher accepts no responsibility for any statement made or opinion expressed in this publication. Consequently, the publishers and copyright holder will not be liable for any loss or damage sustained by any reader as a result of his or her action upon any statement or opinion in this work. Links by third-party websites are provided by AOSIS in good faith and for information only. AOSIS disclaims any responsibility for the materials contained in any third-party website referenced in this work.

Every effort has been made to protect the interest of copyright holders. Should any infringement have occurred inadvertently, the publisher apologises and undertakes to amend the omission in the event of a reprint.

HTS Religion & Society Series
Volume 7

Contested body

Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8

Annette Potgieter

AOSIS

Religious Studies domain editorial board at AOSIS

Commissioning Editor

Andries van Aarde MA, DD, PhD, D Litt, South Africa

Board Members

Warren Carter, Professor of New Testament, Brite Divinity School, Fort Worth, United States
Christian Danz, Dekan der Evangelisch-Theologischen Fakultät der Universität Wien and Ordentlicher Universität professor für Systematische Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, University of Vienna, Austria
Pieter G.R. de Villiers, Associate Editor, Extraordinary Professor in Biblical Spirituality, Faculty of Theology, University of the Free State, South Africa
Musa W. Dube, Department of Theology & Religious Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Botswana, Botswana
David D. Grafton, Professor of Islamic Studies and Christian-Muslim Relations, Duncan Black Macdonald Center for the Study of Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations, Hartford Seminary, Hartford, Connecticut, United States
Jens Herzer, Theologische Fakultät der Universität Leipzig, Germany
Jeanne Hoeft, Dean of Students and Associate Professor of Pastoral Theology and Pastoral Care, Saint Paul School of Theology, United States
Dirk J. Human, Associate Editor, Deputy Dean and Professor of Old Testament Studies, Faculty of Theology, University of Pretoria, South Africa
D. Andrew Kille, Former Chair of the SBL Psychology and Bible Section, and Editor of the Bible Workbench, San Jose, United States
William R.G. Loader, Emeritus Professor Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia
Isabel A. Phiri, Associate General Secretary for Public Witness and Diakonia, World Council of Churches, Geneva, Switzerland
Marcel Sarot, Emeritus, Professor of Fundamental Theology, Tilburg School of Catholic Theology, Tilburg University, the Netherlands
Corneliu C. Simut, Professor of Historical and Dogmatic Theology, Emanuel University, Oradea, Bihor, Romania
Rothney S. Tshaka, Professor and Head of Department of Philosophy, Practical and Systematic Theology, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa
Elaine M. Wainwright, Emeritus Professor School of Theology, University of Auckland, New Zealand; Executive Leader, Mission and Ministry, McAuley Centre, Australia
Gerald West, Associate Editor, School of Religion, Philosophy and Classics in the College of Humanities, University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa

Peer review declaration

The publisher (AOSIS) endorses the South African 'National Scholarly Book Publishers Forum Best Practice for Peer Review of Scholarly Books'. The manuscript was subjected to rigorous two-step peer review prior to publication, with the identities of the reviewers not revealed to the author(s). The reviewers were independent of the publisher and/or authors in question. The reviewers commented positively on the scholarly merits of the manuscript and recommended that the manuscript be published. Where the reviewers recommended revision and/or improvements to the manuscript, the authors responded adequately to such recommendations.

Research Justification

Paul's letter to the Romans, particularly Romans 5–8, is permeated with metaphors of dominion, as words such as rule (βασιλεύω, κυριεύω), enslave (δουλεύω) and liberate (ἐλευθερόω) continually surface. Paul lived in a world where the perception prevailed that people were constantly under the dominion of someone, whether that be a conqueror, a lord, heavenly powers or gods. The modern idea of being autonomous is somewhat foreign when ancient mentality is purveyed. However, from Paul's vantage point, the idea of being dominated is not problematical but rather the incumbent ruler. Paul employs a myriad of images to persuade his auditors that the body of a believer should be a space that is dominated by God.

This study uses conceptual metaphor theory as well as the historical research method to discern metaphors of dominion as well as these metaphors implied spatiality within the argument of Romans 5–8. In recent decades, it has come to light that metaphors are not mere decorative devices but are in fact pervasive to language. We think in terms of metaphors and it has become such a part of our world that we do it without even being actively aware of it. Paul draws on imagery from his time and situation to persuade his audience that there is no force or power that can separate believers from the love of God. For Paul, Jesus Christ 'our' Lord should be the ruler of believers' bodies.

Intrinsic to the unfolding concept of dominion within Paul's argument is that it entails a specific space. A change in hegemony results in change in the status of the dominated space and object. It becomes clear within Romans 5–8 that there is a specific focus on the change of lordship and it is specifically located in the human body. Believers' positioning within the frame of hegemony is important as it contributes to our understanding of how the first Christians related to dominion and space.

Within the plenitude of Pauline studies**,** *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* provides a cohesive scholarly investigation of metaphors of dominion employed by Paul. The book advances the understanding that the body is the specific space where forces vie in Romans 5–8. This scholarly book results from research done at the Graduate School of Ancient Languages and Texts, Humboldt Universität zu Berlin, in Berlin as well as research conducted as a member of Topoi Excellence cluster C2 (Metaphors and Space) research group. It represents an original and innovative contribution to New Testament scholarship and contains no plagiarism.

Annette Potgieter, Hugenote Kollege, Wellington, South Africa; Department of New Testament and Related Literature, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa

Contents

Abbreviations and Tables Appearing in the Text and Notes xi
List of Abbreviations xi
List of Tables xi
Biographical Note xiii
Acknowledgement xv

Chapter 1: Paul, metaphors and persuasion 1
Introduction: Rationale 1
Paul and discourse 3
Romans and rhetoric 4
Diatribe 5
Research history 6
Methodology 10
Conceptual metaphor theory 10
Identifying metaphors 11
Metaphors and discourse 12
Metaphors as tools of persuasiveness in discourse 13
Mental models 14
Metaphor versus reality 15
Outline 15

Chapter 2: Metaphors of dominion 17
Introduction 17
Metaphors of dominion and space 17
Orientational metaphors 18
Defining parameters for space and dominion 20
Ontological metaphors 23
Personification 24
The source domain of Sin 24
The source domain of Death 27
The source domain of Favour 28
The source domain of Law 29
Container metaphors 30
Other metaphors of dominion 31
The slavery metaphor 31
The marriage analogy 33
Integrating metaphors of dominion 34

Chapter 3: Perlocution in Romans 5–8 (exegetical analyses) 35
Introduction 35
From enemies to friends (Rm 5:1–11) 37
To have peace with God (Rm 5:1–5) 37
Detail analysis of Romans 5:1–5 37
The culmination of the power of love (Rm 5:6–11) 54
Dying on behalf (Rm 5:6–8) 54
Detail analysis of Romans 5:6–8 55
To be vindicated and reconciled (Rm 5:9–11) 59
Detail analysis of Romans 5:9–11 60
Persuasion in Romans 5:1–11 62
The reign of powers (Rm 5:12–21) 64
The invasion of powers (Rm 5:12–17) 64
Detail analysis of Romans 5:12–14 65
Detail analysis of Romans 5:15–17 73
The reign of Sin versus the reign of Favour (Rm 5:18–21) 78
Detail analysis of Romans 5:18–21 79
Persuasion in Romans 5:12–21 84
Argument reconnaissance (Rm 6:1–7:6) 86
Separated from the power of Sin (Rm 6:1–14) 88
Separated from Sin (Rm 6:1–4) 88
Detail analysis of Romans 6:1–4 88
Constituting life and death (Rm 6:5–11) 96
Uniting in the likeness of Christ (Rm 6:5–7) 97
Detail analysis of Romans 6:5–7 97
Dead to Sin and alive to God (Rm 6:8–11) 102
Detail analysis of Romans 6:8–11 103
A change of lords (Rm 6:12–14) 106
Excursus: Military imagery 106
Detail analysis of Romans 6:12–14 108
Persuasion in Romans 6:1–14 112
The implication of being under Favour (Rm 6:15–23) 113
A slave to God (Rm 6:15–23) 113
Detail analysis of Romans 6:15–23 115
Persuasion in Romans 6:15–23 127
Freedom from the Law (Rm 7:1–6) 128
Freedom from the law – marriage analogy (Rm 7:1–6) 128
Detail analysis of Romans 7:1–6 128
Persuasion in Romans 7:1–6 136
Paul and the law (Rm 7:7–25) 137

The 'I' debate 137
The relationship of Sin and the law (Rm 7:7–13) 139
Detail analysis of Romans 7:7–13 140
Persuasion in Romans 7:7–13 147
The Spirit versus the flesh (Rm 7:14–20) 148
Detail analysis of Romans 7:14–16 149
Excursus: Medea 152
Detail analysis of Romans 7:17–20 153
Persuasion in Romans 7:14–20 155
The conflict between mind and body (Rm 7:21–25) 156
Detail analysis of Romans 7:21–25 157
Persuasion in Romans 7:21–25 162
The Spirit (Rm 8) 162
Being in Christ (Rm 8:1–11) 163
Believers in Christ (Rm 8:1–4) 163
Detail analysis of Romans 8:1–4 163
Mindset of the flesh versus mindset of the Spirit (Rm 8:5–8) 170
Detail analysis of Romans 8:5–8 171
No really, in believers Christ dwells (Rm 8:9–11) 175
Detail analysis of Romans 8:9–11 176
Persuasion in Romans 8:1–11 179
Children of God (Rm 8:12–17) 180
Detail analysis of Romans 8:12–17 181
Persuasion in Romans 8:12–17 188
Liberation for the children of God (Rm 8:18–30) 189
Free from enslavement to ruin (Rm 8:18–21) 189
Detail analysis of Romans 8:18–21 189
The personification of creation 195
Redemption of the body (Rm 8:22–27) 195
Detail analysis of Romans 8:22–27 196
For those who love God (Rm 8:28–30) 201
Detail analysis of Romans 8:28–30 201
Persuasion in Romans 8:18–30 204
Nothing can separate believers from the love of God (Rm 8:31–39) 204
What opposition? (Rm 8:31–34) 205
Detail analysis of Romans 8:31–34 205
Who shall separate? (Rm 8:35–37) 209
Detail analysis of Romans 8:35–37 210
Neither height nor depth (Rm 8:38–39) 211
Detail analysis of Romans 8:38–39 211
Persuasion in Romans 8:31–39 213

Chapter 4: The body as contested space **215**
Introduction 215
Hegemony and the body 215
The 'embodied or container' schema 223
Spatiality and relationship 226
The body and Sin 227
The body and Death 227
The body and Favour 228
The body and Law 229
Spatiality and persuasion 229

Chapter 5: Hegemony and space **231**
Introduction 231
Some general observations 231
Remarks on metaphors of dominion 232
Remarks on persuasiveness in Paul's argument 235
Remarks on hegemony and the body 238

References **241**
Index **259**

Abbreviations and Tables Appearing in the Text and Notes

List of Abbreviations

CMT	Conceptual Metaphor Theory
MIPVU	Metaphor Identification Procedure

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Patterns that metaphors may display in a text. 14

Biographical Note

Annette Potgieter
Hugenote Kollege,
Wellington, South Africa;
Department of New Testament and Related Literature,
Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria,
Pretoria, South Africa
Email: annettepotgieter1@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5987-4912

Annette Potgieter completed her Dr Theol. (Cum Laude) at Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. During her time in Berlin, she was also part of the Topoi Excellence Cluster C2 (Metaphors and Space) research group. She was the recipient of the prestigious Skye scholarship and also received a bursary from the Evangelische Kirche Deutschland. In 2016, she won the Desmund Tutu-Gerrit Brand prize for the best theology debut book for 'Jong teoloë praat saam… oor God, gemeentes en geloof'. Potgieter obtained M.Th. New Testament (Cum Laude), M.A. Languages and Cultures (Cum Laude) and M.Div. (Cum Laude) degrees at the University of Pretoria. She is currently a theology lecturer at Hugenote Kollege, Wellington and Research Associate with the Department of New Testament and Related Literature, Faculty of Theology and Religion, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa.

Acknowledgement

This is the revised manuscript of the thesis ‘Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8’ handed in and defended on 08 February 2019. This publication is part of the fulfilment of the Dr Theol. degree at Humboldt Universität zu Berlin.

Chapter 1

Paul, metaphors and persuasion

Introduction: Rationale

Paul lived in a world perceived to be filled with powers and forces whether that be a conqueror, a lord, heavenly powers or gods.[1] Ancient people had the acuity that these powers, *inter alia* the palpable Roman Empire, influenced and affected them on a daily basis (Reid 1993:751).[2] It is easy to forget that believers actually lived in real time and space (Breytenbach 2002:248). Within the milieu of the Roman Empire, an interplay between diverse cultures existed, which unequivocally impacted Paul's discourse (Du Toit 2009:142).[3] Paul wrote his longest letter to the community of believers in Rome from Corinth

1. Cf. Philo, Gig. 16; Somn 1.190; Josephus J.W. 5.388; T. Levi 19.3; Enoch 6:1–11:2; 69:2–25; 2 Apoc. Bar 56.11–15; Jubilee 5.6–11; Matthew 25:41; Revelation 12:9. In the first-century Mediterranean world, the perception existed that the cosmos was haunted by spirits above, below and on the earth. These powers were associated with magic, the mysteries, astrology or popular religion (see Reid 1993).

2. The Romans thought that there were numerous secret beings that were constantly helping or hindering the Roman people in their various undertakings, although the anonymity placed the Romans in a disposition to control them with the appropriate ritual, as they could not name these gods (Aune 2003). Along with these anonymous beings, there were minor deities, the *indigimenta,* also assisting and hindering various human activities. See Tertullian Nat. 11, De An. 37–39; Augustine Civ. D. 4.11 (Aune 2003:790).

3. Roman presence in the first century made itself felt and for far too long research did not pay attention to the impact of interculturality (Du Toit 2009:142).

How to cite: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'Paul, metaphors and persuasion', in *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* (HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7), pp. 1–16, AOSIS, Cape Town. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248.01

during the winter of 56 CE. These believers were unacquainted with Paul,[4] entrenched in the epicentre of imperialistic Rome under the reign of Nero (54–68 CE) (Elliot 2010:28). Rome was a pivotal city that served as a convocation point for orators who exerted considerable political and social influence on life throughout the empire (Cosby 1991:210; see Malherbe 1973: 3–77). Persuasive speech was highly valued in the 1st century CE, and rhetoric was regarded as the 'queen of subjects' amongst students (Cosby 1991:210).

Paul's communication was a deliberate action (Runge 2010:16) and he composed his letter with the intent that it should be read aloud (Malherbe 1973:3) to create the illusion that he was among the audience, speaking to them directly (Johnson 1997:11). On the verge of delivering the collection from primarily non-Jewish churches to Jerusalem, he enlisted the believers in Rome to pray in support of his journey, as he harboured doubts that the Jerusalem church would accept the collection (Bornkamm 1969:91). He also requested financial aid for a planned missionary expansion to Spain (Becker 1993:40; Breytenbach 2012:6). The manner in which Paul chose to convey his message to the Roman audience is of particular interest to this study. Paul wanted to persuade a Roman audience already habituated in the gospel to support his standpoints and convince them of a particular course of behaviour (Cosby 1991:210; Porter 2001:569).

Accordingly, Paul drew on a myriad of images that the audience would have been *au fait* with to make his argument convincing. Although Aristotle was famously ambivalent concerning the use of metaphors in the rhetorical sense, for example, attacking Plato for 'empty words and poetical metaphors',[5] metaphors as a persuasive tool are often overlooked.[6] The manner in which Paul stacked these images and deployed patterns of repetition and recurrence contributes to a compelling argument. As metaphors are an omnipresent principle of language (Richards 1936:92), the dense metaphorical language in Romans 5–8 particularly involves themes of dominion, lordship and hegemony. Metaphors and metonymies are central notions that reflect how people cope with the world around them (Raible 2016:40). Inadvertently, these themes of dominion are fundamentally linked with a spatial connection. A dominator, lord or power is dependent upon an object, whether that is a specific person or place, to rule or to exercise its influence over.

4. Paul did not establish the Roman community of believers. There is no certainty concerning the identity of the founder of the Roman church. Most likely converts of Stephen started the church in Rome. A large quantity of Jewish captives brought to Rome, following Pompey's subjugation of Palestine in 62 BCE who came to believe in Jesus as the Messiah, may indicate the origin of the idea that it was Stephen who founded the church as the Jesus movement first took root in synagogues.

5. Aristotle, Metaphysics, 991a21, and see also 1079b26.

6. Even Aristotle commends the instructive power of metaphor in Metaphysics 1015a11, but not the persuasiveness. See Moran (1996:385–398) for more detail on Aristotle's view of rhetoric and metaphors.

The fact that dominion encompasses spatiality contributes to the understanding of how the first Christians related to dominion and space. Metaphors of dominion within the scope of Romans 5–8 are the cardinal focal point of this study. The purpose is not only to identify the metaphors and to explain them against their source domains but also to clarify how Paul used metaphors in an effort to persuade his auditors.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Romans 5–8 form a literary unit (Agourides 1976:184–187, 205–206; Dahl 1951:37, 1977:88–90). The main argument of the justification of sinners is circumposed between Romans 5:1–11 and Romans 8:31–39 (Dahl 1977:88–90). Scholars are unanimous that Romans 1–8 form a unit, but there is contention about whether a break should be considered after Romans 4, or Romans 5 or in the middle of Romans 5 (Cranfield 1975:255; Talbert 2003:53–63). The contention derives from the fact that Romans 5 resembles strong linguistic affinities with Romans 1–4. The similitude between these chapters does not imply despotically that Romans 5 should be considered as a part of Romans 1–4. Romans 5 functions as a hinge chapter, which not only induces flow from Romans 1–4 to Romans 5–8 but also summarises Romans 1–4 to compensate for the length of the text that would have been read aloud in ancient times. Romans 5–8 build on the meaning of justification as introduced in Romans 1–4.

Paul and discourse

Paul described himself as a slave of Jesus Christ, called to be an apostle set apart for the gospel of God (Rm 1:1). This understanding of himself and his task precipitates in Romans 5–8. Paul wants to communicate that believers are slaves to God, called by God, to obtain an 'in-status' as children and heirs of God who will protect them from all other forces or things. He used imagery from his context. Paul was born and bred a Jew of the diaspora, yet at the same time, he lived in an all-pervading Hellenistic culture (Du Toit 2009:121). It is not clear if Paul was trained in rhetoric or if he had mastered the skill while travelling, although it takes years to learn (Cosby 1991:210; Porter 2001:564). However, Paul clearly had efficient Greek schooling[7] and was mindful of the Greco-Roman world. Understandably, Stowers (1994) states:

> The more one engages and comprehends the world of the Roman Empire, as well as the context of Jews in the Greek East, the more difficult it becomes to imagine the Paul known from modern scholarship. (p. 6)

The letter to the Romans is probably one of Paul's most investigated letters. It boasts a rich interpretation of history as is reflected in Augustine, Luther and

7. Paul probably had an equivalent of high-school Greek as he uses the diatribe style typical to what was taught in Greek schooling. Furthermore, he was from Tarsus, a hub known for diatribe rhetoric.

Calvin. Paul is not a solitary figure of 'Christianity'[8]; rather, he stands firmly in the early traditions he inherited as well as the Jesus movement situated within the urban culture of his time (Krentz 2000:279).

An obstacle in the understanding of Paul's letter to the Romans is the assumption that the audience is of Jewish Christian roots.[9] Such a view purports that believers saw themselves as a distinct identity in the 1st century, unique from Jews and Judaism (Barclay 2011:3). This is an incorrect assumption, as 'Christianity' is an intrinsic part of Judaism. With such an assumption of Christianity as a unique identity, Jewishness and Greekness become mere attributes (Stowers 1994:24). The result is that the Romans are reduced to two groups: believers and non-believers, elevated above matters of culture or ethnicity (Stowers 1994:24–25). The delineation *gentile* refers to those who are not Jewish, but in the Greco-Roman world, *barbarian* was used to refer to someone who was not Greek or Roman. The obsession of finding Jewish readers is so great that interpreters often ignore or disallow the letters' explicitly encoded audience (Stowers 1994:30). Paul elaborates on an 'in–out' status, but this is embedded in the culture and ethnicity of his time. In recent years, Pauline studies shifted away from classifying Paul as having either Hellenistic or Jewish influence.

Romans and rhetoric

William Wuellner ([1977] 1991:128–146), as well as George Kennedy (1984:12), describes writing and speaking patterns in Paul's letter to the Romans as an example of deliberative rhetoric (Porter 2001:539). In 1977, Wuellner proposed to read Paul's letters as argumentative texts enabling advancement from the persevered stale attempts that form and genre criticism garnered. This gave rise to the exploration of other scholarly pursuits in Romans such as investigations concerning political and social situations (Wuellner [1977] 1991:152). Although Romans may be explored as deliberative rhetoric, proclaiming Paul's body of work as rhetorical would be a grave error. Paul wrote letters. Porter (2001:584) mentions 'functional correlations between various categories of rhetoric can be found in various parts of Paul's letters'. Paul's style is the most plausible argument to motivate an investigation of his rhetoric. Rhetorical means include *inter alia* antithesis, anaphora, litotes, antistrophe, accumulation, enthymemes and ethical appeal (Porter 2001:537).

8. One should tread lightly not to assume that Paul had a clear-cut idea of the new religion or true religion of 'Christianity'. Firstly, the term religion is 18th-century European culture as something essentially private and separate from politics, law, economic activity and ethnicity. The concept religion is anachronistic during the time that Paul wrote the letter circa 56 CE as politics, law, economic activity and ethnicity were inseparable (see Nongbri 2013:65; Stowers 1994:27).

9. Rome hosted a large community of Jewish people in the 1st century. It is estimated to be between 40 000 and 50 000 people (Dunn 1993:838).

Rhetorical criticism, however, does entail not only identifying 'figures of speech' but also determining how an argument functions and persuades (Vorster 2009:506).

☐ Diatribe

Rudolf Bultmann (1910) compared Paul's style with the Cynic-Stoic diatribe in his dissertation representing the public oral preaching of the moralists.[10] Bultmann (1910:10–11, 67–68), depending on Heinrich Schenkl's Teubner text of Epictetus, understood the diatribe as the oral style of popular philosophical propaganda, which he discerned to have influenced Paul.[11] The diatribe derives from ancient schools of philosophy where the teacher would use a dialogue, question and answer to lead the student from wrong ideas to correct ideas (Watson 1993:213). The style engages a dialogue with a fictitious partner, using brief questions and answers as well as prosopopoeia, comprising personifications of inanimate realities (Johnson 1997:108; Pitta 2015:309; Stowers 1994:264). Robert Jewett (2007:445) mentions that the prosopopoeia brings the audience along with Paul in the diatribe. Paul gravitates to the diatribe style that preachers developed *en masse* to convince their listeners to the rational life, rather than the formal rhetoric taught in classrooms (Malherbe 1989:4).

There is no New Testament book that can be fully regarded as being a diatribe, but Paul's letters exhibit some diatribe features, in particular, the letter to the Romans (Watson 1993:213–214). The diatribe draws on the oral discourse tropes such as rhetorical questions (Rm 7:1; 7:7; 7:13); questions answered by abrupt responses such as 'by no means' (Rm 6:1–2); hyperbole (Rm 8:37–39) and chains of interconnected clauses (Rm 5:3–5) (Johnson 1997:12). These features also include the presence of an imaginary interlocutor (Rm 7:7–25). A good example of this type of rhetoric can be seen in C. Cels. 1.28. Celsus creates a situation where a child is having his first lesson with an orator. Celsus introduces two general types of people: the person who has difficulty seeking God and the fleshly person. He suggests that Christians are like these people (Celsus 6.66; 7.36.17).

It is important to note that the diatribe is not a polemically intended style (Moo 1996:356), but purposed as a method of instruction and exhortation (Watson 1993:214). This raises questions concerning Paul's letter to the Romans. Within the light of Paul's use of rhetoric and diatribe, it firstly seems

10. Malherbe (1989:18) indicates that there are no real original contributions to this study since Bultmann. He does mention Stanley K. Stowers who studied the dialogical element and proposed that the diatribe is rather meant for the schoolroom than the street corner (Malherbe 1989:18).

11. Malherbe (2014:107) indicates that Paul's use of μὴ γένοιτο 'by no means' is unique to him and Epictetus does not feature in Moralia of Plutarch, works of Philo, Bion, Teles, Musonius, Dio Chrysostom, Lucian or Maximus of Tyre.

unlikely that Paul is engaging in a polemic against the Jewish, and secondly, it is improbable that Paul is addressing a specific situation in Roman house churches. Jewett (2007) takes Paul's rhetoric as well as the diatribe elements into consideration but still argues in his commentary on Romans that Paul is addressing strife amongst the Roman house churches. I contend that Paul is writing a letter in which he wants to persuade the Roman churches to understand the Good News in the same way he does. Paul was on his way to Jerusalem, concerned with the reception of the collection, and accordingly wrote his *magnum opus*. Apart from that, Paul wanted financial support for his next missionary trip. In my opinion, he is not concerned with the strife amongst Roman churches.

Research history

The notion of powers at play in Romans 5–8 is not novel. Early 2nd-century Christianity already displayed a proclivity for military terminology, especially incumbent in the works of Clement of Alexandria,[12] Ignatius of Antioch[13] and Origin,[14] but this is not a foreign phenomenon. Military terminology was current in the cults of Bacchus, Mithras, Venus and Isis (Iosif 2006:13–14). Adolf von Harnack (1905:8–9) indicates a connection between Christianity and the Roman military in his seminal work 'Militia Christi: Die christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten'. He argued that Christianity has binary military elements, derived from Judaism, and it retains the ideological expectation of a Jewish Messiah,[15] as well as the language from Old Testament prophets and Psalmists.[16] But it also uses countless military images, for example 'spiritual war' or 'spiritual weapon outfit'. He also adduces this type of thinking in Paul (cf. Rm 6:13; 23; 13,12) (Harnack 1905:12) with the battle not against flesh and blood, but the powers that be (Harnack 1905:13).

Harnack (1905:2) identifies various character qualities that acquire the highest praise during warfare such as obedience, courage, willingness and trust until death. Harnack (1905:19) postulates that Paul regarded the military organisation as an example for Christians, referring to receiving orders and being obedient to it. The analogy is also reflected in the church organisation with regard to the church offices (Harnack 1905:19). Accordingly, Harnack (1905:6,15) views, Christ as a perfect soldier and deems that every Christian

12. Cf. Protrepticus, X190P.

13. Cf. Ad Polycarpum 6.2.

14. Cf. Contra Celsum, 8, 55.27–29.

15. The Jewish Messiah concept is associated with the expectation of an earthly ruler ruling the Jews.

16. The language of the Old Testament is violent. The extent of war images contributed to strife in the early formation years of Christianity, concerning whether the God of the Old Testament is the same God of the New Testament, which is also renowned as the fallacy of Marcion.

should strive to be like Christ.[17] Correspondingly, baptism was seen as a method to become a soldier of Christ (Harnack 1905:69). However, Paul does not generally depict Christians as 'soldiers', but he refers to them as his co-workers (Harnack 1905:14).[18] Harnack's observation seems to fit Ephesians and the Pastoral Letters, which were not written by Paul.

Along similar lines, Edgar Krentz argues that Paul drew on the military as a trope. However, Krentz (2003:349) successfully proves his assumption in Philippians referencing examples of the military harangues, but does not obtain the same results in Romans. Krentz (2000:275) notes that an investigation of the rhetorical techniques of persuasion and the *topoi* Paul utilised in Romans is needed.

Bultmann's (1951:191) understanding of theology and anthropology is the two sides of the same coin, as he describes how God acts in the world and humans react to it. The body (σῶμα) is central to human existence. Paul cannot envision that which is to come without a bodily existence, as the fleshy body is transformed into a spiritual body (Bultmann 1951:192). For Bultmann (1951:192–194), the body indicates the whole person and may even be translated as 'I'. Accordingly, difficulties such as sin in a human's relationship with God indicate an estrangement from the self (Bultmann 1951:196). Bultmann (1968:235), as well as Udo Schnelle (1996:65), refers to the 'spheres' or the 'realms' of Sin. However, understanding believers' orientation towards God within the frame of these spheres is often murky. The following question then arises: What exactly is the sphere or realm of Sin? I am of the opinion that Paul, in Romans 5–8, intends the body as the location where Sin wants to exercise its dominion. It is not an abstract place such as a 'realm' or 'sphere'.

Ernst Käsemann follows the apocalyptic approach when he reacts against Bultmann's present and individualistic focus with a future-orientated apocalyptic vantage point (Shaw 2013:156). According to Käsemann (1969:31), the Jewish image of birth pangs in Romans 8:19 illustrates apocalyptic expectation as the new man and the new world emerge. Käsemann (1969:31) argues that humans' position is debatable and should be defined in relation to the eschatological Christ and remarks (1969:27) that humans cannot be described from their own limits, as the world means more than the sphere they are living in. The world is always under a sphere of dominion whether under creation, sin or redemption (Käsemann 1969:27–28). Accordingly, a human existence is determined from the outside and cannot be purveyed considering the own self (Käsemann 1969:28). For Käsemann (1969:28), Christ takes possession of a person's bodily parts for his service making it part of His body. A human's salvation and ruin are dependent on the Lord he serves

17. In the pastoral letters, we find the first explicit mention of 'soldier of Christ' in 1 Timothy 1:18.

18. Cf. Philemon 2; Philippians 2:25.

(Käsemann 1969:28). The only thing that shapes humans is the notion that Christ, who was crucified and obedient, is both judge of the world and the criterion of the new creation (Käsemann 1969:31). However, Käsemann underscores the role of Christ too much. In my view, Paul presents the dominion of the body as either for God's Favour through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord or for Sin. However, the former allows choice as believers are urged to present themselves to God. Jesus Christ died on the cross for the sinners and the ungodly. Through the body of Christ, God has reconciled with humans. Understanding the body as a dominated space by God does not reduce Paul's argument to a mere anthropological or soteriological discussion. Rather, understanding Paul's interpretation of the body and how the power of the resurrected Christ functions relates an understanding of what a relationship with God entails for Paul.

Beverly Gaventa (2013:61–75) postulates that the theology of Romans cannot be correctly understood without a *rhetoric of violence*. She defines a rhetoric of violence as the physical force of one agent against another and regards it as permeating Romans (Gaventa 2013:61). Gaventa (2004:234) argues that in Romans 5:12, Sin does not only enter and enslave but also unleashes its cosmic partner Death. The cosmos becomes the location of conflict between God and anti-god powers which are predominantly Sin and Death (Gaventa 2011:265–278). Gaventa (2004:232) insists that Sin[19] should be understood within an apocalyptic framework as a cosmic power within the context of a cosmic battle in Romans (Gaventa 2004:229). Her contribution underscores the importance of anti-powers in Romans; particularly that Sin is a power that sets itself over God (Gaventa 2004:232). I disagree with Gaventa that Sin is the nemesis of God, as Paul always indicates Christ as the ultimate power.

Furthermore, Gaventa (2004:238) does not ascribe metaphorical language for these powers, noting that Sin as a power should be taken seriously, although she does concede that Paul did not *per se* envision Sin as a literal character. Gaventa's (2004:238) concern with metaphorical language is the limited understanding of the text as literary evidence. However, the use of metaphorical language does not undermine the importance of powers or subjects, but rather provide an avenue for the modern reader to unlock the intended meaning of the text. I argue that the personification of Sin is vital in convincing the audience that Christ is the only true Lord. Gaventa adjudges Romans reflects an apocalyptic frame of reference. The use of 'apocalyptic' in Pauline studies is abundant since Lücke (1829:285–320) introduced the notion of 'apocalypse' in 1829. I am hesitant to refer to the Letter to the Romans as 'apocalyptic', mainly because Paul uses ἀποκαλύπτω (Rm 1:18, 8:18) and ἀποκάλυψις

19. Personifications of powers such as Law, Sin and Death are written with a capital letter in this study.

(Rm 8:19), which are derived from the same semantic meaning as 'reveal' and 'disclose' in their Greek meaning in Romans. Therefore, I defer using apocalyptic, seeing that a document belonging to a corpus of literature stemming from the modern notion of 'apocalypse' is usually deemed apocalyptic (Breytenbach 2010b:240).

Another significant contribution is that of Emma Wasserman. She builds on the views of Stanley K. Stowers and Troels Engberg-Pedersen and argues that Paul's statements concerning Sin in Romans 6–8 are nonsensical if it is not understood from the perspective of a 'moral-psychological economy' (Wasserman 2008a:387–415). Wasserman (2008a:388) reasons that Paul uses Platonic traditions in Romans 6–8 and postulates that Sin is part of the soul. Paul, like Philo of Alexandria, Plutarch or Galen, uses literary figures to represent the 'passions' and 'appetites' as 'evil indwelling beings' that make war, enslave, imprison and in some cases 'even metaphorically kill' the mind (Wasserman 2008a:388). However, the introduction of the powers occurs already from Romans 5:12 onwards.

Wasserman (2008a:397) notes that 'Platonists frequently use metaphors relating to warfare, imprisonment, rule and slavery to explain the relation between the parts of the soul'. Paul's language in Romans 6–8 is seemingly personal and in bodily terms (Wasserman 2008a:401), and Wasserman (2008a:402) offers an alternative understanding to a cosmic battle between God and Sin, interpreting Sin as a representation of the struggle and conflict of the passions reflecting specifically a Platonic type of struggle between the mind and the passions. Wasserman (2008a:402) posits that Paul depicts a war between God and Sin in Romans 6, Sin and the mind in Romans 7, and the flesh and spirit in Romans 8:1–13. Building on ideas of Stowers, Wasserman (2008a:388) argues that 'Paul uses Sin to stand for the irrational passions and appetites that operate an evil counter-ruler within the soul'. Wassermann's argument helps to shed light on the various images that culminate in Paul's language. She makes an impelling argument but underplays Paul's view of Sin as a destructive force. She traces the debate of Sin from Romans 6 and I am of the opinion that it explicitly begins in Romans 5:12 with Romans 5:1–11 setting the springboard for the argument. I also think that Paul does not view Sin as a part of the body but as a force that invades it.

Matthew Croasmun (2014) presents one of the newest studies on Romans 5–8. He posits the Stoic social body of separated parts, of which an army is a chief example, as a frame of understanding for Romans 5–8.[20] Accordingly, the recipients of Romans are being recruited into two armies, each of which constitutes a collective body. Croasmun (2014:154) argues that this modern description aids in interpreting Paul's participation language quite literally as

20. Lee (2010:50) citing Achilles, Isagoge 14 (SVF 2.368) and Alexander of Aphrodisias, Mixt. 216.14–16.

a case of a somatic union. Instead of the recipients being recruited into two armies, I would rather argue that Paul wants to persuade his audience to present their bodies to God and position themselves under God's Favour. The imagery of dominion is constitutive of Paul drawing on language that both speaker and audience are familiar with and accordingly contributes to Romans 5–8 perlocution.

Michael Wolter (2019:287–306) recently indicated that salvation should be understood through the bodiliness that can be traced in Romans. He refers to Paul's extensive use of metaphors that are especially connected to the body.[21] Similarly, this study argues that the body in Romans 5–8 is portrayed as a space of salvation.

Among the plenitude of Pauline studies concerning Romans 5–8, none conducted a cohesive investigation of Paul's metaphors of dominion. This study contributes to the body of knowledge by offering a view on Paul's use of persuasion by means of metaphors, particularly metaphors of dominion and how these metaphors are fundamentally part and parcel of the perception of space. Paul develops spatial rhetoric or reasoning, linking images with a spatial quality to create a clear distinction between being orientated 'in' and orientated 'out'.

Methodology

This study follows a linguistic approach with predominant focus on metaphors of dominion and the innate function of space. Accordingly, conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) is used. The historical-critical approach is followed concurrently with a close reading of the Nestle et al.'s (2012) 28th version of Romans 5–8. The metaphor identification procedure (MIPVU), a method for identifying metaphors in a discourse, is also used. The MIPVU complements especially the historical-critical approach, as becomes clear in the section 'Identifying metaphors'.

Conceptual metaphor theory

Metaphor definitions usually commence with Aristotle (384–322 BCE) who famously remarked in Poetics 21 [1457b6–7] that 'the greatest thing by far is to have a command of metaphor', where he defines metaphor as a 'transfer of a foreign name' (Eubanks 1999:420; Kövecses 2010:x; Richards 1936:89). Inadvertently, Aristotle contributed to the traditional view of metaphors as mere stylistic devices and rhetorical decorations (Kövecses 2010:x; Schwarz-Friesel 2015:145).[22] A precursor to CMT, Max Black (1973:46) noted with his

21. Wolter's article appeared in 2019, after the defence of this thesis on 08 February 2019.

22. Richards (1936:90) remarks that throughout history rhetoric metaphors have been treated as a 'happy trick'.

interaction theory that the significance of a metaphor is not in the inherent qualities being compared, but in the associations, they evoke (see Marquette 2007:697). George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980) played an instrumental role in overturning this misconception with their seminal book 'Metaphors we live by' giving rise to the 'cognitive turn'. They cogently argue that metaphors are pervasive to everyday life expressed in thought and actions (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:3). Humans think in terms of metaphors and this became such an integral part of our world that we do it without even being actively aware of it. The understanding and experience of the world are fundamentally metaphorically implied (Zimmermann 2000:115). Metaphor may seem to be a verbal matter, but at its core, it is a 'transaction between contexts' (Richards 1936:94). Language and thought are placed on the same level (Schwarz-Friesel 2015:146). Accordingly, a metaphor is not only speaking of something in terms of something else but also thinking of something in terms of something else (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:5). A metaphor is not just a linguistic phenomenon but also a conceptual, socio-historical, neural and bodily phenomenon (Kövecses 2005:8). Correspondingly, the term *metaphor* in this study implies conceptual metaphors. A conceptual metaphor comprises two conceptual domains of which one is drawn from (the source domain) and the domain that is explained (the target domain) (Kövecses 2010:4). The two domains are coherent with one another and consist of systematic correspondences labelled 'mappings' (Kövecses 2010:7).

Identifying metaphors

One of the main concerns with CMT is the lack of an empirical basis (Pragglejaz Group 2007:2; Schwarz-Friesel 2015:146). A solution is proffered with the MIPVU developed by a group of metaphor scholars at Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam (Pragglejaz Group 2007:3; Steen et al. 2010:26).[23] The basic procedure is:

1. find metaphor-related words by examining the text word for word
2. when a word is used indirectly, but may be explained by some form of cross mapping, mark as a metaphor
3. when a word is used directly, but may be explained by some form of cross mapping, mark as a metaphor
4. when words are used for the purpose of lexico-grammatical substitution functioning, mark as an implicit metaphor
5. when a word functions as a signal for cross mapping
6. when a word coins a new formation, mark as a metaphor (Steen et al. 2010:25–26).

23. MIPVU adds points 3, 4 and 5 to the Pragglejaz Group's MIP.

Conceptual metaphors are marked with inverted commas in this study. It should be noted according to cognitive linguistics there is often an interplay between language and thought to the point that it is not always clear whether language or thought is intended (Steen 2007:10). Grammar is itself a socio-cultural conventionalised and cognitively entrenched part of concrete events of use that occur in reality (Steen 2007:5). A fundamental problem of cognitive metaphors is that language does not only refer to mental models, but there is also a procedural system for the actualisation and activation of language knowledge and rules (Schwarz-Friesel 2015:147). However, it is not the purpose of this study to solve the problems in CMT theory. In this study, metaphor serves as a potentially powerful heuristic tool to create new realms of knowledge through the inputs of existing knowledge (Marquette 2007:697).

Metaphors and discourse

Metaphors are not merely thoughts but have the ability to activate the imagination of the recipients and initiate a process of understanding (Zimmermann 2000:108). In arguing, a speaker conveys communicative intention by displaying the target-claim to be correct (Bermejo-Luque 2011:159). Accordingly, to ascertain whether an argument is good or convincing, the argument is contingent on the correctness of the target-claim (Bermejo-Luque 2011:159). A good argument is built on compelling proofs. A normative model for reasoning deals with semantic conditions that determine the correctness of the target-claim as well as pragmatic conditions that determine how well an argument functions as communication (Bermejo-Luque 2011:159). The pragmatic conditions are concerned with the perlocutionary rather than the illocutionary (Bermejo-Luque 2011:159). Paul's use of the personification of Sin, Death, Law and Favour contributes in establishing the argument's claim that the body ruled by God is a protected and eternal space. What is more, in order for a metaphor to be persuasive, both the audience and the speaker should ascribe the same meaning to the metaphor (Breytenbach 2019:136), for example Paul's use of the baptism in Romans 6:4. The metaphor is relevant and convincing as the audience and Paul are aware of the source domain and easily pick up on the status change suggested in the target domain (see ch. 3 for more detail).

Metaphors have the power to motivate people to behave according to the image created by the metaphor (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:145). Metaphors are therefore persuasive tools, especially to provoke, to determine a change of the state of things or to promote certain attitudes (Schwarz-Friesel 2015:143; Zimmermann 2000:128). Paul's continual depiction of the body under God's Favour, instead of the body under Sin, motivates the audience to be obedient to God and align their bodies under God's Favour. What is more, within an argument metaphors can have an epistemic dimension (Breytenbach 2019:135).

Paul's stacking of the imagery not only moves the audience to want to undergo a status change but also imparts the knowledge on them that being under God's Favour has brought on their status change. The characteristic goal of an argument is to persuade (a perlocutionary achievement) using justifications (an illocutionary achievement) (Bermejo-Luque 2011:155). Moreover, metaphors gain their full value when they occur in a discourse (Kövecses 2010:14). The abundance of Paul's images guides the audience in service of his macro-argument that a believer cannot be separated from the love of God. The choice of imagery is also important as the more plausible the mapping from source domain to target domain, the more relevant the metaphor becomes for the overall argument (Breytenbach 2019:137).

Metaphors as tools of persuasiveness in discourse

Humans are wired to recognise patterns (Runge 2010:16). Within a discourse, there are patterns that can be delineated. Elena Semino (2008:54) rightly remarks that these patterns also indicate communicative creativity.[24] Rhetorical patterns abet to constitute conceptual metaphors (Eubanks 1999:420). These patterns not only establish a better account of conceptual metaphors but also provide insight into cultural phenomena and other discursive forms (Eubanks 1999:420). In Romans 5–8, it becomes clear that being under the dominion of someone or something is part and parcel of everyday life. Paul uses this cultural understanding to reframe believers' relationship with God.

The development and context of metaphors within the frame of entire texts showcase the structural and rhetorical brilliance of these texts (Di Biase-Dyson 2016:63). Paul cohesively paints a picture for believers of what the protection of God through the body of Christ implies for their mortal bodies and the enlivening thereof into spiritual bodies.

Semino (2008:22–30) lists various patterns that metaphors may display in a text. I tabulate this list as seen in Table 1.1.

The function of metaphors in communication should be considered to delineate the value for discourse (Semino 2008:30). For example, the conventional use of spatial prepositions such as 'in' or 'on' is almost unavoidable (Semino 2008:30). However, general theories should be traced with regard to the following questions: Why do particular metaphorical patterns occur in a language? (Semino 2008:31) or, as is the case with Paul's argument in Romans 5–8, What does Paul want to achieve with his argument? I argue that Paul establishes a mental model concerning 'dominion' in Romans 5–8 by using

24. Lakoff and Turner (1989) focus primarily on creativity as a departure point from conventional conceptual metaphors.

TABLE 1.1: Patterns that metaphors may display in a text.

Pattern	Definition
Repetition	The repetition of particular metaphorical expressions
Recurrence	The different uses for expressions relating to the same source domain
Clustering	High density of metaphorical expressions (different source domains in a close proximity)
Extension	A specific sort of cluster (numerous metaphorical expressions belonging to the same domain in close proximity)
Combination-and-mixing	Metaphorical expressions drawing from diverse source domains within close proximity
Literal–metaphorical oppositions	Metaphorical punning
Signalling	Metaphorical expressions drawing attention to the presence of metaphors; words such as 'like'
Intertextual relationships	The metaphorical use of a direct quote

Source: Adapted from Semino (2008:22–30).

metaphors as a way to persuade his audience in Rome of his understanding of the relationship with Jesus Christ (Schwarz-Friesel 2015:143–160).

Mental models

An important facet of language and thought may be purveyed in two manners, namely as symbolic structures and systems or as cognitive processes and their mental representation in behaviour, thus symbol versus behaviour (Steen 2007:10). The former requires semiotic approaches and the latter cognitive and social sciences (Steen 2007:10). Symbolic structures and systems as cognitive processes are clearly envisioned within cognitive linguistics (Steen 2007:10). The semiotic attributes centre cognitive linguistics within the conventional view of language as a symbolic system. However, cognitive linguistics is not just about symbolic structure assertions, but also entails psychological validity, as the structure of grammar is mentally represented in the minds of the individual (Steen 2007:10–11). Accordingly, the connections that metaphors create between concepts establish mental models (Schwarz-Friesel 2015:143). Paul establishes a mental model for believers wherein their bodies are the specific place where the reign of God occurs. This reign is associated with life (cf. Rm 5:21), bearing fruit (cf. Rm 6:23) and being filled with overflowing love (cf. Rm 5:5).

Discourse structures are a result of mental models (Van Dijk 2008:17). Accordingly, contexts control discourse production and comprehension (Van Dijk 2008:17). Paul's discourse cannot be understood separately from his Greco-Roman world and its fluid understanding of a body's porosity concerning different powers and subsequent dominion. Such mental models are cognitive representations of humans' experiences (Van Dijk 2008:61). Paul does not shy away from addressing any suffering that believers may experience.

He illustrates, with the image of the body, that the mortal body is subjected to decay. It is the spiritual body that is exempt from any suffering. Paul portrays the believers' experience of their ultimate protection in their bodies as a result of God's love through the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ (cf. Rm 5:6–10). This concomitantly entails that believers participate in the glory of the Father on account of their status change through baptism (Rm 6:4). Mental models presuppose large amounts of 'world knowledge' and the activation of relevant parts of this knowledge (Marquette 2007:698; Van Dijk 2008:63). Paul uses the experience of baptism as a catalysator for his bodily mental model sketching an 'in–out' status. The body in Paul's discourse is a result of his own understanding of God's relationship with believers. God is not some power or force up in the air, but lives in the body of the believer, providing life.

Metaphor versus reality

The assumed distinction between literal and metaphorical often incites debate, which derives from the close analysis of non-literary and particularly spoken language's indication that metaphors are a construct of language (Fludernik, Freeman & Freeman 1999:384). A preference for referring to things, such as resurrection, as metaphors in theological debates derives especially from Bultmann's demythologisation. The cognitive paradigm replaced the anti-literal and literal conceptions of metaphor thereby inverting the binary (Fludernik et al. 1999:385). Cognitive linguists are interested in the thought process used for understanding a person's environment. Paul's language is immersed in metaphorical expressions, as notions such as 'being buried with' or 'crucified together with' cannot be understood in a literal manner. However, caution should be exercised to not label all things metaphorical. Paul's use of 'dying for' illustrates the problem. Presupposing that Christ factually had died for 'us', he did not intend a person to literally die for something but did imply that a person should die to the body of flesh (Engberg-Pedersen 2010:175). Some metaphors have a literal as well as a metaphorical meaning (Engberg-Pedersen 2010:15), for example in Romans 8:22, the image of the 'pain of childbirth'. The possibility can thus not be denied that Paul experienced the powers and forces embattling the body as physical entities.

Outline

In Chapter 1, the research landscape is plotted introducing the objectives of this study. Some general considerations concerning Paul and discourse are established. Conceptual metaphor theory and the manner in which imagery contributes to persuasion in an argument are contoured.

Chapter 2 defines the hegemonic framework that underpins this study. Metaphors of dominion are introduced along with parameters to accommodate

deficiencies in CMT. The relationship with space, dominion and status within the hegemonic framework is purveyed.

Chapter 3 traces metaphors of dominion in the argument. Detailed analysis, along with the application of MIPVU, allows the identification of metaphors of dominion. The persuasive force of these metaphors is continually under scope, especially the relationship between the dominator and the dominated space. Persuasive patterns are delineated and the spatial reasoning that unfolds is also explored.

Chapter 4 explores the body as a contested space. This chapter sheds light on hegemony and the body. The relationship between believers and God is purveyed from the vantage point of spatiality. The body as a means to persuade believers that Jesus Christ is 'our' Lord is investigated as an 'image schema'. This reveals Paul's 'in–out' thinking concerning the dominion of Christ or Sin.

A conclusion is drawn in Chapter 5. The main points of the argument are highlighted reiterating that the body is the space where forces and powers vie for dominion. Key points of the study, such as metaphors of dominion and hegemony and the body, are summarised.

Chapter 2

Metaphors of dominion

Introduction

This chapter explores conceptual metaphors within the frame of dominion. Within this frame of dominion, space may be delineated. Various metaphors, *inter alia* orientational metaphors and ontological metaphors, the latter of which can be sub-categorised as personification and container metaphors, function as heuristic tools to help understand metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8. The space implied within these metaphors is clear as dominion suggests a dominator ruling over a specific location. Metaphors contributing to dominion, such as metaphors of subjugation, for example the slavery and marriage metaphors, are also surveyed. These metaphors are implicitly linked to space, but not as imminent as, for example, orientational metaphors. This chapter provides a framework for metaphors of dominion from which to navigate the use of dominion and space in this study. Personifications of powers such as Law, Sin and Death are written with a capital letter in this study.

Metaphors of dominion and space

A discussion concerning the metaphors of dominion requires a hegemonic framework. Intrinsically dominion encompasses a relationship with a definite hierarchy. This relationship between a dominator that is always linked to a

How to cite: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'Metaphors of dominion', in *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* (HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7), pp. 17–34, AOSIS, Cape Town. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248.02

specific locality or space and something or someone being dominated pertains implicitly to a spatial dimension where the dominator is 'on top' and the dominated is 'under'. Space may be defined as 'an active milieu that both influences and are influenced by social interactions' (Thate 2014:300).

The position of a person is of importance when determining his or her status. The implication of said ascertained status is incumbent to whom or what is defined as the dominator. Conspicuously status reflects a person's relationship with the dominator. A change in hegemony impels a change in the status of the dominated space and its object.

Orientational metaphors

In light of Paul's argument in Romans 5–8, a fundamental delineation is determining believers' position within hegemonic relationships. Paul especially draws on metaphorical language to describe what believers' new position entails. In this regard, Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) orientational metaphors serve as a helpful tool in demarcating position in terms of dominion. The direction 'up' is perceived as positive and 'down' or 'being under' as negative (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:15). Within this frame, having control or power is perceived as 'up', and conversely, being subject to control or power is perceived as 'down' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:15). Orientational metaphors derive from a person's perception of his or her body within a physical environment, thus providing a frame of spatial orientation (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:14). In recent metaphor scholarship, orientational metaphors are often regarded as having no metaphorical value because of their conventionality (Horn 2016:12). Despite the conventional use, CMT has a major limitation, namely that it was developed with contemporary literature in mind. The cognitive function of orientational metaphors is to affirm a set of target concepts coherently in a conceptual system (Kövecses 2010:40). Orientational metaphors are vital in establishing a mental model within the discourse of Romans 5–8 that the body is a contested space.

In the case of Paul's letter to the Romans, the 1st-century milieu must be excogitated. Lakoff and Johnson's determination of 'being under' as always negative is not valid in Paul's context. Rather, it is the force under which a person is positioned that serves as the measure for what is perceived as good and bad.

This is especially prevalent in Paul's use of prepositions. Paul's employment of the preposition ὑπό with an accusative is significant. This expression denotes subjection literally and indicates being under something or someone's authority or control (Smyth 1956:388).[25] Within the scope of Romans 5–8, this expression

25. It could also indicate motion, but in this context, it would be nonsensical.

is used five times: ὑπό νόμον 'under Law' and ὑπὸ χάριν 'under Favour' both occurrences in Romans 6:14, 15; and ὑπὸ ἁμαρτίαν 'under Sin' in Romans 7:14. In Lakoff and Johnson's theory, all these powers are the dominators and accordingly oppress that which is beneath them. The powers Law, Favour and Sin function as dominators with believers being positioned 'under' it. Within this frame, the Law, when manipulated by Sin as well as sin,[26] is perceived as bad. Favour is associated with God and therefore perceived as good.

Not only can a believer be under the dominion of a power but also be within the space of a power, thus 'in'. Paul often applied ἐν to designate a close personal relationship with regard to the referent of the ἐν-term functioning as the controlling influence (e.g. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [Rm 6:23]) (Bauer et al. 2000:327). Paul varied the function of the referent oscillating between a locative (e.g. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 6:11]) and an instrumental (e.g. ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [Rm 8:39]) implication of the dative. The locative use of the dative describes a situation of dominion as a believer's in-or-out orientation defines which controlling influence is dominant. The dative of instrument functions as a vehicle transporting a person to the controlling influence's space of dominion, but is not a metaphor of dominion *per se*. This becomes confusing as Paul varied between ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ instrumentally and other times as a specific situation to be in. This difficulty receives further attention in the exegetical analysis in Chapter 3. Additionally, Paul's use of the preposition διά in phrases, such as διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (Rm 5:21), functions as a metaphor of dominion as the preposition διά can indicate 'within the domain of' (Black 1984:85; Smyth 1956:374).

Essentially, ὑπό, ἐν and διά convey the position of believers in relation to powers among which Sin, Favour and Christ intend to exert lordship. Being under or in or within the domain of the dominion of Christ has profound implications concerning the in–out status of believers. Believers' in-status enables them to partake in eternal life (Rm 5:21), in the glory of God and walk in the newness of life (Rm 6:4) to be set free (Rm 8:2). In contrast, out-status entails a situation of being a body of Sin or Death (Rm 6:6, 7:24) – a state from which a person requires rescuing from the dominating power controlling his or her body. The concept of being controlled or dominated is negative from a modern vantage point, but in the light of Paul's argument, being dominated by Christ is positive. Coincidently, this idea of being dominated needs to be redefined from the perception of dominion in the appropriate 1st-century CE milieu. Consequently, parameters must be ascertained to apply Lakoff and Johnson's orientational metaphors as heuristic tools within the framework of space and dominion found in Romans 5–8.

26. Paul uses ἁμαρτία in some cases, not as a personification, but as a metonymic device referring to all things that may obscure a relationship with God.

Defining parameters for space and dominion

Paul wrote the letter to the Romans during a time that Rome was the undisputed superpower of the ancient world (Peachin 2006:128). At the core of its success lay its military prowess (Kelly 2006:6).[27] The military played a paramount role in establishing Roman colonies, spreading Roman law, mores and social patterns throughout the empire (Krentz 2003:347). Auxiliary troops were stationed throughout the provinces and legions defended the geographical areas they were assigned to. In Rome, a standing army was a visual reminder of the power and control of the emperor (Adams 2007:224, 232).[28] Although the primary role of the army was to secure the interest of the empire, the inhabitants of Rome and its provinces would have been more affected by the military's secondary function, namely to help governors and other representatives of Caesar to maintain law and order (Adams 2007:222). Every person living in the Roman provinces was subjected to Roman rule. The *Pax Romana* enhanced travelling benefits as roads were secured by soldiers who were stationed to provide safe passage as robbers threatened travellers' safety (Porter 2011:164). Paul was bound to have met soldiers on the march, pursuing bandits or escorting prisoners (Williams 1999:215).

The army, *inter alia*, became a vehicle for integration and assimilation (Adams 2007:216).[29] It served as an impetus for economic development and also enforced the Roman Empire's policies and authority (Adams 2007:232). The presence of soldiers also affected the economy of its surroundings as created networks of contacts that resulted in the interplay between Roman and indigenous groups (Adams 2007:229). The army became a focus of trade as soldiers earned more than civilians and merchants often catered for the specific tastes of soldiers, for example, wine from Gaul (Adams 2007:225). Paul would have been acutely aware of the Roman military colonies and consciously positioned himself in colonies such as Antioch, Lystra, Iconium, Troas, Philippi and Corinth, thus staying on the main trade routes of the Roman Empire (Breytenbach 2013a:102). Philippi was a Roman military colony founded by Mark Anthony in 42 BCE and refounded by Octavian in 31 BCE (Krentz 2000:272). Thessalonica was an unimportant city until the Romans elevated it as the capital of Macedonia (Krentz 2000:272). Corinth, from where

27. The Roman military became more organised, especially after the attacks of Hannibal during the Second Punic War, and continued to optimise. It was a unique appearance in the ancient world as Rome's military was becoming a profession.

28. The stationing of troops in Rome was always disliked during the Republic, but during Octavian's rule stationed troops in Rome became the norm (Rankov 2007:43–44). To make the army less conspicuous in Rome, they wore a toga over their uniform. Cf. Mart. 6.76; Tac. His. 1.38; Ann. 16.27.

29. By the middle of the 1st century CE, only half of the legionaries were Italian and the figure dropped to one in five by the end of the 1st century (Rankov 2007:42). Haynes (1999:165) sheds light on the capacity of the army to transform the cultural identity of those who passed through its ranks.

Paul wrote the letter to the Romans, was refounded by Julius Caesar as a Roman colony and served as the capital of Achaia (Krentz 2000:272).[30] The colonists of Corinth promoted their status as legitimate successors and inheritors of the Greek city Corinth, re-establishing the Isthmian Games and adopting symbols and images in Corinth as their own (Millis 2010:25). Corinth was militarily strategically placed (Millis 2010:33) and Rome capitalised from its location by populating the city with veterans to create the population they wanted (Millis 2010:33). The most active mint during the Julio-Claudian period was based in Corinth, with many coins bearing references to imperial ancestry (Hekster et al. 2014:15; Hoskins Walbank 2010:151). The coinage not only served as evidence for Roman propaganda but also indicated that communication between Rome and Corinth was better than with for example Caesarea (Hekster et al. 2014:16).

The military was regarded as an honourable profession (Rankov 2007:65) enabling men to be regularly fed, a real privilege in the ancient world, as well as taking care of their hygiene with baths and latrines (Rankov 2007:69). However, civilians regarded soldiers as thugs enjoying the legal privileges of the emperor's patronage (Haynes 1999:167),[31] which made them virtually unassailable (Adams 2007:219).[32] Even emperors were alarmed by soldiers' actions. Tiberius's response to a prefect of Egypt who sent more tribute than stipulated was that he 'wanted his sheep shorn, not flayed' (Adams 2007:217).[33] In contrast to the army, most of the population (90%) lived in a narrow margin between subsistence and starvation (Punt 2016:201). Krentz (2000:279), however, rightly points out that Paul's political thought, rhetoric, ethical teaching and knowledge of the religions of his time as it manifests in his letters attest that he was not deprived. Furthermore, the propaganda of the Roman Empire perpetuated their status as superior rulers. The exploited[34] were kept in an oppressed condition and were even persuaded to rejoice in it. They were portrayed as unsuitable to rule, a task which was better suited to their superiors (De Ste. Croix 1980:409).

Rome changed as a result of its wars. The city was engulfed in a culture celebrating military victory in art, coins, rhetoric, historiography, triumphal arches and columns extolling imperial virtues associated with military conquest (Kelly 2006:11; Pollard 2006:206–227). Successful warfare brought monumental

30. Cf. Plut. *Caes*. 57.8.

31. Military service did not change or necessarily isolate soldiers from civilians, but changed the way they interacted with them.

32. Soldiers oppressing civilians is not a mere literary *topos.* Apart from evidence in the New Testament, it was also the subject of governor's edicts, imperial legislation and Roman law (Adams 2007:217).

33. Cf. Id Cass 57.10.5.

34. The exploited would have entailed most of society as the elite only made up a small percentage of people.

buildings along the triumphal procession route as well as a drive for buildings and infrastructure that also brought honour and prestige not only to individuals but also to their *gens* (Adams 2007:201).

Warfare was central to Roman society (Adams 2007:231; Keazirian 2014:117), and not just to its army, but also to its citizens as attested by the popularity of the gladiatorial games (Krentz 2003:347).[35] Roman institutions spread throughout the empire accompanied by the arena, the circus and the Roman bath (Krentz 2003:347). Sponsorship of gladiatorial games demonstrated the genuine Roman character of a city and was also a political and social statement (Krentz 2003:347). Although Roman dominion was celebrated and encouraged, Paul moved about in this geographical area ruled by a unified imperial power using Greek, the *lingua franca* of a previous power (Ehrensperger 2012:10).[36]

Apart from the extensive influence of the army established in the Roman Empire, a second parameter concerning dominion and space, namely freedom, must be considered. Freedom entailed being free socially and politically or free from obligation or control (Bauer et al. 2000:316–317). James Harrison (2003:240) remarks that Paul would have agreed with Epictetus that the much-discussed *topos* of 'freedom of the virtuous man' was illusionary under the lordship of the Caesars. Accordingly, freedom meant to allow oneself to be controlled (Schlier 1964:496). Per implication, this meant allowing the right power to control one. For the Romans, this entailed Roman rule exacting Roman law. For Paul, the dominion of Christ creates a position of abundant life for a believer who benefits from his or her in-status.

Thirdly, the notion of subjection is not the problem, but rather, whom to be subjected to. The domination of Rome brought a new culture, even if that meant having to pay tribute to a new ruler as a client-king, that was to dominate the Mediterranean and beyond for many centuries (Adams 2007:208). The system of vassal kings developed, only affecting diplomatic and political relations on a level of tribute paid to the new power. Vassal kings were described as 'slaves of their sovereign' in Iran. In conformity with the Arsacid protocol, Tiridates says to Nero:

> 'Master, I, a descendant of Arsaces, brother of the kings Vologeses and Pacorus, am your slave … My fate will be what you make of it, for you are my destiny and my fortune'.[37]

35. The gladiatorial games were in origin honorific military funeral games initiated by the family of the deceased in his honour. As time passed, this initial funeral association faded. The gladiatorial games were meant for slaves, prisoners of war, criminals and professionals and those perceived as having very low status. Citizens were not allowed to partake, and if they did, could risk the ultimate disgrace *infamia*, loss of status and citizenship (Krentz 2003:347).

36. The Romans were strongly influenced by various aspects of Greek cultures, such as architecture, sculpture, philosophy, theatre and religion (Sacks & Brody 2005:296).

37. Cf. Dio Cassius 63.5.2 (Spicq 1994c:383).

One should keep in mind that under Roman rule, the representatives of the authorities exerting dominion over the vassal state changed swiftly, with the result that most people were not as concerned with who the ruler was, but more with keeping the peace with Rome.

Coins, inscriptions, portraits and titles functioned as Roman media acquainting different audiences with their rulers (Hekster et al. 2014:8). It is possible to trace audience targeting as certain coins, portraits and titles were tailor-made with specific audiences in mind (Hekster 2014:8). It is unthinkable that living within the Roman Empire would not have influenced Paul as well as his auditors. I assume that Paul drew on the language of dominion influenced by the Roman Empire, utilising the imagery that would have resonated with his audience. This would be true, especially in Rome with the intent to drive his discourse of Jesus Christ 'our Lord'. Furthermore, such language participated in Roman ideas of conquest and mapping, which expressed the unity of different provincials under a single imperium (Harrill 2012:165). Orientational metaphors are of vital importance when establishing powers at work contending to gain dominance over a person. Especially in Romans 5–8, the in–out orientation of believers concerning their position to other powers is key in determining the controlling power. In contention with recent attempts to indicate Paul as anti-imperial, I postulate that Paul's writing advanced a particularly Roman discourse of 'clout' (*auctoritas*) (Harrill 2012:165)[38] over subordinates and colleagues, an unofficial authority that provoked the challenge of rivals (Harrill 2012:165).

Ontological metaphors

Determining a person's position within the frame of dominion is crucial to comprehend the person's experience in terms of physical objects and substances to enrich the framework even more (Kövecses 2010:39). Ontological metaphors, like orientational metaphors, are transmitted from experiences with physical objects, especially bodies (Kövecses 2010:39). Ontological metaphors enhance the understanding of the experience of physical objects and substances offering various ways of viewing events, activities, emotions and ideas as entities and substances (Kövecses 2010:39). It gives form to a concept structure that was previously undefined and accordingly delineates experiences more sharply (Kövecses 2010:39). For example, 'we need to combat inflation' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:26). Inflation is the previously undefined concept treated as an object with a substance. This sheds light on the perception of events and ideas (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:25). These types of metaphors are so pervasive to thought that they are often overlooked.

38. The language of *auctoritas* especially participated in Roman ideas of conquest and mapping. The language of *auctoritas* is more advice than command.

However, these metaphors are necessary to deal rationally with experiences, especially as the purpose of these metaphors is often to refer, to quantify, to identify aspects or causes and to set goals (Kövecses 2010:39; Lakoff & Johnson 1980:26).

There are especially two types of ontological metaphors that can be deduced in Romans 5–8, namely personification and container metaphors.

Personification

Personification involves the attribution of human characteristics to nonhuman entities (Kövecses 2010:39; Lakoff & Johnson 1980:33). Zoltán Kövecses (2010:39) rightly remarks that personification utilises the best source domain, namely 'ourselves', Personification is a trope of character invention and have 'the power to make present' and 'to lend speech to mute things' (Southall 2008:74). It enables the interpreter to delineate how a person reacts to the personification and what it does. Personification should not be confused with hypostasis (Dodson 2008:40).

Paul personified various powers, such as Sin, Death, Favour and the Law.[39] These powers, especially Death and Law, are often marked by the definite article in conjunction with the noun, but also appear anarthrous (Moulton 1963:175–177). Accordingly, no set pattern can be deduced in Paul's use of Sin, Death, Favour or Law as he often used nuances.[40] These nouns do not always function as personifications as explained in Chapter 3.

The source domain of Sin

Human qualities are attributed to Sin on numerous occasions in the argument of Romans 5–8. The combination of the definite article and the noun (ἡ ἁμαρτία) particularly signals the personification of Sin as an entity. In Romans 5:12, Sin is introduced into the argument as a power that invades (ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰσῆλθεν). Throughout the scope of Romans 5–8, the personification of Sin becomes more vivid with new qualities attributed to it, for example, reigns (Rm 5:21); people are slaves to it (Rm 6:6, 17, 20); pays it wages (Rm 6:23); takes an opportunity (Rm 7:8,11); people are sold into Sin's service (Rm 7:14) and dwells in humans (Rm 7:17, 20) (Bauer et al. 2000:51).

The personification of ἁμαρτία 'Sin' is a unique occurrence in Pauline literature (Stählin & Grundmann 1964:296).[41] Paul used various terms for Sin,

39. There are more personifications especially in Romans 6:15–23. The creation (κτίσις) is also personified in Romans 8, but as it does not occur continually, it is mentioned in Chapter 3.

40. Within the scope of Romans 5–8, Righteousness, as well as the Creation, is personified, but remarks concerning these personifications are dealt with in Chapter 3.

41. The fullest and deepest development of Sin occurs in Paul and John, but nowhere else Sin is as developed as in Romans (Günther 1978:577, 579).

but the bulk thereof can be seen in Romans with 41 of the 48 occurrences in Romans 5:12–8:3.[42] The frequency of Sin in Romans is not indicative of Paul being obsessed with Sin (Morris 1993b:877), but rather reflective of how Paul understood the relationship with God.[43] For Paul, Sin functions as a power or force. He thinks of Sin in personal terms (Bauer et al. 2000:51).[44]

As discussed in Chapter 1, Wasserman (2008a:388) argues that Paul used Sin to stand for one of the 'irrational passions' that 'operate as an evil counter-ruler within the soul'. Platonic discourse explains the attributes and functions of Sin throughout Romans 6–8: it rules (Rm 6:12), enslaves (Rm 6:13, 18, 20; 7:14), makes war (Rm 7:23), imprisons (Rm 7:23) and kills (Rm 7:10, 11, 13). However, Paul does not view Sin as part of human nature as God created it (Morris 1993b:878), but a ruling power that invades the human world. Paul is seemingly not interested in the origin of Sin (Dodson 2008:185)[45] as it is not part of the soul, but a sickness or infestation as described in Romans 5:12.

Without any parallels in Greek literature for Paul's use of ἁμαρτία,[46] Sin is often defined from the vantage point of the Torah. The Torah is devoid of a main general word for Sin (Günther 1978:577).[47] Befittingly, the law (νόμος) of God functions as a measure for Sin (Günther 1978:577; Stählin & Grundmann 1964:289–293). The Torah is coupled with the will of God, and a transgression against the commands of the Torah, or to not be obedient to it, is regarded as sin and hostility against God in terms of the Judaist concept of Sin (Günther 1978:578; Stählin & Grundmann 1964:289). However, such a measure becomes insufficient in light of Paul's personification of Sin. For example, in Romans 7:9, Sin sprang to life through the law, and in Romans 7:13, Sin is depicted as a force manipulating the law.

A suggestion from the Torah, although not systematically formulated, that is ever-present in Paul's use of Sin or sin, personified or not, is that the result of Sin or sin is death (Günther 1978:578; Morris 1993b:878). In Romans 5:12, Sin

42. Out of the more than 30 words in the New Testament that describe Sin, Paul employed at least 24. Especially in Romans, Paul used ἁμαρτία 48 times, παράπτωμα 9 times, ἁμαρτάνω 7 times, ἁμαρτολός 4 times, κακός 15 times and ἀδικία 7 times (Morris 1993b:877–881; Southall 2008:97).

43. In the NT, Sin is always used as humans' Sin directed against God (Günther 1978:579). Paul does not define sin, but interprets it as an offence against other people and God (Morris 1993b:877).

44. In Sirach 27:10, Sin lies and waits for his prey like a lion and in Genesis 4:7, Sin is lurking at the door. See also 1 QH 1:27; 4:29–30.

45. Morris (1993b:878) mentions that Paul refers to the fall as a starting point resembling Jewish thinking concerning Adam and Eve with Eve as the true culprit in the narrative (Sir 25:24; Life of Adam and Eve). However, Eve does not feature in Romans 5:12.

46. From Aesch. onwards, the noun ἁμαρτία cognates 'to make a mistake' or denotes the failure to reach a goal, mainly spiritual, with the result of such an act committed against friends or one's own body. The Greek view of a mistake is intellectually orientated around the result of some ignorance (Günther 1978:577–583). However, this is not what Paul had in mind when he drew on the source domain of ἁμαρτία.

47. The fullest and deepest development of sin occurs in Paul and John (Günther 1978:579).

enters into humanity and through it, Death. In Romans 7:11, it becomes clear that Sin is a power that kills and deceives humans. Sin is a universal problem (Morris 1993b:878), [48] manoeuvring in the human race and continues to do so through humans (Morris 1993b:879).

Two strands of thought can be demarcated from Paul's personification of Sin. On the one hand is the subjection of all humans to the power of Sin from which they can be redeemed only through God's once-and-for-all act of salvation in Jesus Christ (Günther 1978:581). On the other hand, there is a call to all believers to turn to this new righteousness in faith and to be servants of Christ instead of servants of Sin and then to walk in the spirit of Christ (Günther 1978:581).

Paul did not consistently apply ἁμαρτία as a personification within the pericope of Romans 5–8. Sin sometimes functions as an obstacle in the relationship with God, for example in Romans 6:2. What exactly is intended with these obstacles are unclear, but the Torah can be used to fill in the gaps.

A configuration must be made between 'sin' and 'sins'. Exponents such as Arland Hultgren (2011:243) and Peter Frick (2007:206) argue that the occurrence of ἁμαρτία in the singular refers to Sin as a personified power and 'sins' in the plural as an ethical reality in the broadest sense of the word. However, such delineation does not contribute to an understanding of sin or Sin or sins. With regard to the frame of dominion, Paul did not provide a systematic teaching of sin or Sin but described the victory of Jesus Christ over the powers of Law, Sin and Death (Barrosse 1953:458; Günther 1978:581).

There is a debate concerning the personification of Sin that hinges on whether sin should be equated as a demonic force or not. Bauer et al. (2000:51) explain that Paul understood sin as a destructive evil power. N.T. Wright (2002:457) goes so far as to view sin as a synonym for Satan. Similarly, Beverly Gaventa (2011:275) questions the ontological status of both Sin and Death as Paul's environment reflected the belief that humans are subjected to powers in the form of demons. Timo Laato (1995:75) asserts that Sin is a personal superhuman. Drawing on Dibelius (1909:122), Sin is a hypostatised being 'exerting a trans subjective reign of terror over the whole cosmos'. Matthew Croasmun (2014:147) also notes that Sin is not a 'mere personification' or a 'mere metaphor' but a social power embedded in institutional structures. In German scholarship, Günther Röhser (2012:84–110) reacts to the circumscribed gnostic emanation of sin, whereas exponents like Ernst Käsemann and Ulrich Wilckens purport a power reflective of Paul's conceptualisation of demonology and Rudolf Bultmann refers to sin as a 'Tat' (Southall 2008:108). Röhser rejects both positions and I agree with him that the personification of Sin should be curtailed to Romans 5:12–8:2 with the focus on its rhetorical function. What is

48. The universality of Sin is also evident in the Torah (Gn 6:5; 8:21; Hs 12; Is 64:6).

clear in Paul's argument is that Jesus Christ is upheld as the Lord to whom a believer should be obedient to and this is a prerequisite for a relationship with God. Paul considers Christ to be the dominant power in a believer's body if the believer submits to Christ. Sin, however, remains a problem reigning in the flesh, although the power of Jesus Christ supplants it. The possibility persists for a believer to fall back into sin or Sin (Röhser 2012:110).

☐ The source domain of Death

The personification of Death as a power is also signalled by the appearance of the definitive article with the noun (ὁ θάνατος). Death (ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν [Rm 5:12]) spreads through Sin and is explicitly portrayed as a reigning ruler (ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος [Rm 5:14, 17]).

Unlike Sin, the personification of Death is not unusual in ancient literature (Schmithals 1975:431). Roman dining rooms in imperial times had pictures of a skeleton with the inscription: 'know thyself' as an invitation to not miss out on the pleasures of the moment (Schmithals 1975:431). The personification of Death was often negatively used, for example in Eur. Alcestis 28 where death is personified as a demon or monster from the underworld (Schmithals 1975:431). The horror of death cannot be ignored as life was viewed as the absolute good (Bultmann 1966:8).

Harrison (2013b:86) rightly remarks that too much focus is placed on Death as a cosmological power without cognisance that imperial Rome was entrenched in a 'culture of death'. The Roman engrossment with death reached various sources including the epigraphic, papyrological, monumental, iconographic, numismatic and literary covering different genres of literature (Harrison 2013b:91). The voice of the masses is lost as it is only possible to observe from the nobles' point of view (Harrison 2013b:90–91). The audience lived in the capital under the Neronian 'reign of death', as Harrison (2013b:87) puts it and suicide became a way to protest against Nero (Harrison 2013b:88). Traditionally, the death of nobles was perceived in the late Republic as promoting the ancestral glory of a house, but during the Julio-Claudian reign, the funerary eulogies were curtailed, lest they meant to challenge the honour of the Julian house (Harrison 2013b:87–88).

During Nero's reign, a group of senators and equestrians decided to partake in the gladiatorial games with the hope to achieve *amor mortis*, the gladiator's love of death, which offered them a chance to redeem themselves as, even in light of the despised status, a gladiator could achieve honour if he died without flinching in the face of death (Harrison 2013b:89). Such extreme measures exemplified the dire situation of nobles left without the possibility to obtain honour through military virtue achieved in a public competition for the noble houses on account of the emperor's patronage (Harrison 2013b:89). This, along with the growing autocracy, furthered a psychological culture of what

Harrison (2013b:87) labels: 'living death'. Harrison (2013b:92) cogently argues that even if there is no evidence of the mass culture's experience of death, any person in the Roman audience suffering the excesses of Nero would have been moved by Paul's 'reign of grace' in Romans 5:12–21.

Another problem with applying CMT to Paul is that he did not truly envision believers to die. Walter Schmithals (1975:437) argues that Paul did not reflect on death as a biological phenomenon, but as a theological problem as a result of sin or Sin that incites the reason for death. This view is partly true, but cannot be consistently applied to Paul as cognition of biological death does surface in Paul's use, for example Romans 6:4 refers to the biological death of Jesus. Clifton Black (1984:413–433) cogently remarks that death is for Paul an exceptionally appropriate metaphor illustrating believers' pre-Jesus existence as it captures the estrangement and alienation from God, which is the essence of sin.

Again, Paul did not continually personify death in Romans 5–8 and as is the case with Sin, its function should be viewed within the unfolding argument.

The source domain of Favour

In Romans 5:21, ἡ χάρις is depicted as an entity that reigns, as the definite article with the noun signals. However, in Romans 6:14,15, χάρις is also personified as a force to submit to, even though the definite article is not employed. Paul used χάρις to refer to a relation between God and humankind (Breytenbach 2014:349). Throughout Romans 5–8, χάρις is translated as favour or Favour, to communicate God's beneficial action towards underserving humans (Du Toit 2009:126).[49]

Χάρις functions on two levels, namely the gods favouring humans as seen in Homer, Il. 2.12; 6.235; 6.19; 17.63 and usually takes the form of concrete gifts of services, for example, in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (581).[50] Agamemnon remarks it is the favour of Zeus that enabled the army to conquer Troy. The reverse is also true, as χάρις can also be used to signify a 'human' request for the gods to show favour, for example Pindar, Nem. 10.30. Another level, χάρις, functions between people, for example in Homer's Iliad 4.95, Athena tells the son of Lycaon that if he kills Menelaus, he would win the χάρις of the Trojans (Joubert 2005:188–191). However, two important developments in later antiquity influenced the reception of χάρις in the New Testament.

G.P. Wetter (1913:2) was the first to investigate whether the Christian idea of χάρις is also prevalent in the ancient Greek association of the word. He argued that Paul introduced a word that was foreign to Judaism. Χάρις usually

49. The term χάρις is heavily clustered in Romans (it appears 23 times).

50. In connection with gods, see Hom Il 5.874; 23,650; Aischyl. Ag. 581; 821–823; Bakchyl. 3.38 (Wagner-Hasel 1998:987).

designates the sovereign actions of the emperor. By the 1st century CE, χάρις became a central leitmotiv of the Hellenistic reciprocity system because of the Augustan 'age of grace', which ensured that nobody would be able to compete against munificence of the Caesars (Harrison 2003:63). This marks the first development as χάρις became a fixed term for the ruler's favour often seen in inscriptions, for example τῆι τοῦ θεοῦ Κλαυδιου χάριτι edict of Tiberius Alexander (Ditt. Or., II 669, 28) (Conzelmann & Zimmerli 1974:375). The noun denotes not only the attitude of the gods but also that of humans (Esser 1976:115).[51] In the relation of being the recipient of favour, χάρις means 'thanks' to the benefactor (Conzelmann & Zimmerli 1974:376; Wagner-Hasel 1998:984–988). The papyri confirm that ingratitude was a grave mistake and that the obligation on the recipient to express gratitude extended beyond the structures of the city-state into household relations (Harrison 2003:80). The reciprocity of Roman patronage was upheld to maintain the superiority of the donor over the client (Bauer et al. 2000:1079). Harrison (2003:352) argues that the parallel of the Augustan 'age of grace' with the eschatological reign of Christ would have been especially potent for Paul's Roman auditors.

Χάρις was perceived as a force in ancient times and often occurs with δύναμις (Harrison 2003:244). In the late Hellenistic period, χάρις developed to be perceived as a substantial power streaming from the divine (Conzelmann & Zimmerli 1974:376).[52] Paul often used expressions such as 'favour' (χάρις) and 'glory' (δόξα) to convey a notion of divine power (Arnold 1993:723–725). For Paul, χάρις is the essence of God's decisive saving act in Jesus Christ (Esser 1976:119). In Pauline use, χάρις carries the basic sense of 'favour' (Luter 1993:372–374; Bauer et al. 2000:1079), and a sense of love (Spicq 1994r:500). When God or Christ is involved, grace towards humankind is undeserved favour, especially concerning salvation (Luter 1993:372). Paul's use of χάρις is rooted in Jewish theological conception expressed in Greco-Roman language of benefaction (Breytenbach 2016:352).

☐ The source domain of Law

Paul attributes human qualities to the law three times within the scope of Romans 5–8. In Romans 5:20, νόμος is used without the definite article but introduced as an entity that 'slips in'; in Romans 7:1, the law rules (ὁ νόμος κυριεύει); and in Romans 7:7, the law said (ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν).

Paul is not the first to use the metaphor of governance concerning the law. Bondage under the law makes a human a citizen of a polis and in later Greek times of the cosmos, differentiating him or her from the slave who by nature

51. Χάρις for marriages, see Hom Il 14, 235; Soph. Ai, 522; Eur. Med. 1155. Χάρις, especially as military assistance in Hom. Il 15, 744; Hdt. 3, 140,4 (Wagner-Hasel 1998:987).

52. Cf. Corp. Herm. 1,32;13,12; Ascl., 41; Eur. Med. 439 (Kleinknecht 1967:1023–1035).

has no part or lot in the νόμοι by making him or her free as seen in Cicero, Pro Cluentio LIII, 146: *legum … idcirco omnes servi sumus, ut liberi esse possimus.*[53] In a quotation from Pausanias transmitted by Plutarch 'laws must be lords of men, not men lords of the laws' (τοὺς νόμους … τῶν ἀνδρῶν, ού τοὺς άνδρας τῶν νὸμων κυρίους εἶναι δεῖ).[54] The personification of νόμος is not foreign in Greek literature, unlike that of Sin, as νόμος was often personified and presented as a divine figure in poetry, for example Eur. Hec., 799.; Plat. Crito, 50a.[55] This stems from the common idea that the gods reigned supreme over humans and exercised power over those who evaded the gods' νόμος (Kleinknecht 1967:1035) as the concept νόμος is intrinsically linked to the Greek gods (Kleinknecht 1967:1035). Rejection of the rule of law is equivalent to apostasy, for example Plato Leg. IV, 701b/c (Kleinknecht 1967:1029).[56] The Greek word does not refer to personal moral conscience but to the objective knowledge of right and wrong condensed in the law (Kleinknecht 1967:1030). The imagery also develops in Plato that the ideal is not the dominion of law, but the rule of a righteous and kingly figure that possesses true knowledge.[57]

However, Paul's use of νόμος is challenging, especially as he never defined the content of νόμος (Räisänen 1987:16). Referring to the Torah, Paul upheld the importance of the law. Although, Paul personified νόμος in Romans 3:19 as a power speaking to those who are in the Law (ἐν τῷ νόμῳ), νόμος functions as an instrument in Romans 7. Paul makes it clear in Romans 7:12 that the Law is holy and good. The problem arises when the Law is used by Sin. Law in Romans 7 is not a force or a power, although Paul could use it like that, rather it functions as an instrument that can be good when the Lord is Jesus, but bad when the lord is Sin.

Container metaphors

Another type of metaphor that points to determining dominion is the container metaphor. These metaphors function on the same premise as orientational

53. In Cicero Pro. Cluent. 53, 146, Pla. Leg. III 701b; Aristotle Pol. 5,9, p.1310a, 34 (Kleinknecht 1967:1023–1035).

54. Cf. Plutarch Moralia vol. 2.1.

55. The phrase ὑπὸ νόμον also appears twice in Ps-Plato, Def. 415c; Ps-Longinus, Sublim. 33.5. Comparisons can also be made with Aristotle, Resp. 1270a6–8; Demosthenes, Or. 24, 131; Josephus, C. Ap. 2, 210. Jewett (2007:415) mentions that the formulation ὑπὸ νόμον is found in Plato's description of 'the mass of people bound by the same law' (ὑπὸ νόμον τὸν αὑτόν).

56. The Greek understanding was drastically influenced in the 5th century BCE by the discovery of multiple νόμοι 'laws'. The realisation of other people leads to two intrinsic ways to understand νόμος, namely, (1) νόμος which is essentially related to the idea that it can only be overthrown by an attack on religion, and (2) the crisis of νόμος that originates and culminates in the divinisation of the world (Kleinknecht 1967:1029). In Romans 5, Paul particularly, aligned believers with God as they have been reconciled.

57. Cf. Pol. 294 a/b; Plat. Leg., IX, 875 c/d Aristotle Pol., 3,13, p. 1284a. A description of νόμος as δεσπότης is also found in Hdt 7, 104.

metaphors pertaining to positioning, as an in–out projection is established (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:29). Unlike orientational metaphors, container metaphors establish humans as the containers with the surface of their skins functioning as the boundary to define the inside and outside orientation (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:29). Substances can also be viewed as containers (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:30). Accordingly, ἐν πνεύματι 'in the Spirit' (Rm 8:2) is also a container metaphor.

Container metaphors are used to comprehend events, actions, activities and states (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:30) like being 'in love' (Kövecses 2010:39; Lakoff & Johnson 1980:31). A state of dominion can also be conveyed with container metaphors, for example ἐν τῇ σαρκί 'in the flesh' (Rm 7:5) or ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι 'in your mortal body' (Rm 6:12) reflects in Pauline thought as being entrenched under the dominion of Sin. The container metaphor highlights the simplicity of an argument (Kövecses 2010:98). The conceptual metaphor 'mind is a container' is also seen in Romans 8:5–8.

Other metaphors of dominion

Ontological and orientational metaphors are intertwined with space. However, Paul used an array of images, some of which are not confined to a specific space, but are still relevant to draw attention to dominion, for example, the slavery and marriage metaphors.

The slavery metaphor

Modern interpreters often have difficulty with Paul not demonstrating concerns with the idea of power over others (Holland 1992:185–194). However, a modern ethics debate concerning slavery obscures the purpose of Paul's use of the imagery. Christine Gerber (2014:5) rightly warns about the complexity of using slave terminology, as it does not necessarily indicate slave status. Ceslas Spicq (1994f:380) deems the accurate translation of δοῦλος to be 'unfree'. Paul often drew from the imagery of slavery. Slavery as a source domain proves to be fruitful with polyvalent meanings and multiple mapping possibilities. The semantic domain of δοῦλος is listed as ranging from 'control, rule' and 'status' (Aageson 1996:77), which contributes to the effectiveness of the image of slavery.

The Greco-Roman slave system was an integral part of the empire in every aspect of life in Paul's time (Rupprecht 1993:881–883). During the first and second centuries, approximately 85%–90% of the inhabitants of Rome and the Italian peninsula were slaves (Rupprecht 1993:881). Seneca the Younger (c. 4 BCE–65 CE), the Roman Stoic philosopher, mentions the defeat of the Roman senate legislation to compel slaves to wear a particular type of clothing to distinguish them from free men because it was feared that the slaves would

realise how large a group they are and might revolt (Longenecker 2016:619–620).[58] Freed slaves played an important role in Roman society purely because their numbers increased during the 1st century (Rupprecht 1993:881). Under Roman laws, a slave could expect to be manumitted at age 30 (Rupprecht 1993:881).

Slavery was not only a practice in Greco-Roman society, but it was also legally protected (Longenecker 2016:619). It was a system that everyone would have been aware of and accordingly successfully communicated the target domain that is a change of status. This change of status entailed the change from being unfree to free. Freedom is interpreted as being subjected to the correct ruler. To be a slave meant to be attached to a master and above all, it referred to legal status that is an object of property (Spicq 1994f:381). The divide between being a slave and being free was permeable (Holland 1992:186). In Greco-Roman society, being a slave mattered less than the status of the slave's owner (Holland 1992:188).

Slaves had diverse job descriptions that ranged from labourers to philosophers; from farmers to physicians; and in the imperial administration, the most capable could advance (Spicq 1994f:383).[59] The education of slaves was encouraged as it enhanced their value (Bartchy 1993:1098–1102). In Rome, slaves from eastern origins were especially favoured as a result of the revolt of Spartacus in 73 BCE, whereas slaves of northern origins were more inclined to be put to hard labour which was in contrast to eastern slaves being trusted with the management of households, and could become teachers, librarians, accountants and estate managers (Rupprecht 1993:881). Jewish slaves were brought to Rome by the tens of thousands from the time of Pompey's conquest until the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE (Rupprecht 1993:881). Cicero even mentions that Judeans and Syrians are 'peoples born for slavery'.[60] It is the owner of the slaves who profits from their activity; thus their *opera* is his, just as the fruit of a tree belongs to the owner of the tree (Spicq 1994f:382). Although slaves received wages, Roman law procured a *peculium* for slaves, enabling them to set themselves up after they have been freed (Rupprecht 1993:881).[61]

In very early Roman history, slavery was the result of debt (Rupprecht 1993:881). Accordingly, mappings from this domain are non-present in Paul's slavery metaphors. During the late Republic, slaves were usually prisoners of

58. Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, De Clementia 1.24.1.

59. The job of praegustator led to the post of tricliniarcha (CIL. XI, 3612, n.10,68) and that of vestitor to procurator.

60. Cicero, De provinciis consularibus 10. This is not a new idea in Roman culture as Tacitus declares that in pre-Hellenistic times, Judeans were slaves regarded as the lowest low, a nation too 'degraded' to be properly Hellenized by Atiochus (Hist. 5.9).

61. The Roman law was better developed than the Jewish law, as it had the *peculiam* (Lyall 1970–1971:76).

war and the major sources for slaves were warfare and piracy (Rupprecht 1993:881). However, in the 1st century, with the stabilisation of the empire, the main source of slaves was their children (Longenecker 2016:620; Rupprecht 1993:881; Scheidel 2011:308).[62] In 52 CE, Emperor Claudius passed a law which enabled slaves to marry, although it was not called marriage (*contubernium*), with the provision that children from this union would be enlisted as slaves. This would probably have been the main source of slaves in Rome during the 1st century, although the importance of prisoners of war and piracy should not be ruled out.[63]

Being a slave did not implicate being at the bottom of the socio-economic pyramid, as it rather were free persons who had to look for work each day, occupied the lowest level and often opted for slavery to have job security, food, clothing and shelter (Bartchy 1993:1099). This is important, as Paul presented himself as a slave of Jesus Christ; proclaimed that he does not exclusively belong to any emperor; and stated that his existence, his mission and all of his activities are defined in terms of his master, Jesus Christ. If the slave is the object of the *dominica protestas*, then Paul had no legal status as a person entitled to no rights: 'servile caput nullum jus habet' (Diogenes Laertius) (Rupprecht 1993:882; Spicq 1994f:382). However, the idea of slaves of God was not used in Roman and Greek self-description (Bartchy 1993:1099).

The marriage analogy

The analogy in Romans 7:1–6 draws on the source domain of marriage law. The disposition of a married woman can be traced in the functioning of marriage law. Early Hebrew law was founded on a marriage purchase in which the woman who was deemed to be of low status became the husband's property, but the husband could not sell his wife (Livingstone 1997:1055). In the Greco-Roman world, marriage was held as a life-long monogamous partnership sharing civil and religious rights (Hawthorne 1993:594; Livingstone 1997:1055).[64] This seems surprising as numerous instances of polygamy and polyandry are seen in Greek myths. However, monogamy, as well as strict morality with regard to marriage, was upheld (Günther 1978:575). The Homeric hero is an example as he had one wife, faithful and inviolable, who is a mother and managed the home well (Günther 1978:575). There existed strict laws forbidding marriage between persons from close relationships, whether natural or adoptive, as well as marriage between classes (Hawthorne 1993:594).

62. Postulating it was slave trade and prisoners of war.

63. It is not sure whether the 'breeding' of slaves was of economic interest for the Romans (Gerber 2014:6).

64. Modestinus Digesta 23.2.1.

In the Greco-Roman world, a marriage between a free person and a bonded person was seen as repugnant (Livingstone 1997:1055).

Usually, the marriage law in Romans 7:2–3 is interpreted as referring to Mosaic Law as the woman cannot divorce (Lee 2010:330; Wolter 2014:414).[65] In contrast, divorce in Greco-Roman marriage law under the Roman Empire was readily available to the husband as well as the wife (Hawthorne 1993:594; Livingstone 1997:1054). Such a cessation did not require formal legal divorce proceedings as a simple oral or written notification was sufficient (Hawthorne 1993:594).

Divorce is, however, not within the periphery of the analogy in Romans 7:2–3 as it is concerned with the death of the husband. In Greco-Roman marriage law, death terminated a marriage, but the same is true in Jewish marriage law. This is a general notion and marriage law concerning this specific point of order could be Jewish or Greco-Roman.

Integrating metaphors of dominion

Both orientational and ontological metaphors are concerned with the perception of space. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:17) remark that most of our primary concepts stem from the systematisation of spatial metaphors. The quest to understand the physical is challenging, as it is embedded in cultural coherence (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:19). In recent scholarship, space is viewed as a mere intellectual trend, but vital to social and cultural life as an epistemic locus (Obadia 2015:203; Vorster 2005:575). It is the nexus between the human body and experience that orients people within space and gives meaning to a place (Nasrallah 2012:57). In Chapter 3, it is evident that the space Paul envisioned was specifically the body. For Paul, the forces of the Law, Death and Sin function on the same level as they become hindrances in the relationship with God (Schmithals 1975:431). The position of a believer within the hegemonic structures determines his or her in–out status. This status is vital as *in* means to live in opposition to *out*, which constitutes death.

65. In Jewish marriage law, a wife could not divorce her husband (Hawthorne 1993:594). Contra Elephantine-papyri.

Chapter 3

Perlocution in Romans 5–8 (exegetical analyses)

Introduction

A hegemonic relationship is the core assumption of metaphors of dominion. Paul's interest in relationships, specifically the relationship between God and humans, is axiomatic from the outset of the argument in Romans 5.[66] If believers are with God, then no one or no power can be against them. No power or force can separate believers from this bond with God. Within this relationship, it is possible to infer God as the dominator and believers as the dominated. However, there are also other forces at work, contesting for dominion. This lengthy chapter will investigate the argument of Romans partitioned according to the main pericopes: Romans 5:1–11, 12–21; 6:1–14, 15–23; 7:1–6, 7–13, 14–25 and 8:1–11, 12–17, 18–30, 31–39. Each section will be surveyed with a broad argument overview setting the scene, ensued with a specific focus on the exegetical details evincing the possibility to indicate how metaphors of dominion may aid in unlocking the persuasive force of Paul's argument.

66. The interpretation of Romans abreast with the relationship between God and the individual has come under scrutiny, and the scholarly pendulum has swung to interpret Romans as God's dealings with Israel and the gentiles (Gaventa 2004:236). However, in my view, Paul is predominantly interested in believers' relationship with God.

How to cite: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'Perlocution in Romans 5–8 (exegetical analyses)', in *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* (HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7), pp. 35–214, AOSIS, Cape Town. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248.03

The overarching argument in Romans 5–8 is concerned that Jesus Christ 'our' Lord should be the controlling power of a believer's body. This argument builds on the argument of Romans 1–4 of believers being justified through faith (Rm 1:17; 3:21–31; 4), providing the possibility for believers to have a relationship with God. Paul describes God's wrath against humanity's sinfulness and unrighteousness in Romans 1:18–3:20. The portrayal of God's relationship with humans shifts from Romans 3:21 onwards.

Drawing on Romans 3:21–31, Paul establishes God's action in the relationship between God and humans in Romans 5:1–11. The peace/reconciliation metaphors frame the argument that claims believers transform from enemies to friends. The argument in Romans 5:12–21 underscores believers' past situation of being enemies as a result of their subjection to powers such as Sin and Death. However, God's Favour is introduced as the victorious power overpowering these forces in an analogy between Christ and Adam. Romans 5:21 climatically posits God's Favour might reign through vindication, leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν).

Romans 6:1–7:6 develops in reaction to Romans 5:21, clarifying the reign of God's Favour. The argument in Romans 6:1–14 indicates the significance of God's action towards believers elucidating believers' participation and ultimately showing believers are situated 'under Favour' (ὑπὸ χάριν) and not 'under Law' (ὑπὸ νόμον) as they are separated from Sin. Romans 6:15–23 continues to explicate what the categories of being 'under Favour' (ὑπὸ χάριν) and not being 'under (the) Law' (ὑπὸ νόμον) entails. To illustrate the difference between the two dominions associated with being 'under Favour' (ὑπὸ χάριν) and 'under (the) Law' (ὑπὸ νόμον), Paul draws on a slavery imagery. Romans 7:1–6 underscores again that believers are free from the law in order to be in a relationship with Christ from the vantage point of a marriage analogy.

Paul picks up the thread of the law from Romans 6:15 in Romans 7:7–13, detailing the real problem of the law, namely, that Sin has taken an opportunity through it. However, the problem of Sin persists as Romans 7:14–25 illustrates the predicament the 'I' encounters as a result of the action of Sin in opposition to the saving action of Christ within the body. Believers are supposed to allow Christ to control their bodies instead of Sin.

The focus of the argument shifts in Romans 8 from illustrating the adverse effects of non-godly powers as Paul roots the argument in what being under the dominion of Christ or the Spirit entails. In Romans 8:1–11, Paul establishes that believers are positioned 'in Christ'. The argument ensues building on Romans 8:1–11, with Romans 8:12–17 defining believers are children of God. In Romans 8:18–30, the liberation of believers enslaved bodies comes to the fore again. Paul ties the argument in the climactic conclusion that no forces can separate believers from God in Romans 8:31–39, mirroring Romans 5:1–11.

From enemies to friends (Rm 5:1–11)

To have peace with God (Rm 5:1–5)

The central notion in Romans 5:1–5 concerns believers have peace with God through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rm 5:2b]). This position of peace is a by-product for believers having been justified by faith (δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως [Rm 5:1a]). The instrumentality of Jesus Christ brokering peace comes under the microscope in Romans 5:2. Jesus Christ 'our' Lord also provides believers access through faith to this favour (δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν [τῇ πίστει] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην [Rm 5:2a]) in which believers are already standing (ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν [Rm 5:2b]). They take pride based on hope based on the glory of God (καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 5:2c]). However, Paul continues the argument illustrating the flipside, stating not only this but believers should also take pride in the sufferings (οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν [Rm 5:3a]). The reason for this statement is because knowingly suffering achieves perseverance (εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rm 5:3b]). The structure of Romans 5:3–4 forms a chain with the last word in each clause repeating as the first word in the next clause, which creates an emphasis. Romans 5:4a picks perseverance up, demarcating perseverance produces character (ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν [Rm 5:4a]), character produces hope (ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα [Rm 5:4b]) and hope is not put to shame (ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει [Rm 5:5a]). The reason why hope is not put to shame originates from the claim that the love of God has been poured out into the hearts of believers (ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν [Rm 5:5b]). This has been managed through the Holy Spirit, who was given to believers (διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν [Rm 5:5c]).

Detail analysis of Romans 5:1–5

The subordinate clause (δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως [Rm 5:1a]) emphasises God's exclusive agency in the relationship between God and humans.[67] The aorist participle passive of δικαιόω promulgates God's decisive action on behalf of humanity (Fitzmyer 1993:395; Greijdanus 1933:255; Moo 1996:298; Wolter 2014:319).[68] Reintroducing the theme of justification, the subordinate

67. The phrase δικαιωθέντες … ἐκ πίστεως has specified agency (Porter 1992:65). The instrumental use is also a recurrent Pauline pattern (Porter 1992:156).

68. Jarrard (1993:124) remarks that the focus on the figure Adam contributes to an erroneous understanding of God's agency in humans as the focus becomes the human response to salvation instead of the intended role divine initiative played in the salvation of humankind.

clause functions as a transitional statement,[69] with the conjunction οὖν linking rhetorical questions to previous discussions (Porter 1992:305), recalling Romans 1:16–4:25 and captioning what will be said in Romans 5:2–8:39 (Fitzmyer 1993:394; Hendriksen 1980:168; Hultgren 2011:202; Longenecker 2016:552; Morris 1988:218; Wolter 2014:319).[70]

Notwithstanding, the image created with δικαιόω is problematic. The root of the problem lies in the lexical understanding of δικαιόω, interpreted in Bauer et al. (2000:249) as forensic[71] and by Louw and Nida in relational terms (Du Toit 2003:53–79). Onesti and Brauch (1993) assimilates both usages and defines δικαιόω as:

> [*T*]he divine action that affects the sinner in such a way that his or her relationship with God is altered or transformed, either ontologically like a change in nature, or positionally resulting from a judicial act as one who was alienated is now reconciled. (pp. 827–837)

This being said, Romans 5:1–11 and Romans 8:31–39 form a framework from which δικαιόω should be purveyed (Dahl 1951:37–48, 1977:88–90). Andrie du Toit mentions Romans 5:1 should be read with Romans 8:34 revealing God has already justified believers but is still justifying believers drawing on the image of an ongoing court process (Du Toit 2003:60).[72] Accordingly, the forensic[73] meaning is proffered drawing from the source domain of 'an acquittal'. The believer cannot embark on a relationship with God out of his or her own accord. God initiated the possibility for the believer to enter the relationship fashioning a status change. The legal imagery illustrates the believer status change from being unrighteous to being justified (Greijdanus 1933:255; Moo 1996:298).[74] The prepositional phrase ἐκ πίστεως [through faith] expounds this relationship between humans and God. A believer is justified by trusting God's

69. Paul draws on the rhetorical form *transitio*. The 1st century BCE anonymous author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines it as a statement that briefly recalls what has been said and likewise briefly sets forth what is to follow next (Cosby 1991:213; Longenecker 2016:551).

70. Garlington (1993:89) argues that it makes little difference whether Romans 5:1–11 is understood as part of Romans 3:21–4:15 or as the beginning of Romans 5–8, as it remains a transitional passage.

71. Δικαιόω is listed as 'to take up a legal cause, show justice'.

72. Interpreters, such as Witherington III and Hyatt (2004:133), suggest that the action of God sets believers right in order to have a new relationship. If God was to impute righteousness, there would be no reason to require righteousness after conversion. Garlington (1993:91) follows a different approach locating Romans 5:1 to be influenced by Isaiah 32:17–18. He is aware of the connection with Romans 8:31–39, but also opts to interpret Romans 8:33 against the backdrop of the Suffering Servant song in Isaiah 50:8–9. For Garlington, Romans 5:1 is more than a mere 'past forensic act' as it should be read with the image of 'pouring out' in Romans 5:5, broadening the interpretation parameters.

73. Du Toit (2003:53) coins the term 'forensic metaphors' referring, in a technical sense, to all matters of a court of law.

74. Romans 5:8 explicitly defines this disposition before justification as ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων [we were being sinners].

action as the preposition ἐκ implies 'fulfilment, completion and resolution' (Smyth 1956:378), in conjunction with the noun πίστις denoting, in this context, 'trust and fidelity' (Bauer et al. 2000:818–820; Spicq 1994q:110).[75]

The image of justification is subordinate to the image of having peace or reconciliation seen in the main clause εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ [we have peace with God through Jesus Christ our Lord] (Rm 5:1b). The verb ἔχω in combination with a noun describes having something (Larsson 2011:238–242), in this case, to have peace. However, there are textual discrepancies concerning ἔχομεν or ἔχωμεν that first need to be addressed. The contention pertains to whether the indicative ἔχομεν or the subjunctive ἔχωμεν is Pauline or the first reading.[76] Verlyn D. Verbrugge (2011:559–572) cogently revisits this ongoing debate illustrating that the indicative is the more likely reading. His investigation focuses on the relationship with οὐ μόνον δέ (Rm 5:3a) and the possibility that καυχώμεθα in Romans 5:2, 3 could also be read as a subjunctive or indicative, rendering the indicative as the correct Greek grammar as well as the most logical with regard to the internal evidence. Verbrugge (2011:570–572) postulates that even if prevalence is usually given

75. In Romans 1:16, Paul states that it is the power of God as the saviour for all who have faith (δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστιν εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι) (Morris 1993a:285–291). In Jos. *War* 6.345, πίστις is used in the sense as καταφυγοῦσι πίστεις ἐτήρησα [I kept my word]. This is a particularly interesting text as it continues to explain how, by keeping his word, oppressors were forbidden to torture prisoners and peace was invited even though the soldiers thirsted for blood (Jos. *War* 6.345–346). The idea of allegiance and trustworthiness features again in Jos. *Ant*. 15.134. Here fidelity is shown as a code of conduct because those who serve superiors, such as mercenaries and royal and imperial officials, still have a duty: ὡς ἥ γε πίστις ἔχουσα καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμιωτάτους τόπον τοῖς γε φίλοις ἀναγκαιοτάτη τετηρῆσθαι [For if indeed there is room for good faith even towards one's greatest enemies, it must surely be most necessary to keep faith with one's friends] (Spicq 1994q:113). There are multiple examples of how πίστις concerns fidelity and an ultimate trust. Πίστις could result in obtaining power, as seen in Polybius 5.41.2: ὁ δὲ Ἑρμείας ἦν μὲν ἀπὸ Καρίας, ἐπέστη δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα Σελεύκου τἀδελφοῦ ταύτην αὐτῷ τὴν πίστιν ἐγχειρίσαντος, καθ᾽ οὓς καιροὺς ἐποιεῖτο τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν Ταῦρον στρατείαν [This Hermeias was a Carian who had been in charge of affairs ever since Seleucus, Antiochus' brother, on leaving for his expedition to the Taurus had entrusted him with the government].

76. Scholars who argue for an indicative reading include Wright (2002:515), while scholars who argue for the subjunctive 'let us have peace' include Black (1973:74) and Jewett (2007:348). Jewett (2007:348) bases his decision on the tensions between the churches in Rome and the fact that they have not yet embodied the peace Paul envisions. However, a text-critical problem should not be solved with a presupposed assumption about the situation of the churches in Rome, which is impossible to delineate accurately. Porter (1992:58) reads a hortatory subjunctive εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν [let us have peace with God]. Based on the external evidence, a subjunctive appears as the best-attested reading. According to Moule (1953:15), ἔχω carries a perfect meaning conveying the message of enjoying the possession of something already obtained, rendering the translation 'let us enjoy the possession of peace'. Longenecker (2016:554) cites the discovery of the 1950s 'Wyman fragment', which has been designated as uncial 0220 and dated to the latter part of the 3rd century, as evidence of the originality of the indicative ἔχομεν. The fragment agrees with both the *Codex Vaticanus* and B03 at all points in transmission, except in the main verb of Romans 5:1. As the fragment is older than the *Codex Vaticanus*, it is considered as more accurate (Cranfield 1975:257; Longenecker 2016:555). Greijdanus (1933:256) posits that it is without contest an indicative on the grounds of 'intrinsic probability'. Furthermore, Cranfield (1975:257) argues that it is clear that Paul views the believers' peace with God to be factual. Along similar lines, Morris (1988:218) favours an indicative reading of ἔχομεν as he argues that a subjunctive reading would indicate a choice, which is 'un-Pauline'.

to the *lectio difficilior* being the subjunctive, in this case, Paul dictated the letter with ω and ο sounding similar. This could be a scribal error from the inception of the letter, but the debate will never be conclusively settled.[77]

The textual problem can also be traced to the understanding of εἰρήνη [peace].[78] In secular Greek, εἰρήνη denotes a political and social phenomenon describing first and foremost a state of a nation that is not at war (Spicq 1994i:424). Accordingly, εἰρήνη [peace] is a relational word indicating harmonious relations between people or nations living in peace (Bauer et al. 2000:287; Porter 1993:695–699). Furthermore, peace is not just the absence of war, but also an organisation of the future, as it guarantees tranquillity,[79] wealth,[80] the cessation of banditry[81] and an opportunity for all sorts of happiness and prosperity (Spicq 1994i:425).[82]

In addition, the backdrop of Roman 'religion'[83] must also be considered in understanding the phrase εἰρήνην ἔχομεν [we have peace]. The Romans considered 'religion'[84] as a legal, political matter (Reasoner 1993:852; Rüpke 2001:13). Roman state religion consisted effectively of a contract between the community that offered a sacrifice and the deity who offered protection and success (Malherbe 2008:303; Rankov 2007:69).[85] There existed an idea that, if rituals were kept, a contract is made comprising *pax deorum* [peace with the gods] (Aune 1993:789–796; Reasoner 1993:850–855; Rüpke 2001:132). This contract entailed prosperity and success as the results of a harmonious relationship with the gods (Aune 1993:789–796; Reasoner 1993:850–855). The occurrence of disasters was assumed to be the result of discord in this

77. Porter (2013:577–583) writes a scathing response to Verbrugge's arguments for the indicative, opting for a subjunctive, for ἔχωμεν in Romans 5:1 and καυχώμεθα in Romans 5:2–3.

78. The images created with εἰρήνη [peace] and κατάλλασσω [to reconcile] are synonymous. The image of reconciliation is repeated in Romans 5:10, expressly utilising ἔχθρός [enemy].

79. Cf. Plato, *Resp.* 575 b.

80. Cf. Homer, *Od.* 14.486.

81. Cf. Epictetus 3.13.9.

82. Cf. Treaties of alliance and peace are mostly linked with εἰρήνη. In Philemon Frag, 71; Stobaeus, Flor. 44.5, vol 4. p. 373: anthology on peace speaks of εἰρήνη as a goddess, loving and kind, who permits marriage, feasts and friends (Spicq 1994i:424). Within these conditions of εἰρήνην ἔχομεν, it is possible to thrive, as can be seen in the example Diodorus Siculus 11,72,1: εἰρήνην γὰρ ἔχοντες οἱ Σικελιῶται [for the Sicilian Greeks were at peace].

83. Rüpke (2001:133) rightly notes that a uniform idea of 'religion' did not exist in Roman culture. What is meant by Roman religion, is the religion of the Romans, which was primarily maintained by those who were ethnically Romans, that is, belonging to the *polis-religion* of Rome (Rüpke 2001:25). This religion remained native to Roman citizens, although other religions were widespread in the Roman Empire (Aune 1993:789).

84. With religion, I use the term derived from 18th-century European culture reflecting the modern view of religion as something essentially private and separate from politics, law, economic activity and ethnicity (see Nongbri 2013:65, 109).

85. Cf. Seneca, *On Mercy* 1.4.1–2.

relationship. The broken relationship had to be rectified with sacrifice and prayer, the fulfilment of vows and oaths, attention to outward signs of the gods and the ritual of *lustratio*,[86] preserving the city from hostile influences (Aune 1993:790). This also operated as a way to ascertain loyalty to the emperor and was practised without any real spiritual aspect (Rankov 2007:69). During the *Pax Romana,* εἰρήνην ἔχομεν was a famous slogan designating the political and military means Rome exerted to retain its authority.[87]

The metaphor εἰρήνην ἔχομεν [we have peace] draws on the source domain of the 'war/absence of war, creating the possibility to prosper'.[88] The political aspect of the source domain is mapped onto the target domain, as the relationship in the source domain pertains Caesar, Paul maps εἰρήνην ἔχομεν to believers' relationship with God. Dependent on the knowledge of the audience, the idea of *shalom* could be implicit in the target domain,[89] but it is not the source domain. The metaphor drives the image through that believers are transformed through Jesus Christ from being God's enemies into being at peace with God (Cranfield 1975:256; Wolter 2014:320).[90] Accordingly, believers undergo a status change.

Paul adds a new concept of εἰρήνη evoking internal and spiritual peace (Spicq 1994i:432),[91] requiring devotion to one God. The hegemony becomes evident in the instrumental use of the prepositional phrase πρὸς τὸν θεὸν διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [towards God through Jesus Christ our Lord]. The preposition πρός with an accusative expresses motion or direction towards ὁθεός 'God' (Smyth 1956:371).[92] Believers are not at the same level as God in this relationship.

86. This is an ancient Roman purification ritual that in some cases would involve sacrifice.

87. Cf. Tacitus, *Histories* 2.12, 4.74; Josephus, *Jew. Ant*. 14.160, 15.348; OGIS 614 where the slogan expresses both political and beneficence of Roman rule (Malherbe 2008:303).

88. Cf. ἀντὶ πολέμου μὲν εἰρήνην ἔχομεν Herodian 8,7,4; Thuk 2, 65, 2; Isoc, *Archid*, 51 Xen, *hell*. 2,4,38–3,2,1; Demosth. Cor, 167; Pol, 21 (43),7; Diod 11,68,6; 11, 72, 1; 12, 75, 6; 15, 6,1; Plut Thes, 6,6; Cic. 36,7; Jos. Bell 2, 401; App. Lib. 31, 130; Epikrt. Diatr. 3,13,12; Cass Dio 7 (Eschner 2010a:325).

89. Harrisville (1980:77) argues that in ancient times peace had a paradisiacal condition, which was not an inner state or condition. Peace should be understood in terms of the concept of *shalom*, the fullness of the right relationship that is implied in justifying itself and all other bounties that flowed from it (Fitzmyer 1993:395). *Shalom* is a social concept and for this reason, Paul does not confine it to the unifying of two formerly hostile parties (Harrisville 1980:77). Spicq (1994i:426–428) remarks that εἰρήνη is derived from the root *shalom*, giving a sense of completeness and safeness, and is perceived as a 'gift from God'.

90. Van Leeuwen and Jacobs (1974:101) express that to have peace is an expression of a reconciled relationship with God to be in a normal relationship again.

91. Morris (1988:218) and Greijdanus (1933:256) indicate that Paul is not employing εἰρήνη as a subjective feeling but rather as an objective fact that the justified are no longer enemies of God but at peace with him.

92. Wolter (2014:320) and Greijdanus (1933:255) also mention the importance of the preposition as it indicates a relationship of peace between God and the believer.

However, God has given the means for believers to orientate themselves towards God through their Lord Jesus Christ (διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).[93] The preposition διά with the genitive is used instrumentally but also indicates dominion as agency brings an intended result (Smyth 1956:375). Accordingly, the metaphor of peace is set within a Christological context (διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).[94]

Moreover, Jesus is not just depicted as Christ but also as κύριος [Lord].[95] Κύριος, meaning to 'be master of or having authority' (Spicq 1994m:341), was used as a term for a political ruler[96] and gods. Accordingly, a position of power and authority is implied (Bauer et al. 2000:576),[97] *inter alia* the dominator, who is in control and has dominion over another person (Fitzmyer 2011:812; Zimmermann 2007:193). In Rome, the perception was shared that the emperor was a god. Augustus was called θεός καὶ κύριος, [god and lord] and his successors kept the title κυρίος, especially Nero: Nero, lord of the whole world (Spicq 1994m:346).[98] Accordingly, not only was Nero recognised as the ultimate world authority who alone dominates all, but also that he was revered as a beneficent god and a Roman saviour (Spicq 1994m:346). Oaths were sworn *per genium Caesaris*, and the imperial cult was influential throughout Greece and Asia Minor (including the eastern region where Tarsus was located, the city Paul grew up in). The word κυρίος would have had clear associations with the imperial cult to ancient Mediterranean people, especially the audience located in Rome (Aune 1993:794).

93. Wolter (2014:319) expounds on the *passivum divinum* (δικαιωθέντες [Rm 5:1]), indicating that Paul is referring to a past event, which enables all Christians in the present time to believe through the blood of Jesus Christ.

94. This Christocentric basis is highlighted throughout the argument of Romans 5:1–8:39. This exact phrase is repeated in Romans 5:21; 6:23; 7:25 and 8:39 (Longenecker 2016:556). Fitzmyer (1993:396) purports that the phrases connote the actual influence of the risen Christ on the lives of Christians.

95. A similar Pauline notion of being justified through faith/trust exists in Galatians 2:16, but the major difference between the two texts is that Paul does not refer to Christ as κύριος.

96. In Egypt Ptolemy XIII OGIS 186,6 (Philae, 62 BCE) and the LXX translation of Daniel as well as Judit, κύριος is used as a title for an Assyrian king; Roman Caesars were also called θεὸς καὶ κύριος καισαρ αὐτοκράτωρ, but Tiberius, for example, deviated from this use (cf. Tac. Ann. 2, 87; Cuss. Cult 55).

97. In the LXX manuscripts of the 4th century BCE, the word developed as an equivalent for the Tetragrammaton read as Adonai, but it also includes simpler meanings such as 'owner' and the polite form 'sir'. In the New Testament, the secular meaning can be found again, mostly as an expression of respect and a formal address, for example, Matthew 6:24. In the New Testament, its use progresses to be an application of a title of Jesus functioning as a royal, a messianic title (Spicq 1994m:346). The substantive κύριος refers to the one who commands, a boss, a master, notably the owner of a slave and the master of a household. Many examples attest to this in various forms, such as Demosthenes P. Phorm. 36.28: freed by his master; 36.43; Antiphon 2.4.7; Xenophon Oec 9.16: 'owner's authorisation'. It could also describe a tutor or guardian as in Greek and Egyptian law a wife or daughter is assisted by a legal guardian or tutor, for example, P. Aberd. 30, 4; 65, although this legal meaning does not occur in the Bible. However, be it a tutor, house owner or slave owner, the term κύριος refers to someone who has authority.

98. In Egypt, the Ptolemies, as successors of the Pharaohs, inherited their divine character, for example, Ptolemy XII is 'the Lord King God'.

In new Pauline scholarship, it has become popular to interpret εἰρήνην ἔχομεν within the echoes of Augustus' *Pax Romana* founded on *iustitia* in conjunction with the titles 'Lord' and 'Saviour'[99] being used by Paul to indicate a different peace from that of the imperial peace that is being offered (Witherington III & Hyatt 2004:131; Wright 2002:515).[100] This unconvincing argument, in my opinion, posits Paul did not experience peace and security in his lifetime but rather endured the hardships of the Roman Empire, such as persecution, imprisonment and flogging by Roman authorities.[101] Accordingly, Roman emperors exercising brutal force is contrasted to Jesus who died and rose again for the purpose of peace (Kruse 2012:226). Just as the argument is formulated that Paul spoke against the Roman Empire, it can easily be disseminated that Paul drew on the ideas of the Epicureans who sought a peaceful life and found it in associations with friends.[102] Although these are enticing speculations, there is simply no convincing evidence to make such claims.[103]

A better solution comprehends that Paul uses κυρίος first and foremost as a Christological reference (Fitzmyer 2011:815; Zimmermann 2007:194). If the reference is made to God with κυρίος, then the possibility exists that Paul drew on a possible link between the political terminologies of rulers (Zimmermann 2007:194). However, this is not the case in Romans 5:1 as κύριος is used for Jesus Christ and not God. The term κύριος already had a ruling connotation before the *Pax Romana* (Zimmermann 2007:193). In light of Paul's use of the earliest confession of believers, 'Jesus Christ is Lord' precipitated in 1 Corinthians 12:3 Κύριος Ἰησοῦς and Philippians 2:11 κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, the argument is rather more convincing that Paul draws on material known to him from the early church.[104] Christ's active presence and his lordship are prevalent in the κυρίος language and κυρίος concepts describing early believers experience of him (Fatehi 2000:267).[105]

99. Dio 44.4.5.

100. Wright (2002:515) describes an alternative empire, set up by the true Lord that Paul envisions. The empire secured peace by engaging in war. The emperor's virtues were linked with his ability to kill enemies of the state and were particularly a theme of coinage during Nero's rule. First-century critics, such as Seneca, even remarked in Clem. 1.9.1–2; 1.11.1–2, that Augustus 'used the sword ruthlessly' (see Harrison 2013b:85–124).

101. Cf. 2 Corinthians 4:9; 11:25; Philippians 1:14; Acts 16:22 (Malherbe 2008:303).

102. The Epicurean focus is on life with friends in the here and now. It is part of Paul's rhetoric. Cf. Lucretius, *On the Nature of Things*, 5.1120; Epicurus, *Principal Doctrine,* 13, 14, 28; Philodemus, *On Frankness*, Fragment 78; Epictetus, *Discourse*, 2.20.8 (Eschner 2010a:334; Malherbe 2008:304).

103. See Kim (2008), *Christ and Caesar*, for a cogent and systematic explanation of the problem and why Paul cannot be labelled as anti-imperial.

104. The early Christians employed κύριος Ἰησοῦς as the grounds on which believers have been saved (Fitzmyer 2011:819; Zimmermann 2007:200).

105. Since the use in 1 Thessalonians, it is clear that Paul connects κύριος with Christ (Zimmermann 2007:195).

This imagery is rather evident of a metaphor of dominion entailing warring parties to cease with animosity but to become friends. However, God is the dominator over believers with Jesus Christ functioning as the access point for believers to become dominated. God's dominion enables believers to become the embodied space of peace associated with prosperity, with the opportunity for happiness.

The instrumental role of Jesus Christ within the peace metaphor in Romans 5:1 is further elucidated on in the relative clause (δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν [τῇ πίστει] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην) in Romans 5:2a as δι᾽ οὗ refers to Jesus Christ the Lord with the preposition διά employed instrumentally. Paul elaborates on the mediating role of Christ the Lord as a way to have a relationship with God (target domain) with another image produced with the noun προσαγωγή (Légasse 2002:340). The source domain is arduous to ascertain with two plausible options, namely, cultic or royal.[106] The cultic source domain is the first choice of most commentators (Black 1973:75; Longenecker 2016:558; Michel 1966:177; Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:102; Wright 2002:516).[107] This argument relies on the LXX use of the verb προσάγω with reference to cultic practices, often in the context to approach God's altar with an offering, for example, Leviticus 4:14; Exodus 29:4; Leviticus 21:18–19 and Numbers 8:9–10 (Borse 2011:388–389; Longenecker 2016:558; Michel 1966:177; Wright 2002:516).[108] The problem with this approach is that it is based on the verb[109] and not the noun.

The second possible source domain is associated with royal imagery.[110] The noun προσαγωγή denotes 'a way of approach or an introduction especially with regard to a king' (Bauer et al. 2000:876; Liddell, Scott & Jones 1996:1500). The latter is derived from the description of an audience with Cyrus described in Xenophon Cyr.7.5.45, which most commentaries mention (Liddell et al.

106. Gupta (2009:169–181) argues the difficulty of delineating between more than one possible source domain.

107. Dunn (1988:248) opts for a cultic understanding pointing out the parallel with 1 QS 11:13–15 with almost certain cultic overtones. Käsemann (1978:133) also opts for the cultic dimension arguing on account of similar imagery used in Hebrews 10:19–22.

108. In Qumran 1 QH 12.20–26, Jewish covenanters were pure and qualified enough to enjoy access to God in their community (Longenecker 2016:558).

109. The other two occurrences of the noun in Ephesians 2:18 and 3:12 are dismissed, as Ephesians is not an authentic Pauline work. Gupta (2009:179–180) argues that the instances of Ephesians 2:18 and 3:12 are connected with the blood of Christ 'brought near' verse 3 and repeated in verses 20–22. However, apart from the fact that Ephesians is not a trustworthy measurement, the connotation of blood in Romans 5:9 is not cultic. The only plausible evidence for this theory in my view is the similarity to the use of the noun προσαγωγή in the Letter of Aristeas 42, a contemporary work in the time of Paul: καὶ τράπεζαν εἰς ἀνάθεσιν, καὶ εἰς προσαγωγὴν θυσιῶν [for the offering of sacrifices] (Meecham 1935:1).

110. Bauer et al. (2000:876) lists the royal connotation of προσαγωγή as the first possible interpretation.

1996:1500).[111] The innate spatiality προσαγωγή induces must not be underplayed, as the translation 'access' easily subverts the notion (Black 1973:75; Morris 1988:219).

However, προσαγωγή indicates ground that offered no access to enemy forces or an access point for ships in Plut., Aem. Paul. 261,13,3 and in Polyb. 10,1,6 (Bauer et al. 2000:876). James Dunn (1988:248) argues for a cultic understanding but notes the nautical image of a 'landing stage' enabling a sea-weary mariner to make a safe landing on firm ground cannot be cast aside, although he does agree that it fits less the emphasis on relationships.[112] This is not constructive in understanding the source domain. Firstly, the nautical image is not relevant to this context, especially as metaphors are coherent.[113] Secondly, the spatial aspect of προσαγωγή[114] can also be inferred from the court situation approaching a king, thus compelling the nautical image as unnecessary. I posit that the metaphor derives from a royal source domain. The metaphor is novel and the separation of time and language from the 1st century proves it is difficult to delineate the exact source domain. Christina Eschner (2010a:329) underscores the spatiality of προσαγωγή, grounding her view on Plut. Aem. 13,5 as 'a cordoned off land' where a battle could take place. I agree with her focus on spatiality, but if the ring composition is to be purveyed in Romans 5–8, then I would rather argue that the spatiality of προσαγωγή is mapped onto the body as the space intended for this introduction.[115] The body becomes a space cordoned off by Jesus, where peace induces prosperity and wards off calamity. However, any interpretation concerning προσαγωγή remains highly speculative, as there is simply not enough textual evidence.

However, the image is embedded in the relative clause (δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν [τῇ πίστει] εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην [Rm 5:2a]) hinting how to understand προσαγωγή. The perfect tense of ἔχω 'have' also highlights the ongoing activity of what Christ has done and the continued result thereof (Morris 1988:219; Wolter 2014:321). Believers have access through Christ by

111. Cf. Cyr.7.5.45 δεομένους προσαγωγῆς [ask you for an introduction] (Black 1973:75; Morris 1988:219). The justification of believers brought a state of peace. They enjoy (Rm 5:2) 'access' to the 'favour' in which they stand (Byrne 1996:165; Fitzmyer 1993:396).

112. Black (1973:75) proposes that this interpretation is more logical than assuming that the nautical metaphor of 'grace' must be used. Contra Eschner (2010a:332) interprets Plut. Aem. 13,5 as a land that has been cordoned off.

113. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:86) argue that when a concept consists of more than one metaphor, the different metaphorical structures usually fit in a coherent fashion. The metaphor of access is part of the main metaphor of peace in Romans 5:1.

114. Wolter (2014:321; cf. Greijdanus 1933:257) also mention the spatial envisioning introduced with προσαγωγή as well as its metaphorical aspect, which he ties into the understanding of 'Gnade' in Romans 5:2a.

115. Cf. Romans 8:11.

trust (τῇ πίστει)[116] to this favour (εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην [Rm 5:2a]). The preposition εἰς is used in Romans 5:2 to describe a situation, namely, 'to this favour' (Oepke 1964b:426). The spatiality is amplified with the demonstrative pronoun ταύτην along with the noun χάρις, which refers to εἰρήνην (Rm 5:1b). This recalls the image of believers having peace with God.

The spatial aspect of the metaphor of access/introduction is furthered with the relative clause ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν [in which we stand] (Rm 5:2b), specifically in this favour.[117] The spatial dimension is accentuated with the perfect use of ἵσταμαι, which means to 'stand, step in something' (Rm 5:2b) (Wolter 2011: 503–509). Wolter (2011:506) notes that ἵστημι has a cultic connotation as it is often used to describe standing in front of a God.[118] Nonetheless, ἵστημι is used metaphorically, referring to the favour in which believers stand. Liddell et al. (1996:841) list the metaphorical meaning of ἵστημι as 'stand firm'.[119] The wordplay between ἐσχήκαμεν [we have] (Rm 5:2a) and ἑστήκαμεν [we stand] (Rm 5:2b) also underscores the link between the images (Black 1973:75; Longenecker 2016:557; Wolter 2014:321). Believers have access by trust in this favour in which they stand.

However, it is necessary to linger on the meaning of τὴν χάριν ταύτην [this favour]. Especially as metaphorical extension[120] occurs, this favour refers to 'have peace with God' (Rm 5:1). Χάρις is a central leitmotiv in the Hellenistic reciprocity system (Barclay 2015:24; Harrison 2003:2; Joubert 2005:187–212). In papyri and inscriptions of the Hellenistic period, it especially expressed 'favour' of a friend, a prince or the gods (Spicq 1994w:502). Roman patrons and Greek benefactors[121] strived amongst one another for honour, and clients and beneficiaries strived for the material benefits of the system

116. The use of πίστις recalls the forensic metaphor of Romans 5:1a. Paul's wording seems strange as he utilises τῇ πίστει (Rm 5:2) instead of ἐκ πίστεως (Rm 5:1) without any necessary or obvious reason (Longenecker 2016:557). The occurrence of τῇ πίστει is another text-critical discrepancy. The evidence is almost evenly balanced and the phrase could have been added for emphasis or left out as it may read to be redundant with regard to Romans 5:1. Morris (1988:219) suggests that it is a scribal insertion. The addition or omission does not affect the sense of the text (Hultgren 2011:201; Morris 1988:219).

117. The prepositional relative phrase ἐν ᾗ [in which] refers to 'to this favour' (εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην) (Porter 1992:292).

118. In Qumran and the Hebrew Bible, it is often used to describe the priests' cultic assembly that 'stands before God' (Lv 9:5; Dt 29:9; Jos 24:1; 1 Ki 8:15; 2 Chr 29:11; 1 QH 7:30; 11:13).

119. Cf. X.HG5.2.23; Plb.21.11.3; Arist.GA776a35, EN1104a4, Metaph. 1047a15; Plb.3.105.9; τιμαὶ ἑστηκυῖαι fixed prices, *PTeb.ined* 703.177.

120. Extension is a particular type of cluster where numerous metaphorical expressions in close proximity draw on the same source domain (Semino 2008:25).

121. In the 1st century, the patronage underwent a change from being a city patron to a universal patron, and the term became entrenched in a political meaning (Lowe 2013:68). Lowe (2013:78–79) comments on the distinction between the Roman patronage and the Greek beneficiation, noting that it would be naïve not to assume the system influenced one another and accordingly the terms may be used interchangeably.

(Joubert 2005:189–190). The power of the wealthy was of such an extent that a high proportion of the society was immediately dependent on them (Barclay 2015:13; Clarke 1990:128–142). Even freedmen would be under legal obligation and social pressure to continue to support their masters in political as well as business matters, even long after achieving liberty (Clarke 1990:137). In Rome, this social hierarchy was reinforced daily with the attendance of the less wealthy men (*officium*) at the residence of the superior benefactor for a form of *beneficium* (Clarke 1990:138). The sheer size of the Roman Empire, even though there was a centralised government, was held intact by personal patronage from dominating elite families emitting from a supposed benevolent emperor (Barclay 2015:36; Lowe 2013:57–84). With the transition of the late Republic to a dictatorship, Augustus especially needed to maintain an image of caring without being perceived as a monarch (Lowe 2013:68).[122] However, a powerful ruler could distribute munificence, but that was not a reason to praise the ruler for fairness (Barclay 2015:475). At its core, benefaction entails the *do ut des* principle, namely, benefactors or would be benefactors considered what they receive in return for their beneficence, whether it is in the form of loyalty, power, honour or material benefits (Du Toit 2009:131; Engberg-Pedersen 2008:1; Joubert 2000:19).[123]

Paul draws on this source domain, introducing a word that was foreign to the LXX by employing χάρις (Breytenbach 2010a:209),[124] and uses it in an original manner (Spicq 1994w:500). He applies favour (χάρις) as a new position and a new status for believers (Du Toit 2007b:91; Eschner 2010a:328).[125] He envisions life as being under the dominion and influence of favour (Du Toit 2007b:91). However, Troeltsch Engberg-Pedersen (2008:15) rightly remarks on the underlying problem, namely, whether there truly is such a thing as a true gift?[126] He indicates Paul's use of ἀγάπη and πνεῦμα in Romans 5:5 and paves the way for the argument of Romans 8:14–39. Believers' hearts are filled with love, which they can expect from God, but also Romans 8:14–39 illustrates believers' response, specifically defined in Romans 8:28 as love for God (Engberg-Pedersen 2008:38). In contrast, Du Toit (2009:131) argues that χάρις is unconditional. He argues for Paul that χάρις stems exclusively from God and

122. Romans intrinsically abhorred the idea of a king.

123. Engberg-Pedersen (2008:1) succinctly puts it: 'man is a reciprocal being'.

124. The word had a Hellenistic reciprocal aspect even in a Jewish context and presented great versatility as it designated 'favour', goodwill or grace conferred by the benefactor but could also refer to the return of 'favour' or 'thanks' by the beneficiary to the benefactor. Paul uses χάρις [favour] in contrast to the LXX's use of ἔλεος [mercy] as his central description of beneficence (Harrison 2003:2).

125. Galatians 5:4 and Acts 13:43 also contain the spatial aspect of χάρις.

126. If receiving a gift, it is crucial to give a well-measured gift in return (Barclay 2015:25). See Ps.-Phocylides 152; Delphic maxims (Harrison 2003:44–45).

Jesus Christ,[127] and unlike the whims of Hellenist benefactors, it is constant (Du Toit 2009:131).[128] Therefore, believers can stand in 'this favour'.

But what is more, believers take pride in this favour with reference to hope of the glory of God (καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ) as Romans 5:2c ensues elucidating the imagery of this favour in which believers stand further. The verb καυχάομαι is problematic as there is no consensus whether it is an indicative or a hortatory subjunctive.[129] I interpret it as an indicative, coherent with Romans 5:1. The verb καυχάομαι with the preposition ἐπί means to take pride in something (Bauer et al. 2000:536).[130] The interpretation of καυχάομαι has been greatly influenced by Bultmann's (1938:646–654) delineation that praise is a theological problem for Paul, hinging on the Jewish perspective of self-praise. The reception of self-praise is negative and even in the 1st century unadvisable.[131]

However, Christine Gerber (2015:230) cogently argues that 'boasting' is an essential element in rhetoric used to defend one's argument.[132] It is an acceptable form of speaking when it is utilised to defend something offered (Gerber 2015:230). Paul uses καυχάομαι with the intent to persuade the audience (Forbes 1986:30).[133] The verb καυχάομαι is repeated emphasising believers should have pride,[134] seeing that Paul establishes a genuine object of taking pride in, namely, the hope of the glory of God.

127. This is also the beginning of the concept of the trinity of God.

128. Joubert (2005:208) states that Paul represents God as the 'divine benefactor par excellence'.

129. Jewett (2007:351) argues that the hortatory subjunctive indicates that Paul uses boasting to replace honourable status and performance claims that mark traditional religion in the Greco-Roman world. The hortatory subjunctive should rather be interpreted as an indicative referring to τὴν προσαγωγήν (Cranfield 1975:259).

130. Cf. Καυχάομαι means that 'boast, glory in, to put one's human confidence in something' (Spicq 1994I:295). Morris (1988:219) suggests translating 'boast' as 'rejoice' as it carries the thought of giving expression to what is felt and not simply feeling or even 'exult' may be more fitting. Van Leeuwen and Jacobs (1974:103) propose it is boasting in hope. Zmijewski (2011:680–690) opts for 'sich rühmen'.

131. Cf. Quintillian, Inst. 11.1.8–26, especially 11.1.15 as the audience hates self-praise (Gerber 2015:233). Du Toit (2007c:50–51) indicates that the καύχησις label was popular as a denigrating device and usually supplied to the antagonist. Cf. Romans 2:17, 23; 2 Corinthians 10:12–18; 11:12; Galatians 6:13; James 4:16; 1 Clement 21:5; Ignatius Ephesians 18:1.

132. Cf. Isoc, *Antidosis* (Or. 15); Demosthenes, *De Corona* (Or. 18); Flavius Josephus, Contra *Apionem* 2.145 (Gerber 2015:230–233). Forbes (1986:30) notes that Paul uses 'boasting' in the same manner as Hellenistic rhetoric belonging to the category 'grand style' with emotional force intent on moving the audience.

133. Byrne (1996:165) notes that this notion is over against an illegitimate 'taking pride' serving as an epideictic rhetoric of true Christian boasting.

134. Gathercole (2001:304) notes that καυχάομαι is essential in establishing Paul's relationship with his Jewish contemporaries. Gathercole (2001:306) argues that καυχάομαι is not a feeling of superiority in relation to gentiles, but confidence that God will act on Israel's behalf and is the conviction of God's gracious election. This is coherent with Gathercole's view that obedience to the Torah is the basis for salvation. Obedience is perceived as the appropriate reaction to God's salvation (Gathercole 2001:303–306). In contrast, I do not think

Although the preposition ἐπί usually is used with καυχάομαι, the preposition also indicates 'in dependence upon/in the power of' (Liddell et al. 1996:932)[135] referring to ἐλπίς,[136] centred in τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ as the genitive signifies (Légasse 2002:340)[137] in Romans 5:2. Spicq (1994j:487) remarks ἐλπίς becomes the 'fervent expectation of salvation, eternal life and glory'.[138] In Plautus' Mercator 876, *Spes* is associated with two other divinities, *Salus* and *Victoria*, with Hope epitomising the first step towards salvation and final victory (Tataranni 2013:69). Hope fulfilled an important role in Roman political, religious and cultural life, apart from being invoked at weddings and birthdays, as an integral part of the imperial cult (since Augustus) and Roman propaganda (Tataranni 2013:65–78).[139] In Rome, a temple was devoted to *Spes* (hope) situated next to the

(footnote 134 continues...)
Gathercole has a convincing argument. The only point I agree on is that there is a lack of scholarly attention to καυχάομαι, specifically in Romans. Paul's argument is not concerned with a Jewish audience and accordingly I deem the Jewish relationship Gathercole wishes to trace as unnecessary, without regarding the context of Romans. Furthermore, καυχάομαι becomes part of a universal motif and obedience is not the answer to χάρις but the answer unfolds in Romans 8:15–39.

135. Cf. Pi.P.8.76; ἐπί τινί ἐστι it is *in* his *power* to do Hdt.8.29; M.Ant.7.2; as far as is in my power X. Cyr.5.4.11, Isoc.4.14.

136. The noun ἐλπίς does not occur in the four Gospels, but stems from the increase of Paul and the other apostle's contact with pagans, who they defined as 'those who have no hope' (Spicq 1994j:481). In the 1st century, hope is best understood as the expectation of something good, for example, soldiers hope for promotion (107, P. Mich. 466,30; 423,27; P. Lond 1941.8) (Spicq 1994j:481–482). In Plautus, *Spes* is portrayed as a heartening and sustaining force with his characters often appealing to the goddess *Spes* for aid in the midst of a predicament (Tataranni 2013:69).

137. The glory of God is a technical term in the Hebrew Bible referring to God's visible and active presence in creation, closely related to God's grandeur and power as creator and redeemer (Gaffin 1993:348–350). The LXX translates *kabod* from the root *kbd* [be heavy] as δόξα, but it denotes esteem or respect and especially power and wealth. Δόξα can sometimes be translated as majesty, for example, 2 Maccabees 15:13 (Spicq 1994f:364). In this instance, δόξα is usually interpreted as 'reflected radiance' (Bauer et al. 2000:257). The word δόξα comes from the verb δοκέω, meaning think, admit and claim (Spicq 1994f:362). From the beginning, δόξα was understood to mean 'expectation, what is thought to be possible', and thus the widespread meaning in secular Greek as 'opinion, thought, sentiment' (Spicq 1994f:362). Consequently, this opinion can be about people and δόξα developed the meaning of 'renown, reputation' (Spicq 1994f:362).

138. According to Longenecker (2016:559), in Paul's letters, 'hope' is a frequently repeated term and a dominant theme, not just for God's people corporately but also for individuals who come into relationship with God. Hope is grounded in God's victory over evil in death and resurrection of Christ and the gift of the Holy Spirit. Hope for the future is developed as it is combined with the first fruits in Romans 8 (Everts 1993:416).

139. *Spes* usually is perceived as positive, but the Greek ambiguity concerning ἐλπίς stemming from Hesiod, affected Rome as can be seen in a poem of Seneca, *De Spe* 1: *Spes fallax, Spes dulce malum, Spes summa malorum* [Hope the deceiver. Hope the sweet evil. Hope the sum of all evil] (Tataranni 2013:66). According to the myth of Pandora, the jar from which evil spread closed before Hope could get out (Hesiod, *Op.* 42–105) (Spicq 1994j:481). Zeitlin (1996:64–67) argues that a child is referred to as the hope of a house. Accordingly, Zeitlin (1996:64–67) postulates that this concept is intrinsic to the story of Pandora, with Hope left inside the jar as a metaphor of a child residing in the womb. However, these negative perceptions were clearly secondary as the association with the imperial cult would not have been so strong if this were the case (Tataranni 2013:67).

temple of Janus, god of peace and war, on the triumphal route.[140] Within the imperial period, *Spes* was especially associated with *Fides*, *Salus* and *Victoria* connoting in the public sphere that prosperity is derived from military conquest (Spicq 1994j:487; Tataranni 2013:70). Hope became an extension of the imperial house representing the promise of prosperity for the Roman people in a charismatic dynast and the people's confidence that such prosperity would continue through his successors (Tataranni 2013:67). Moreover, *Spes* also became associated with the cult of *Iuventis*. The beginning of Claudius's reign in 41 CE marked the birth of his son Britannicus appearing on imperial coinage with an impression of hope on the reverse side signifying the hope of the imperial house (Tataranni 2013:70).

Furthermore, the expression τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ [the glory of God] also heeds consideration. Harrison (2010:156–188) points out that researchers neglect the regular occurrence of δόξα used for benefactors in honorific inscriptions.[141] The Greco-Roman world was noted for heads of state and public-orientated individuals who enhanced their own reputations (δόξα) of a city or an organisation through munificent gifts or great actions (Harrison 2010:162).[142] The rise of Julio-Claudian benefactors caused a defected type of glory, which was derived from one's association with the ruler and not one's personal achievement or ancestral inheritance, as was the case in the past (Harrison 2010:183).

Paul sketches powerful images in the clause καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ (Rm 5:2c). Unlike the Roman hope associated with the Caesar and bound to the victory obtained through military success, believers can take pride of the hope associated with Jesus and connected with the glory of God. Harrison (2010:188) suggests that Paul sketches God as the world benefactor in a magnanimous demonstration of glory through Jesus Christ on the cross. However, the phrase δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ is a metonymy rather referring to the resurrection of Jesus Christ through the glory of the Father, as seen in Romans 6:4 (Wolter 2014:322).[143]

140. Aulus Atilius Calatinus erected the temple on the forum Holitorium during the first Punic War. See Cicero, Leg. 2.11.28 (Spicq 1994j:481; Tataranni 2013:70–72).

141. Δόξα has, in Koine, and especially in inscriptions and papyri, the meaning 'esteem, honour' (Spicq 1994f:362).

142. Famous houses of Roman nobles sought to equal and surpass the glory of their ancestors in a heated competition for magistracies and military victories (Harrison 2010:162). For example, an honorific decree of Ptolemy IV for the Cretan auxiliaries (around 150 BCE), Aglaso of Cos, through his deeds and his excellent council, showed himself 'worthy of his country and of the glory (good reputation) that he enjoys' (Spicq 1994f:363).

143. In Romans 5:1–2, linguists in the analysis of discourse mention planes of discourse, with a background, foreground and front ground. Paul depicts the justified (aor) to enjoy present peace with God. The enjoyment stands out against the background of justification, his new topic building on the old (Porter 1992:23).

The expression οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καί, meaning 'not only this, but also' (Bauer et al. 2000:659),[144] initiates the adversative clause (οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν [Rm 5:3a]), shedding light that believers should not only take pride in this favour dependent on hope deriving from the glory of God but also take pride in sufferings. Paul repeats the verb καυχώμεθα and draws attention to believers taking pride dependent on hope derived from the glory of God, but in stark contrast, Paul argues believers should also take pride in suffering as the prepositional phrase ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν [in the sufferings] marks.[145] For Paul, sufferings are contrary to the χάρις, in which believers stand (Du Toit 2007b:91).[146] During Paul's time, stoicism was popular valuing patience under suffering and prizing a tried and tested character (Morris 1988:220; Wright 2002:516). The notion of hope seen in Romans 5:2c is substantiated in Romans 5:5a, causing a circular arrangement of the argument from hope to hope.[147] Within this circular arrangement, the climax consists of picking up the keyword of the preceding phrase in the following one: ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται (Rm 5:3), ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα (Rm 5:4) and ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει (Rm 5:5) (Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1961:§493(3); Moule 1953:117).[148] Paul draws on the rhetorical techniques of *graditio* and polysyndeton.[149] The rhetorical chain signifies that the innocent undergoes a test in which God puts their trust to the test, drawing on the early Jewish understanding of suffering (Wolter 2014:324).

The clause εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται (Rm 5:3b) gives the reason why believers are able to take pride in their sufferings. Paul assumes that the audience already knows that suffering achieves perseverance (ἡ θλῖψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται [Rm 5:3c]) (Jewett 2007:354; Wolter 2014:324). The verb κατεργάζεται with τί implies 'to accomplish or bring a result by doing something' (Bauer et al. 2000:531). The noun ὑπομονή refers to the 'capacity

144. The expression ἀλλὰ καὶ following οὐ μόνον δέ retains its adversative sense (Porter 1992:205).

145. Jewett (2007:353) remarks that Paul has a specific hardship in mind, namely, the expulsion of Jewish Christian leaders under Claudius and their return from exile after 54 CE. In contrast, Cranfield (1975:261) suggests that tribulations resemble the exultation in which God subjects believers as part of the discipline by which He teaches them to wait patiently for his righteousness.

146. Contra Longenecker (2016:560) who posits believers' sufferings are contrary to honour–shame systems of the 1st century, something to pride in. Pagan views understood calamity as without meaning and a disaster simply to be voided or explained away, but for believers it fosters character. Wright (2002:516) also views suffering as part of a larger narrative ending with hope.

147. It is identical to 2 Corinthians 10–12. Christian existence is characterised by a dynamic movement towards a goal, being an existence by faith (Harrisville 1980:78).

148. Cf. Maximus Tyre 16, 3b.

149. Cf. Quintilian, Inst. 9,3,56; *Rhet. Herenn.* 4,25,34; Maximus v. Tyre, *Philosoph.* 16, 3 (Cosby 1991:214; Wolter 2014:324).

to hold out in the face of suffering' (Bauer et al. 2000:1039).[150] The word is a metaphor of submission in itself. The preposition ὑπό denotes a state of being under and μένω to stay in a position (Radl 2011:969–971). Plato and Aristotle established the conception of ὑπομονή, which influenced later Greek tradition (Spicq 1994u:414). Plato asked: 'In what does courage consist?' He answered it as 'a certain endurance of soul … one of the noblest things … it is endurance accompanied by wisdom that is noble' (Spicq 1994u:414). Endurance is not merely a passive quality but a virtue of fortitude (Black 1973:75).

Ὑπομονή is repeated in Romans 5:4a. The adversative particle δέ is repeated, creating emphasis. It becomes clear in Romans 5:4a endurance achieves character (ἡ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμήν) and character achieves hope (ἡ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα). According to Spicq (1994e:360) δοκιμή means 'proven character'. Michel (1966:179–180) suggests that it refers to the paraenetic tradition, as the other occurrence in James 1:3.[151] Paul's rhetoric mounts a climax.[152] What remains important is that character derives from being tested. This image of ὑπομονή also occurs in Romans 8:25.

The notion of hope is picked up again in Romans 5:5a (ἡ δὲ ἐλπὶς οὐ καταισχύνει), bringing the argument to a preliminary conclusion and elucidating that hope does not disappoint. The notion of hope also features in Romans 8:24, where it is connected with being saved. The verb καταισχύνω (Rm 5:5a) denotes 'to disappoint' (Bauer et al. 2000:517).[153] The background of honour/shame is vital, as honour entails being triumphant over enemies and accordingly not to be put to shame. Spicq (1994j:491) notes, in this context, ἐλπίς [hope] functions as a certainty of God's love and infinite mercy.[154]

The reason why hope does not disappoint comes to the fore in the clause ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν (Rm 5:5b). The expression

150. 'Perseverance' at its core means to suffer, but also entails the skill of self-mastery. The notion of self-mastery is crucial in Romans 7:12–25.

151. Wolter (2014:325) compares Romans 5:3–4, James 1:2–4 and 1 Peter 1:6–7 to determine the meaning of δοκιμή. The context is crucial in unlocking the word's meaning, which, according to Jewett (2007:355), is the testing of qualifications by performance in battle or public life. Morris (1988:221) notes that it indicates the result of being tested and the quality of being approved on the basis of a trial. Jewett (2007:354–355) clarifies δοκιμή in terms of its use in the Corinthian controversy with reference to the super apostles, interpreting it to mean 'approbation' in the sense of authentic faith. Faith does not consist of taking pride.

152. A similar rhetorical climax can be found in Wisdom 6:17–20 (Fitzmyer 1993:397; Longenecker 2016:561).

153. It is frequently used in LXX Psalms, for example, Psalms 21:6; 22:5; 24:20; 25:3, 20; LXX Isaiah 28:26 and 2 Timothy 1:12 (Fitzmyer 1993:397; Jewett 2007:356; Morris 1988:221). In both cases, people who are faithful worshippers hope for financial restoration and a relief from adversity. Their honour requires Yahweh's victory over their adversaries or at least the compensation of a blessed life after death. However, the idea of compensation is not present in Romans 5:1–11. Instead, Paul refers to God's righteousness by faith as a means that overcomes shame in the current stand of believers in grace (Jewett 2007:355).

154. With this sense of hope emerging from suffering, Paul begins to develop the major theme of the entire section seen in Romans 8:31–39 (Byrne 1996:166; Longenecker 2016:562).

ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ is repeated in Romans 8:39.[155] In Pauline usage, ἀγάπη usually indicates the love of God to humans (Bauer et al. 2000:7).[156] The subjective genitive signifies God's love (Porter 1992:95) and brings the idea of God's love in connection with the Holy Spirit (Wolter 2014:327). 'Αγάπη also includes the linking of persons from different statuses, such as rulers, benefactors and fathers, illustrating God's generous love (Spicq 1994a:13). Again, as seen in Romans 5:1, God's initiative in this relationship with humans is accentuated.[157]

The metaphor of abundance comes to the fore in Romans 5:5 sketching a loving and generous God who had poured his love into the hearts of believers through the Holy Spirit (ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν). The verb ἐκχέω [to pour out] usually has a cultic association[158]; but in this context, Bauer et al. (2000:312) postulate a metaphorical sense for ἐκχύννω, implying 'cause to fully experience'.[159] Paul metaphorically moves ἐκχύννω from its natural semantic domain, increasing the vividness of his expression (Cosby 1991:215). The verb ἐκχύννω is in the perfect passive describing the continued relevance of a completed action of God (Blass et al. 1961:§340). The source domain ἐκχύννω [to pour out] expresses the idea of unstinting lavishness.[160] God had poured love out into the hearts of believers (ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν).[161] This is a rare case that the preposition εἰς is substituted with ἐν (Oepke 1964b:433). The concept καρδία is translated as 'heart', but any ancient person of the 1st century would have fully understood it to refer to a person's thoughts, inclinations, desires, purpose and mind, thus expressing a

155. The phrase ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ also occurs in Romans 8:39.

156. This is the first occurrence of ἀγάπη in Romans. The word ἀγάπη [love, esteem, affection] originates from its use on tombs honouring an army officer who was highly regarded by his country. This association is not attached to the verb ἀγαπάω (Bauer et al. 2000:6). Spicq (1994a:12) mentions that ἀγάπη should be translated as 'demonstration of love'. Oda Wischmeyer (2015:15) writes that the early Christian idea of ἀγάπη comprises three components: ethics, ἐκκλησία and theology. The notion of God's love for humans stems from early Christians continued Jewish ideas, but also their reflection of their re-interpreted understanding of their faith (Wischmeyer 2015:15). Wischmeyer (2015:16) rightly warns against a reductionist understanding of ἀγάπη, as it entails more than mere brotherly love or ethnic notions.

157. The emphasis on love is strangely overlooked, as it is God's love that motivates believers, thereby emphasising the divine initiative (Morris 1988:221).

158. The verb ἐκχέω recalls images of shedding blood in murder as seen in the Old Testament (Gn 9:6; Ezk 18:10) and recalls other New Testament instances (Mt 23:34; Ac 22:20; Rm 3:15) and the Lord's supper (Mk 14:24; Mt 26:28; Lk 22:20). Pentecost traditions link it with the pouring of the Spirit.

159. Cf. Ps.-Demeter, Eloc. 134 Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 1,37 of light; Jos. *Ant*. 6, 271 of the Holy Spirit.

160. Cf. Chrysostom, col. 470 (Kruse 2012:226).

161. There is an allusion in LXX Isaiah 28:16 that the idea of spiritual refreshment and encouragement is usually conveyed in the East through the metaphor of watering. Isaiah 44:3 seems to be prevalent according to Black (1973:76), Fitzmyer (1993:398) and Longenecker (2016:561). Cranfield (1975:203) indicates that this use is not strange as it is often used in the LXX and occurs nine times in the New Testament referring to the pouring out of God's wrath, particularly in Ecclesiastes 18:11 with the pouring out of God's mercy and in Malachi 3:10 with the pouring out of his blessing.

person's whole inner life (Bauer et al. 2000:508). However, καρδία functions as a specific place where God had poured his love through the Holy Spirit. Drawing on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:29) container metaphor, this image may be interpreted as a container metaphor, with the body of the believer functioning as the container for the substance of the God's love God had poured into believers' hearts. The audience was non-Jewish people; thus, it is significant that Paul illustrates the abundance of God's love that had been poured into all hearts.[162] The verb δίδωμι means to express generosity (Bauer et al. 2000:242), supporting the image of abundance. In this case, it is especially associated with the generosity of the Holy Spirit. However, this abundance of the Holy Spirit is also prevalent in Romans 8:15, and especially 8:23, linking the space overflown with the Holy Spirit as a place filled by the first fruits of the Holy Spirit, while in anticipation for the redemption of the body.

The culmination of the power of love (Rm 5:6–11)

Dying on behalf (Rm 5:6–8)

In Romans 5:3–5, the chain structure places the focus on hope. The basis for hope is supplied in Romans 5:6–8 (Bauer et al. 2000:400; Eschner 2010a:294; Fitzmyer 1993:399; Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:104). In a type of sandwich structure, Paul cements the possibility for believers to have a relationship with God. The tradition of Christ 'dying on behalf of' humans is employed in both Romans 5:6 and 5:8 for those who are not deemed worthy. In Romans 5:6, for while believers were still powerless, at the right time, Christ died on behalf of the ungodly (ἔτι γὰρ Χριστὸς ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν ἔτι κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν [Rm 5:6a–b]). Romans 5:7 illustrates the oddity of dying for someone who is not worthy, as for barely will one die for a righteous person (μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται [Rm 5:7a]). The verse continues stating perhaps on behalf of a good person one might be brave to die for (ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν [Rm 5:7b]). However, the magnitude of the relationship between God and the believers is underscored in Romans 5:8a as God shows his love towards believers (συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός [Rm 5:8a]). The past state of believers that has changed by Christ dying on behalf of them comes to the fore again in Romans 5:8b, which is parallel with ἀσεβῶν in Romans 5:6. The reason for God's love is that even while believers were sinners, Christ died on behalf of them (ὅτι ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν [Rm 5:8b]).

162. Cf. Galatians 3:2; Acts 2:18, 33; 10:45.

Detail analysis of Romans 5:6–8

The particle γάρ (Rm 5:6a) signals an explanation and the emphatic repetition of the adverb ἔτι connects the main idea of Romans 5:5 with Romans 5:6 and stresses the persistence of the condition, which is hope. The placement of ἔτι γάρ (Rm 5:6a) in the beginning of the clause not only emphatically situates the words (Moule 1953:166) but also creates proleptic anticipation of the subject, Χριστός. The genitive absolute (ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν) adds by making the object the main clause (Blass et al. 1961:§476[1]). This is the first independent appearance of Χριστός [Christ], which is also repeated in Romans 5:8.[163] Χριστός especially brings the death of Jesus into remembrance (Hahn 2011:1158).[164] Χριστός means 'anointed One or Christ' and is derived from the Jewish concept of the Messiah, who is seen as a saving figure (Hahn 2011:1147–1166). Martin Karrer (1991:377) indicates how Christ as anointed one stems from a Jewish tradition where the death of Jesus overcomes all curses as salvation 'for us'. Paul's use of the cognomen altered the Jewish understanding as a title (Hahn 2011:1159). The *genitivus absolutus* (ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν) draws attention to a period where humans were powerless.[165] The word ἀσθενής means to lack strength and thus be weak and powerless (Bauer et al. 2000:142). Usually, ἀσθενής is interpreted in the light of 1 Corinthians 15:43 as a reference to human susceptibility to death. This link was made within the context of the conflict of the boasting apostles in Corinthians, a claim that Paul refutes by boasting that he has weakness and that Christ was crucified in weakness. This theological deviation remains unanswered by commentators. However, such an approach is problematic within the text as the earlier argument concerns the human situation prior without peace with God as marked by hostility and rebellion against God instead of merely weak finitude. In Romans 5:6a, in conjunction with the present participle of εἰμί and the personal pronoun ἡμῶν [of the inner life], it denotes a weakness of faith and a moral sense is implied. I do not perceive ἀσθενής [powerless] as a synonym of ἀσεβῶν[166] as the parallelism between Romans 5:6a and Romans 5:6b is often interpreted to imply that

163. Χριστός also marks an *inclusio* featuring in Romans 5:6a and 5:8 (Longenecker 2016:562–564; Witherington 1993:96).

164. See also Witherington (1993:96). For non-Jewish and non-Christian people, the idea of a saviour, Χριστός, entailed a unique relationship with a god, enabling a person to enter the godly realm, for example, Ovid, Metam. XIII 950–955 (Karrer 1991:377–384).

165. Eschner (2009:661) notes especially the situation of people before the death of Christ.

166. Rather ἀσεβῶν functions as a synonym for ἁμαρτωλός [sinner] in Romans 5:8 (Longenecker 2016:563; Schlier 1977:152; Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:106). Schlier (1977:152) has ascribed anomalies to Paul's use of ὑπέρ ἀσεβῶν as an early Christian confession used in Rome and modified by Paul to suit his argument. The phrase ὑπέρ ἀσεβῶν only occurs once in other Greek literature, namely, in Diodorus Siculus Hist. 23.1.4.13 describing the outset of the first Punic War 'but if they were to enter upon a war of such magnitude over the most impious of people' (Jewett 2007:359).

'weakness' should be viewed as 'godless'.[167] Paul describes the condition of the ungodly; because of Sin, they were weak and had no reverence for God (Fitzmyer 1993:399).

The seemingly traditional statements (Jewett 2007:346–347; Longenecker 2016:551) in Romans 5:6–8 are held together with the preposition ὑπέρ along with the fourfold repetition of ἀποθνῄσκω and the adverb ἔτι. This established a pattern of repetition (Semino 2008:22). In Romans 5:6, 8, the preposition ὑπέρ [on behalf of] is best understood as in the sense of ἀντί [in the place of] (Breytenbach 2005:172; Eschner 2010b:85). Paul uses traditional formulaic phrases connected with prepositions, such as ὑπέρ, διά or περί, with ἀποθνῄσκω or (παρα-) δίδωμι, expressing the effect of Christ's death (Breytenbach 2005:163–185).[168] Moreover, Christina Eschner (2010b:20) has illustrated that various Greek authors during the imperial time drawing on Euripides placed immense importance on the notion of 'dying for' someone, that is, ἀποθνῄσκω – ὑπέρ – τινος expression (Breytenbach 2005:163–185; Eschner 2010b:196). During the time Paul wrote the letter to the Romans, the materials of Euripides and an awareness of mythical persons were widespread amongst citizens of the Romans Empire (Eschner 2009:665). It is significant that the formula is usually utilised in an apotropaic way to ward off disaster (Eschner 2009:664). Within the tradition of the death of Alkestis, Paul's use of the formula includes the leitmotiv of love.[169] Eschner (2010a:351–352) cogently illustrates that the death of Christ also wards off a war, as the language in Romans 5:1–11[170] reflects 'war'.[171] The notion of one person dying to prevent a war is like kings of the polis would have warriors fight to the death (Eschner 2010a:352). For Paul, the 'to die for' metaphor is intertwined with the notion of love functioning as an indicator that people are saved (Eschner 2009:661–662, 2010b:86).[172]

167. Wolter (2014:329) also does not view these terms as synonyms. Black (1973:77) opts that although the use is rare, the adjective should be interpreted as 'weakness of the wicked' as this is attested for in 1 Clement XXXVI, 1; Herm, Mand., IV. III. 4.

168. The preposition ὑπέρ is often used in classical Greek, especially Hellenistic papyri, for example, P. Teb. 104.39–40, in a substitutionary sense meaning doing something for someone's benefit and doing it in the place of someone, as is the case in Romans 5:7–8 (Porter 1992:177; Moule 1953:64).

169. Cf. Sen. Epist. 9,10; 9.8,20; Vict. Caes. 14,8; Test. 2.3 (Eschner 2010b:207–208).

170. Cf. Th 5:1–11.

171. ἀποθνῄσκω – ὑπέρ – τινος: Pol. 6,24,7; Dion. Hal. *Ant*. 6,9,1; *rhet*. 6,4; Lukian. *Tox*. 36; Jos. *Ant*. 6, 335, 347; Jos. *Bell*. 3, 358; Ps.-Lukian. *Charid*. 18 (Eschner 2010b:214).

172. Cf. Xen. Cyn. 1,14 (Antilochos dies for his father); Verg. Aen. 10, 789 & 10, 812, 824 (also the love of the son for the father). Du Toit (2009:132) argues that love is the motivation of God's action and the use of ἀγάπη is Jewish to the core.

A peculiarity in the clause of Romans 5:6b is the use of the phrase κατά καιρόν[173] in contrast to Paul's normal use of ἐν καιρῷ, as seen in Romans 3:26; 11:5; 2 Corinthians 8:14 and 2 Thessalonians 2:6.[174] Eschner (2010a:301) indicates that ἔτι κατὰ καιρόν refers to the allotted time that believers will be saved from their predicament. The time before the salvation of the death of Christ is crystallised in the *genitivus absolutus* (ὄντων ἡμῶν ἀσθενῶν) underscoring the hopelessness (Eschner 2010a:301).

An explanation follows in Romans 5:7a as γάρ designates.[175] Paul argues *a fortiori* as Christ did not only die but also died for the sinful and godless people (Byrne 1996:167; Fitzmyer 1993:399). Paul describes how it would have been logical to die on behalf of someone who is righteous (ὑπὲρ δικαίου) or someone who is good (ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ), but Christ died for those who are considered to be unworthy.[176] Divine generosity to all in the ancient world is not an anomaly as gifts of nature such as rain, sun, light and heat are given to both good and bad.[177] The reason for Christ's action is intertwined with love, as the imagery of God's love, poured out into the hearts of believers, illustrated in Romans 5:5. However, the recipients of God's love are demarcated unworthy and Paul does not even imply that they have any hidden potential that evokes such a gift from God (Barclay 2015:477). Paul identifies the gift of God, not as the benefactions of nature but with the death of Christ (Barclay 2015:478). Paul makes a good case that this love from God is exceptional and emphasises God's loving action towards humans.

Closely bound with this notion is the envisioned status change Christ's death entails for people God favours (Eschner 2009:661). The clause is parallel with Romans 5:7b, illustrating Paul's distinction between the righteous (δίκαιος)[178] and the good (ἀγαθός). There has been debate concerning what is intended with τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Schlier (1977:1953) argues it is masculine and not

173. The article can be omitted as seen in the prepositional phrase κατὰ καιρόν in Romans 5:6b (Blass et al. 1961:§255(3)).

174. Morris (1988:222–223) comments that Paul offers two ways of looking at the time of Christ's death. Firstly, he died at a time when we were still sinners, and at a time that fitted God's purpose. Secondly, Christ died for the ungodly people.

175. Romans 5:7 is supposed to clarify Romans 5:6, but hardly does so in any clear fashion (Fitzmyer 1993:399). This verse has been widely disputed as being a gloss, or even the combination of two glosses. The word μόλις [barely, scarcely] does not appear anywhere else in Paul's letter. However, this is no reason to assume the verse is a gloss (Fitzmyer 1993:400; Longenecker 2016:562).

176. Paul emphasises in Romans 5:6b that the death of Christ took place not for good people but for sinners (Cranfield 1975:264; Morris 1988:222).

177. Cf. Seneca, Ben. 1.1.9–10.

178. Jewett (2007:359) suggests that δίκαιος is used in a typically Judaic manner, meaning 'righteous' in contradiction to Paul's argument in Romans 1:18–3:23 that no one is righteous.

neuter, allowing for a distinction between δίκαιος and ἀγαθός.[179] Sometimes the article is not demonstrative but may be described as 'deictic', thus pointing out some familiar type or genus (Moule 1953:111). Asserting τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ as a *neutrum* without a reference opens the idea of dying for someone in a general way (Wolter 2014:331). This interpretation fits with the context. The gnomic future of ἀποθνῄσκω expressing what is to be expected under certain circumstances (Blass et al. 1961:§349[1])[180] described by the adverbs of manner μόλις [barely] (Rm 5:7a) (Porter 1992:126) and τάχα [perhaps] (Rm 5:7b) (Blass et al. 1961:§102(2)). The adverb τάχα is used with the indicative of τολμάω instead of the potential optative (Fitzmyer 1993:400).[181] The expression τολμᾶν ἀποθανεῖν ὑπέρ is found since Euripides in Greek literature[182] and makes it clear that τολμᾶν should not be translated as 'dare' because the focus was not on the risk 'to die for someone', but rather on the great 'courage' that was needed to be successful (Liddell et al. 1996:199). This places the stress on the enormity of the deed (Byrne 1996:167). In contrast to Greco-Roman culture and especially Roman civic cult, where the hero dies for the honoured fatherland, Jesus did not die as a hero (Eschner 2010b:212; Jewett 2007:361). Seneca (Ben. IV.8.2) warns against the bestowal of benefits for ungrateful people as beneficial deaths by human benefactors were never undertaken for enemies, the unrighteous or sinners (Joubert 2005:202).[183]

The adverb ἔτι is repeated in Romans 5:8b, creating a sandwich structure as it complicates the interpretation of Romans 5:7 (Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:104).[184] Romans 5:7 forms the antithesis to Romans 5:8, which reverses the poles of Romans 5:6 and 5:7 (Harrisville 1980:81; Jewett 2007:360). The ἀγάπη of God becomes even clearer (Schlier 1977:153). For Paul, the death of Christ is the proof of God's love (συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός

179. Longenecker (2016:563) notes that this distinction signifying the righteous and the good as people for whom scarcely anyone would give his or her life is peculiar. However, Clarke (1990:136) indicates that the two terms were often used together praising a figure comprising a different nuance in meaning as the philosophy of the principate stipulated that the person who benefitted society the most was more valuable. Accordingly, the ἀγαθός associated with wealth, family ties and rank was considered essential in maintaining political stability and thus revered of as higher value than δικαιοσύνη (Clarke 1990:136).

180. Porter (1992:44) argues that the clause has a timeless facet, meaning someone will die for a just person where it can hardly be expected.

181. Contra Blass et al. (1961:§385[1]).

182. To die for a person: Eur. *Alc*. 644.; 469; 741; Eur. Ion 278; to die for Greece: Hec. 310; with reference to death of Achilles Iph. A. 1389 (Eschner 2010b:281); Eschner (2010b:13–15) gives various examples from Euripides indicating dying for friends, parents dying for their children and dying for the fatherland. Cf. Iph. Aul. 1389; Plato, Symp. 179e–180a; Isocrates, Phil. 55; Pax 153; Demosthenes, Or. 26,23.

183. Cf. Philo, *Spec Leg III,* 153–168.

184. Longenecker (2016:562) also maintains that the focus is on Romans 5:7. Romans 5:6–8 heeds linguistically, structural and theological perplexities despite the obvious familiar Christian statements (Longenecker 2016:562). There appears to be textual corruption in Romans 5:6 on two levels, namely, grammatical as the subject of the verb is in an unusual position and textual as ἔτι is repeated (Black 1973:76).

[Rm 5:8a]) (Cranfield 1975:265; Du Toit 2009:132). Christ died to avert the evil of sin because God loves sinners (Eschner 2010a:288).[185] Christ willingly gave his life for sinners so that believers are defended from the consequences of wrongdoings according to the Torah through the death of Christ (Breytenbach 2013b:324).

Paul is most likely accepting a traditional formula to substantiate his argument that the shameful status of sinners has been reversed into a new form of taking pride as Christ has died for them in the ὅτι clause[186] of Romans 5:8b.[187] Paul takes up the same reference of Christ's death for sin as seen in 1 Corinthians 15:3 (Breytenbach 2013b:325). The 'dying for' formula ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is connected to the *genitivus absolutus* (ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστός). The use of the plural of the personal pronoun as well as the use of the noun ἁμαρτωλός attributes to a personal Gestalt (Eschner 2010a:356).[188] It is significant that Paul refers to dying for 'us' instead of surrendering 'for our sins', as is the case in traditional formulations such as 1 Corinthians 15:3 and Galatians 1:4, which is usually linked to impersonal prepositional phrases (Eschner 2010a:356). Paul takes up the fundamental notion that the death of Christ is to deter calamity from individuals (Breytenbach 2013b:325).

☐ To be vindicated and reconciled (Rm 5:9–11)

A typical *a minori ad maius* rhetorical style frames Romans 5:9–11 as Paul extrapolates the meaning of Christ dying for sinners. The inference is that if that is how God treats someone who is underserving of his love, then just imagine the implications for those who are justified and reconciled with God. Believers' current position comes to view as having now been justified in his blood (δικαιωθέντες νῦν ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ [Rm 5:9a]). Based on their position towards God enabled through Christ, believers will be saved through him from God's future judgement (σωθησόμεθα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς [Rm 5:9b]). Believers' position with reference to God is emphasised again in Romans 5:10. The conditional clause reminds that when believers were enemies, they were reconciled to God through the death of his Son (εἰ γὰρ ἐχθροὶ ὄντες κατηλλάγημεν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ [Rm 5:10a–b]). The imagery of Romans 5:10 links with Romans 5:1 and paints the instrumentality of the Son's death concrete.

185. Cf. Matthew 5:44; Luke 6:27, 35.

186. In Romans 5:8b, ὅτι means 'in that', 'by the fact that'.

187. In this case, Paul seems to place the Greek presentation of 'dying for', which is personalised to the background to accommodate the traditional impersonal 'dying for' formula (Eschner 2010a:356).

188. The word ἁμαρτωλός in the ὅτι-clause means behaviour or activity that does not measure up to standard moral or cultic expectations, thus an outsider (Bauer et al. 2000:51). Jewett (2007:361) describes ἁμαρτωλός as a social class of people who are the opposite of 'righteous and pious', engage in social oppression and stand in opposition to God.

Again the 'much more' (πολλῷ μᾶλλον) language in Romans 5:10c reiterates the implication of believers' attained reconciled status, that is, they will be saved in his life (καταλλαγέντες σωθησόμεθα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ [Rm 5:10c]). Romans 5:11 elucidates believers have not only have been reconciled to have been saved but also take pride in God through Jesus Christ their Lord (οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμενοι ἐν τῷ θεῷ διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rm 5:11a]). The instrumentality of Christ resurfaces in the adverbial clause Romans 5:11b (δι᾽ οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν) as it is through Jesus Christ in whom believers have now received reconciliation.

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 5:9–11

Romans 5:9–11 instigates a conclusion of the argument as the inferential particle οὖν in Romans 5:9a designates. The *a minori ad maius* rhetoric features as the phrase πολλῷ μᾶλλον [thus many more] signals.[189] The recurrence of the aorist participle passive of δικαιόω recollects Romans 5:1. The latter creates a rhetorical extended anaphora as Paul resumes his discussion of Romans 5:1–5, supervened by Romans 5:6–8 (Longenecker 2016:564). In Romans 5:1, justification is grammatically subordinated to having peace with God. The same pattern unfolds in Romans 5:9a as justification is subordinated to future salvation seen in the main clause Romans 5:9b (Black 1973:77).[190] However, similar to Romans 5:1, justification is depicted as a present reality seen in the temporal adverb νῦν [now], which is also repeated in Romans 5:11b that underscores the notion (Longenecker 2016:565).

The references to 'death' and 'blood' are not cultic but connote to death as giving up one's life on behalf of someone else (Fitzmyer 1993:401).[191] The phrase is metonymy referring to the crucifixion, thus Christ dying 'for us' (Harrisville 1980:81). Stanley Porter (1992:158) highlights that a metaphorical extension residue in ἐν of the locative sense remains in the prepositional phrase ἐν τῷ αἵματι (see Fitzmyer 1993:400).[192] The Greek tradition of 'dying for' has no semblance with categories of atonement or expiation (Breytenbach 2010c:180). Justification and reconciliation are possible in light of the creedal statements of Romans 5:6 and 5:8 that Christ died 'for us'. Rather Paul layers another meaning by expressing how humanity benefits from Christ dying for all,

189. This technique is employed again in Romans 5:15–17 (Byrne 1996:168; Fitzmyer 1993:400; Harrisville 1980:82; Longenecker 2016:565; Morris 1988:224).

190. Fitzmyer (1993:400) argues that the subordination of justification to salvation is significant as, in spite of the emphasis, Paul felt he must lay upon justification, he found the real centre of his religion in the new life, which followed upon justification.

191. Contra Blass et al. (1961:§219(3)). Moule (1953:77) interprets δικαιωθέντες … ἐν τῷ αἵματι αὐτοῦ as instrumental, indicating the price of his αἷμα.

192. The meaning of αἷμα [blood] in a figurative sense also implies the life of an individual (Bauer et al. 2000:26). Accordingly, the prepositional phrase is parallel to ἐν τῇ ζωῇ in Romans 5:10c.

personalising and universalising Christ's death for every sinner (Breytenbach 2010c:180).

Furthermore, the future passive of σῴζω in the main clause of Romans 5:9b fittingly refers to the future salvation through Christ (δι᾽ αὐτοῦ) from God's future judgement (ἀπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς).[193] Both in Seneca and in Plutarch, ὀργή is used as the opposite of χάρις (Engberg-Pedersen 2008:22–23). The verb σῴζω in secular Greek means to deliver someone from a particularly perilous situation, for example, war or deliverance from enemies or opponents (Spicq 1994s:345).[194] This renders the question: from what does a person need saving? The answer is from the consequences of Sin/sin,[195] and this idea from 1:18–3:20 becomes expounded in Romans 5:12–21.

The conditional clause in Romans 5:10 sheds further light on the salvation that is to come, recapitulating that the 'we' had the status of being enemies (ἐχθροὶ ὄντες).[196] The construction implies the truth of the supposition: 'when we were enemies' (Morris 1988:225). However, believers' status changed, as they have been reconciled with God, restating what has been said in Romans 5:8, but in different words (Fitzmyer 1993:401). This change of hostility to friendship with God has been made possible through the death of his Son, referring to the death of Christ (διὰ τοῦ θανάτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ). The use of καταλλαγ- terms are unique to the Pauline tradition. The use of καταλλάσσω [to be reconciled] is heavily influenced by Greek secular literature, making the Hellenistic milieu fundamental in the understanding of its use (Breytenbach 2010c:171–186; Porter 1993:695). For pagans and Christians, καταλλαγή is the action of re-establishing friendship between two persons who are on bad terms, to replace hostility with peaceful relations. The theological elaboration of καταλλαγή entails reconciliation with God and humans as an immediate effect of Christ's death. It describes the change from enmity to friendship (Breytenbach 2010c:171). The use of καταλλαγή was not important in the language of Greek and Roman religion and does not connote 'atonement'

193. In Romans 5:9b, ὀργή means 'God's future judgement' (Bauer et al. 2000:721). Paul is referring to the wrath to come; the eschatological wrath and Christ salvation is not only effective now but also what lies beyond this life (Breytenbach 2010c:184; Morris 1988:225). The reference to wrath when all stress seems to be on the love of God seems surprising, but remains a key factor within the apocalyptic perspective of the argument, and salvation at least in negative terms is the rescue from wrath (Byrne 1996:168; Mounce 1995:137). Schmitt (2014:67–79) sheds light on the occurrences of wrath and peace in Paul, noting that the first occurrence of wrath is marked by no hope of being saved, with the situation being changed in Romans 5 and eventually the occurrence of wrath diminished in Romans with peace increasing.

194. The process of saving is only possible through Jesus.

195. Frick (2007:208) succinctly states that both the Jews and the gentiles are in the same peril of being enslaved to Sin and in need of the same solution. This will especially become clear throughout the argument of Romans 5:12–8:39.

196. Paul is elaborating the Christological basis of both reconciliation and salvation according to Wright (2002:520).

(Cranfield 1975:267). This is a mapping of non-religious terminology unto a religious domain (Breytenbach 2010c:171).

The verb καταλλάσσω [reconcile] is repeated in Romans 5:10, appearing in the aor pass form the first time and in the aor participle pass[197] the second time, marking the second movement of the argument with the metaphor of reconciliation (Byrne 1996:168). The passives signify God's action. This reconciliatory deed of Jesus is emphasised with the next clause in Romans 5:10c introduced with the formula πολλῷ μᾶλλον [much more]. The scope is widened. 'We' have not just been reconciled (καταλλαγέντες) but 'we' shall also be saved (σωθησόμεθα) as the future passive of σῴζω indicates.

The argument culminates in Romans 5:11. Romans 5:11a is subordinated to Romans 5:10 as the phrase οὐ μόνον δέ [not only, but also] signals. The phrase ἀλλὰ καί emphasises the climactic third instance of καυχάομαι[198] linking Romans 5:2 and structured in the same elliptical fashion as in Romans 5:3: 'and not only that, but we boast in God' (Fitzmyer 1993:401; Harrisville 1980:82; Morris 1988:226).[199] This clause also recalls Romans 5:1 with the repetition of the phrase διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ bringing the concept of peace, which is strongly linked with καταλλαγή [reconciliation], into remembrance, connoting 'through whom we have now received reconciliation'. Paul uses the dramatic aorist for a present action emphasising νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν [now we have been reconciled] (Porter 1992:36). The adverb νῦν [now] designates an action or condition beginning in the present in contrast to its use with the aorist tense of λαμβάνω (Bauer et al. 2000:681).

Persuasion in Romans 5:1–11

Paul wants to convince the audience that they have been reconciled with God. The synonymous images 'to have peace with God' (Rm 5:1) and 'to be reconciled' (Rm 5:10) create a metaphorical cluster framing Romans 5:1–11.[200] Metaphorical clusters are usually employed to heighten persuasiveness (Semino 2008:25). The source domain of both metaphors is 'war', enforcing

197. Both times being in the past emphasising the finality of God's action. The only other time this connection is made, is in 2 Corinthians 5:18, 19 (Black 1973:76; Harrisville 1980:82).

198. This is an instance of a participle where normal Greek would have used a finite or imperative (Moule 1953:179).

199. Jewett (2007:376) elaborates on the connection with καυχώμενοι in this clause mentioning that wrongful boasting declares war against God, but boasting through the gift of reconciliation results in a new form of life. I understand καυχάομαι to indicate 'drawing on the glory of God'. Boasting comes full circle, catching up with the ancient privilege of Israel (LXX Dt 10:21; Ps 5:12; 105:47; 106:47) (Byrne 1996:169).

200. Metaphorical clusters may occur in the beginning and end of a passage to frame the discussion (Semino 2008:25).

the image that believers, before they had peace or were reconciled with God, were his enemies.

This shift in believers' relationship with God is particularly incumbent with regard to the spatiality of Paul's language in Romans 5:1–5. The metaphorical structuring fits in a coherent manner (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:87–114). Paul paints a powerful picture of believers standing in favour after being reconciled with God. Initially, the audience encounters a forensic image 'having been justified', evoking a court scene. The image harks back and supports the principal argument of Romans 1–4 as believers have been justified, but also sets the scene for the metaphor of peace. This metaphor of peace draws on the source domain of war, intrinsically comprising an area where the fight will take place on or for. This image is elaborated on with the royal image of προσαγωγή, illustrating that believers have gained access through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord. The royal source domain is coherent with the notion of dominion, as a royal court setting implies a king and a subject.

Paul expounds the image spatiality further with more dimension of 'standing in favour'. The metaphor 'to stand' draws on the body as a reference point. But what is more, on account of believers standing in this favour referring to the peaceful relationship obtained with God through Jesus Christ, believers take pride with reference to hope of the glory of God. The language of καυχάομαι is part of a rhetorical ploy. The metonymy of ἐπ᾽ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ subverts Roman conceptions of glory referring to the crucifixion. For Paul, glory is not obtained from winning on a battlefield in contrast to imperial Rome. Believers not only take pride in the hope of the glory of God but also take pride in their sufferings. Paul draws on the Jewish understanding of suffering as a test of trust in God and develops a chain emphasising hope. Hope will not disappoint believers. The reason for hope is also underscored with the notion of believers' sufferings being parallel to the imagery of the abundance of God.

The abundance metaphor also exhibits a spatial aspect. The bodies of believers may be perceived as the container in which the love of God had been poured into. As the substance fills up the container, it becomes the controlling influence. However, the only indication at this point is that the love of God has been made available to believers, and what is more, the Holy Spirit is also being given to believers.

In Romans 5:6–8, Paul propounds this notion of hope. Paul utilises the Greek formulae of 'dying for' someone, conveying that calamity is warded off by the deed. In Romans 6:8, Paul's use of the 'dying for' image seems to conflate with the traditional formulae, but the focus remains that the believers have been warded off from the consequences of sin. God's love is demonstrated, especially as believers had been enemies, godless and unworthy of the deed

of having someone die 'for' them.[201] The new body entails a metaphorical death of the body to enable the reality of life dominated by God.

The argument continues with *a minori ad maius* reasoning. If this is how people who are deemed unworthy are treated, imagine what it must be like when a person is a friend of God. The Christ event is referred to again metonymically to Jesus dying for humans. The image is not cultic. Believers will be saved from wrath, which is the opposite notion of favour, thus indicating a state of not being in the favour of God. The metaphor of reconciliation is employed again highlighting the current status of believers as friends of God.

The reign of powers (Rm 5:12–21)

The invasion of powers (Rm 5:12–17)

The implications of the status change purveyed in Romans 5:1–11 are elucidated in Romans 5:12–21 as the formula διὰ τοῦτο signals (Byrne 1996:173; Cranfield 1975:271; Fitzmyer 1993:411; Longenecker 2016:586; Mounce 1995:140; Snyman 2016:3; Wolter 2014:341). Within this pericope, the source domain βασιλεύω [to be a king], conveying 'to have royal power or to dominate' (Liddell et al. 1996:309; Schmidt 1964:590; Spicq 1994d:256), is particularly prevalent. The argument in this pericope makes it clear that the reign of Favour (Christ) is far superior to the reign of Death and per implication, Sin.

Romans 5:12 marks the entrances of Sin and Death as personified powers. Just as Sin came into the human world through one human (ὥσπερ δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν [Rm 5:12a]) and Death through Sin (καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος [Rm 5:12b]), so too Death spread into all humans (καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν [Rm 5:12c]). The entrances of these powers are proffered as the cause that all sinned (ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον [Rm 5:12d]). Paul elucidates the state of the human world affected by these forces as he describes a time without the law, for until the law, Sin was in the human world (ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ [Rm 5:13a]). Within this period, Sin was not charged where there was no law (ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rm 5:13b–c]). Yet, Death reigned from Adam until Moses (ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως [Rm 5:14a]), even over those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression (καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ [Rm 5:14]), who is a mould for the one to come (ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος [Rm 5:14c]). In Romans 5: 12–14, an analogy between the figures of Christ and Adam unfolds, in which believers' prior position is compared with their justified and reconciled position.

201. In 2 Corinthians 5:14–21, Paul uses similar language explicating that the love of God controls believers, creating a status change, because one had died, all had died, which results in being created anew.

The different implications of the reigns of these two figures crystallise in Romans 5:15–17. Paul negates the grace-gift, is not like the trespass (ἀλλ᾽ οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα [Rm 5:15a]). Paul's different use of χάρισμα becomes prevalent, as Christ's χάρισμα [Favour-gift] is contrasted with Adam's παράπτωμα [trespass]. In a typical *a minori ad maius* style, Paul highlights that if many died through the trespass of the one (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον [Rm 5:15b]), how much more have the 'Favour of God' and the gift in Favour through the one human Jesus Christ abounded for the many (πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν [Rm 5:15c]). Paul continues that the gift is not like the result of the one who sinned (καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα [Rm 5:16a]) for, on the one hand, a verdict from the one resulted in condemnation (τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα [Rm 5:16b]), but on the other hand, the Favour-gift from many trespasses resulted in vindication (justification – τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα [Rm 5:16c]). Romans 5:17 elaborates the reasoning that if Death reigned through the trespass of the one, (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός [Rm 5:17a]), how much more will those who receive the abundance of the Favour and gift of righteousness in life (πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶςτῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ [Rm 5:17b]) reign through the one Jesus Christ (βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rm 5:17c])?

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 5:12–14

The structure of Romans 5:12 resembles a chiasm: (1a) Sin came into the world through one man (δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν), (2b) and Death through Sin (καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος), (2b) so too Death spread to all humankind (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν) and (1) for that reason all humans sinned (ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον) (Black 1973:78; Longenecker 2016:579; Wolter 2014:343). The particles διὰ τοῦτο with ὥσπερ initiates a comparison in Romans 5:12; however, the apodosis culminates in Romans 5:18a (Greijdanus 1933:272; Harrisville 1980:82; Lohse 2003:174; Longenecker 2016:586; Schlier 1977:160; Zahn 1925:261).[202] The aim of the supposed[203] comparative clause in Romans 5:12 is to elucidate the presence of Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and Death

202. The use of διὰ τοῦτο in connection with the comparative conjunction ὥσπερ [just as] was widely used in Greek literature, for example, Plato Eryx. 400c5; Aristotle Hist. An. 618a 27; Dio Cassius Hist. Rom. 66.2.4; Dinarchus Dem. 96.2 and Porphyry Abst. 3.17.11. This is not the first instance in which Paul compares Jesus Christ and Adam. See 1 Corinthians 15:21–22 (Black 1973:77; Fitzmyer 1993:413; Greijdanus 1933:272; Harrisville 1980:82).

203. The phrase καὶ οὕτως [and as] provides an implication rather than being an apodosis for a comparison.

(ὁ θάνατος) in the world and God's reaction to it. Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία)[204] and Death (ὁ θάνατος) are personified[205] because the definite article in conjunction with the noun marks the personification, illustrating both as forces.[206]

Paul's use of the phrase δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου [through one human] in Romans 5:12a is significant at two levels.[207] Firstly, the instrumentality evoked by the preposition διά[208] reminds the audience of διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [through Jesus Christ our Lord] in Romans 5:11 (Wolter 2014:341). Secondly, the noun ἄνθρωπος is used in a generic sense as 'humanity' underscoring that all humans are affected by the actions of one human (Lohse 2003:174; Schlier 1977:161).[209] The particular human in question can be inferred as Adam.[210] The divergence from Genesis 1 is ubiquitous, as Adam was initially not intended as a figure to represent the whole of humanity (Wilckens 1978:314).[211] Moreover, the phrase διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rm 5:12b) is parallel to δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου (Rm 5:12a) (Wilckens 1978:315).

204. This is the first time sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) appears in this chapter and it appears overall 23 times in Romans 5–8. It is noteworthy that sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) appears five times in Romans 5 (5:12, 13 [twice], 20 and 21), eight times in Romans 6 (6:1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14) and 10 times in Romans 7 (7:7, 8 [twice], 9, 11, 13 [thrice], 17, 20), but does not occur in Romans 8.

205. Contra Cranfield (1975:274) who argues that the personification is not sustained.

206. Paul sometimes deviates from this formula of a definite article in conjunction with a noun, as is prevalent in the following verse (Smyth 1956:1122). Zahn (1925:263) remarks that Sin with the article provides a familiarity that all humans already know of this ruling force.

207. Jewett (2007:373) mentions that δι᾽ ἑνός ἀνθρώπου is a common expression in classical parallels to refer to evil caused by one person. He lists Dinarchus Dem. 49.4; Hippocrates Epist. 11.9; Plutarch Cim 2.1.3; Plato Men. 92e3; Resp. 462c10. There are plenty of examples indicating this phrase also to be used in battles, for example, Isocratus, Oracles, 24.6; Polybius, Histories, 3.107.14.2. However, Zahn (1925:263), Wolter (2014:342) and Wilckens (1978:314) note that it is evident that Genesis 2:16; 3:1–19 is presupposed with the phrase 'through the one'. Paul deviates from this Jewish tradition.

208. Stauffer (1964:423) maintains that διά in Romans 5:12a is employed in a causal sense. However, διά functions in an instrumental manner, similar to ἐν, as some person or entity serves as the device or means by which some action is performed (Porter 1992:149).

209. Contra Michel (1966:186).

210. Even though ἄνθρωπος is used in the generic sense, Adam may be inferred and appears explicitly in Romans 5:14 (Byrne 1996:173; Fitzmyer 1993:411; Schlier 1977:160; Wolter 2014:342; Zahn 1925:267).

211. The traditional understanding presupposed of Genesis 1–3 did not yet exist in Paul's time (Stowers 1994: 86–87). The Adam tradition derived from Genesis 3:16 exists in a wide assortment of post-biblical Jewish literature. Cf. 4 Ezr 3:7; 2 Apoc. Bar. 17:2–3; 23:4; 48:42–43; Bib. Ant. 13:8; cf. 2 Enoch 30:16. Some forms of the tradition places the blame solely on Eve, as seen in Sirach 25:24; Apoc. Mos. 14; or the devil in Wisdom 2:23–24 (Byrne 1996:174; Zeller 1985:115–116).

Adam is not portrayed as inherently evil[212] or truly as the root of the problem.[213] There is no mention of Adam's trespass or misstep until Romans 5:15. Rather, Adam is the vehicle of the problem.[214] Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) enters into the human world (εἰς τὸν κόσμον) through Adam, and in this sense, Adam may be perceived as a victim.[215] However, with Romans 5:1–11 as a frame of reference, Jesus Christ's death will save humanity. The turmoil of the human world comes into view as the phrase εἰς τὸν κόσμον implies earth with special focus on its human inhabitants (Bauer et al. 2000:561; Painter 1993:979–982)[216] and mirrors εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους in Romans 5:12c, accentuating humans as the topic of Paul's current argument (Wilckens 1978:315).[217] The contrast between one human (ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου) in opposition to all humans (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους) places prominence on Death spreading to all humans. This is an important motif as all humans are continually implied throughout the argument of Romans 5:12–21.

Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:29) container metaphor may be used as a heuristic tool to enlighten the rich imagery Paul employs in Romans 5:12. Human beings are physical objects and can be demarcated in terms of what is inside and what is outside. A container determines the bounding surface with the coinciding in–out orientation (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:29). In this case, the human world is envisioned as the container. Adam forms part of this container (εἰς τὸν κόσμον) and functions as the instrument through which Sin and Death enter and go.[218] However, what is more, at a conceptual level, Adam

212. Some passages, amongst which Adam and Eve 44:2 and Apoc. Mos. 32:1–2; cf. 14:2, suggest that the root of Adam's problem is an evil heart and not sin *per se*. The blame is, however, placed on Eve (Byrne 1996:175).

213. Contra Wolter (2014:342). In post-biblical Judaism, sin derives from Adam or Eve and is viewed to have spread from them to establish its dominion over the entire human race (Stählin & Grundmann 1964:291; Stowers 1994:86).

214. Zeller (1985:114–115) also makes this point clear, indicating Paul is not referring to the sin of Adam but presents Sin/sin as a power that comes into the world controlling the life space (Lebensraum) of people.

215. Frick (2007:203–222) cogently argues that Paul's soteriology derives from the notion that all humans, Jew and gentile alike, are under sin and thus in need of saving.

216. Morris (1988:229) maintains that humans, and not the earth specifically, are intended. However, the emphasis might be on humanity, but the whole creation is still implied. Consequently, I translate it as 'human world'.

217. Paul is not interested in a cosmological debate, for example, as seen in Cicero or Plutarch (Garlington 1993:100; Gaventa 2011:266).

218. Contra Wolter (2014:342): I do not interpret Adam as the cause of Sin, but the instrument Sin used. Wolter (2014:342) argues on the basis of εἰσέρχομαι not meaning 'to come from outside' but to mean 'unter den Menschen entstehen'. Paul never clarifies where Sin and Death come from. However, it is not important to the argument, but rather the fact that Jesus Christ saves believers from these forces. Gaventa (2011:266) postulates that the most important aspect about the cosmos is that it is God's and under siege by Sin and Death and other anti-god powers. Byrne (1996:175) mentions that the personifications lend a mythological tone to the entire discussion.

is a reference point signifying all humans (Raible 2016:26).[219] The container metaphor enables the reader to visualise the entrance of Sin and Death affecting all humans as the impetus for a structural change of the whole cosmic *raison d'être* (Käsemann 1978:141; Lohse 2003:176; Michel 1966:186). Sin and Death are now forces in the container. The container is tainted, and there is no flow between in and out. Humans are in this container with these forces. Paul does not enquire where Sin and Death come from, but that they are merely within the human world (Stauffer 1964:423).[220] The problem is, humans are with these forces, both evidently negative forces, in the container. At this point of the argument, Sin is depicted as a force, through which also another force, Death in Romans 5:12b (διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος),[221] has entered the human world.[222] This is what Lakoff and Johnson (1980:72–73) would describe as 'the substance goes into the object' which functions as a metaphorical extension for the container metaphor, illustrating the concept of 'causation'.

In Romans 5:12a (ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν), a metaphor of dominion may be detected. Paul's use of the verb εἰσέρχομαι [come into] signals the metaphor of dominion.[223] However, Bauer et al. (2000:293–294) interpret εἰσέρχομαι to have no negative connotation in Romans 5:12.[224] Liddell et al. (1996:494)[225] and Weder (2011:972–975)[226] suggest εἰσέρχομαι [come into] draws on the source domain of contestation meaning 'to invade, to force' and particularly when used in light of people, the meaning protrudes 'to occupy'. The notion of occupation is mapped onto the target domain, depicting Sin as a force that occupies the human world.

219. Contra Michel (1966:186) who views Adam as the one through whom the rank of humankind goes through. This view is derivative from another metaphor, namely, identifying Adam as a doorway created by interpreters to understand the text better. The problem is that the modern 'door' metaphor takes away from the original Greek text.

220. In various versions of Greek creation and fall stories such as Hesiod, the mix of good and evil best serves human life in the world to which humans belong (Stowers 1994:87).

221. The articular genitive (τῆς ἁμαρτίας) refers to 'that sin' seen in Romans 5:12a. Haacker (1999:119) describes Death as an infection.

222. The dominion of Death becomes apparent in Romans 5:14.

223. I agree with Black (1973:81) who posits that εἰσέρχομαι should be given greater emphasis as it indicates that sin forced its way through an opened door. This doorway metaphor is also used by Kuss (1957:227), Michel (1966:186) and Wilckens (1978:314); Contra Wolter (2014:342) who argues that Adam is the source for sin with death as the result of sin.

224. However, the idea of possession εἴς τινα as [to come or go into someone] is listed (Bauer et al. 2000:294).

225. εἰς τὸν πόλεμον in X.*An.*7.1.27; εἰ. εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους [enter the ranks of the Ephebi], Id.*Cyr.*1.5.1.

226. Cf. Mark 9:25; Matthew 12:45. In Romans 5:12, Paul uses εἰσέρχομαι as 'das Eindringen der Sündenmacht' (Weder 2011:972–975).

Just as Sin is an occupant in the human world, so too is Death. Romans 5:12b (καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν) propounds the implication of Sin entering into the human world, namely, Death spread through it in all humans (Fitzmyer 1993:412; Jewett 2007:374).[227] The verb διέρχομαι [go through] (Busse 2006:776–778; Liddell et al. 1996:425–426) has no connotations of control or dominion. Nonetheless, the universality of Sin is assumed as Paul shifts the focus in the pericope to Death (Fitzmyer 1993:417; Zahn 1925:262).[228] The concept that sin leads to death is pre-Pauline and appears in Jewish sources prior to and contemporary with Paul.[229] However, Paul now personifies Death as a force in its own right,[230] not merely as a punishment for Sin but also as a power that rules, as it will become clear in Romans 5:14.

The clause ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον (Rm 5:12c) reiterates πάντες from the previous clause εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους (Rm 5:12b) highlighting that Romans 5:12b was intended to explain why death came to all humans (Cranfield 1975:275; Michel 1966:187; Schlier 1977:161; Zahn 1925:265). The interpretation of the prepositional phrase ἐφ᾽ ᾧ in Romans 5:12c incites debate.[231] Charles Moule (1953:132) notes the phrase most definitely means 'in as much/because' opting for a causal meaning. The combination of ἐπί with a dative (ᾧ) 'for that reason, because' is involved in the metaphorical meaning, 'to set over'

227. Contra Cranfield (1975:274) who argues that the personification is not sustained.

228. The personification of sin resurfaces in Romans 5:20.

229. Cf. Wisdom 2:24; 1 Enoch 5:9; 4 Ezra 7:62–131; Philo, Mos 2:147 (Cranfield 1975:281; Fitzmyer 1993:408; Hultgren 2011:221). Byrne (1996:175) mentions that, for Paul, the idea of physical death is unnatural, viewed from the vantage point of Wisdom 1:13–14; 2:23–24 considering death as not part of the original design the creator had intended.

230. This is not a strange occurrence in Pauline literature, as in Paul's other letters, death is described as 'the last enemy' (Scott 1993:554). In Romans 8:38, death is also a cosmic force, as well as in Romans 5:14, 17; 7:5; 1 Corinthians 15, 21, 22, 26; 1 Corinthians 15:54; 2 Corinthians 4:12 and especially 1 Corinthians 3:22 (Schlier 1977:160); death is the manifestation of God's wrath (Rm 2:5, 8; 3:5; 5:9; Eph 5:6; Col 3:6; 1 Th 1:10; 5:9).

231. Cranfield (1975:274–275) lists at least six possible ways to understand it, and Fitzmyer (1993:413–416), Hultgren (2011:221) and Longenecker (2016:587) list 11 possibilities. Käsemann (1978:140), Lohse (2003:175) and Zahn (1925:267) interpret the phrase as a relative, referring back to ὁ θάνατος. Contra Wilckens (1978:316). The problem of interpreting ἥμαρτον as an individual sin fosters the notion of original sin that is not present in this text (Wilckens 1978:317). Romans 5:12–14 has been the cornerstone of centuries-long theological debate as Paul affirms the existence of hereditary sin. However, Paul does not have original sin (*peccatum originale*) in mind, as it is a thought belonging to a western theologian originating from Augustine. Paul's terminological fuzziness indicates no interest to develop a consistent doctrine of sin or even of Adam's fall, but the all-encompassing glorious effect of Christ on those who belong to him (Fitzmyer 1993:408; Mounce 1995:143). The antecedent of 'whom' is usually assumed as Adam. However, the Greek word for sin is feminine and consequently considering Adam is not plausible. Another possibility is 'because of whom' spelling out a possibly elliptical phrase and referring the masculine pronoun to Adam. This solution is also not convincing (Fitzmyer 1993:414; Hultgren 2011:222). The phrase should be read as ἐπί τούτῳ, ὅτι.

(Blass et al. 1961:§235(2)). Where there is sin, there Sin has dominion as the verb ἁμαρτάνω signifies all sin (Wilckens 1978:317).[232]

Paul interrupts the developing comparison of Jesus Christ and Adam with a parenthetical explanation[233] in Romans 5:13a (ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ) to elucidate the relationship between Sin and the law.[234] Sin was already functioning as an independent power, present in humanity, even though the law did not exist then (Cranfield 1975:282; Hultgren 2011:225; Michel 1966:187).[235] In this instance, Mosaic Law is meant.[236] Both the law and sin are employed without a definite article.[237] Paul often omits the article with abstract nouns such as sin, death and law, but the reason is recognisable in Romans 5:13a as the meaning leans towards an abstract sense (Blass et al. 1961:§258(2)). However, ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ (Rm 5:13a) recalls πάντες ἥμαρτον (Rm 5:12c) focusing on the universal dimension of Sin (Wolter 2014:345). Moreover, this does not imply that the law is responsible for the universal occurrence of Sin. Rather, it emphasises the formlessness of Sin without the law (Cranfield 1975:282; Hultgren 2011:225).[238] It is in the presence of law that Sin is visible (Cranfield 1975:282).

Moreover, Sin is not accounted for where there is no law (ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου [Rm 5:13b–c]). The adversative clause (ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται [Rm 5:13b]) utilises an image from the source domain of finance with the verb ἐλλογέω drawing on the Jewish tradition.[239] The verb ἐλλογέω

232. The use of ἥμαρτον recalls Romans 3:23 (Cranfield 1975:279; Schlier 1977:162).

233. The causal coordinating conjunction γάρ 'for' links Romans 5:13a to Romans 5:12 (Zahn 1925:271).

234. The relationship between sin and law is further developed in Romans 7:7–25 (Schlier 1977:164). Zahn (1925:271) rightly remarks that the sentence does not say anything yet. Black (1973:82–83) posits that Romans 5:13–14 resembles a diatribe style with Paul arguing with an imaginary interlocutor.

235. Longenecker (2016:592–593) argues that Paul's antithetical grammatical constructions, as seen in 2 Corinthians, should be used as a frame of reference to make sense of the incongruous notion that 'all people sinned throughout the course of history' followed by 'sin is not considered where there is no law'. A better argument is that of Byrne (1996:178) who convincingly argues that the pattern of sinning is different from those who did not sin 'under law', but most importantly, that Paul insists that the presence of the law does not make a fundamental difference.

236. It has been debated whether Roman Law or Mosaic Law is intended here. Some commentators argue that νόμος is clearly referring to Mosaic Law (Fitzmyer 1993:417; Lohse 2003:176). Morris (1988:233) suggests that there is a more comprehensive law than that of Moses, namely, the law written in people's hearts (τοῦ νόμου γραπτὸν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν [Rm 2:15]). However, with the image of finance in Romans 5:13b drawing on Jewish tradition, it is more plausible that Mosaic Law is intended in this instance.

237. Lohse (2003:176) marks that the lack of articles is because of the brevity of the concepts. A better solution is Zahn's (1925:271) who notes that the articles contribute to indicate that the pre-Mosaic Law time was without form.

238. This idea is not foreign to the 1st century CE as a contemporary of Paul; Philo also draws on this type of language in Philo Quod Deus Imm. 28:134.

239. Cf. TestBenj 11:4; syrBar 24:1; Herm (v) 12:1; Philemon 18 (Käsemann 1978:141; Schlier 1977:165; Wilckens 1978:319).

denotes 'charging something to someone's account' (Bauer et al. 2000:319; Mayer 2011:1066) and in the passive form employed in Romans 5:13b emphasises God's action (Michel 1966:187). Sin is seen here as debt.[240] Accordingly, Sin is not charged to someone's account, where there is no law.[241] The participial clause μὴ ὄντος νόμου (Rm 5:13c) indicates that this is solely applicable if there is no law as the particle μή is used in a conditional sense (Bauer et al. 2000:645).

In contrast to Sin having been around before the law (Rm 5:13b), Romans 5:14a (ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως) illustrates Death has ruled from the time of Adam until Moses.[242] A metaphor of dominion is evident as Death is portrayed as a ruler.[243] The source domain βασιλεύω [to be a king/to reign] reflects the Hellenistic concept of a leader who had military success (Busse 2006:316), but also a king who was perceived as an imitation of the god's rule over the world (Spicq 1994d:258).[244] The connection with ruling and the military was prevalent in Rome. The expectation that the Caesar had military proficiency existed.[245] The idea of absolute power is mapped from the source domain to the target domain, elucidating the impressive absoluteness of Death's rule until the law came (Morris 1988:233). During the time the law was not given yet, the punishment of death was already exacted on everyone (Lohse 2003:177).

The participial clause καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ [even over those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression] (Rm 5:14b) indicates Adam's trespass resulted in all humans being culpable (Michel 1966:188). Again, the verb ἁμαρτάνω expresses 'to commit a wrong or to transgress against divinity or custom' (Bauer et al. 2000:49) and echoes the verb used in Romans 5:12c reminiscent of the universality of sin. The noun ὁμοίωμα signals a metaphor as the word denotes 'likeness' (Semino 2008:27). Another metaphor unfolds with παράβασις [transgression]. The noun παράβασις is also a metaphor in itself denoting space, meaning 'to walk beside and to deviate from the true direction'

240. This does not mean that people were 'innocent sinners' as Cranfield (1975:82) describes it. Morris (1988:233) interestingly argues that from a biblical perspective, amongst others, the flood narrative (Gn 6:5–7; 12–13) indicates that sin was reckoned to people and punishment existed in the period between Adam and Moses.

241. According to Wolter (2014:346–347), the verb occurs in non-literary papyri and inscriptions that indicate a money exchange in which an account is settled.

242. This is marked by οὐκ in Romans 5:13b and ἀλλά in Romans 5:14a (Morris 1988:233; Wolter 2014:346).

243. Death also reigns in LXX Wisdom 1:14 and Hosea 13:14.

244. In the papyri and inscriptions to be a friend of a king is a source of pride (Spicq 1994d:259). For example, Apollonius is 'a benefactor who has been honoured by the friendship of kings'. See Bernard (1969) n. VI, 25.

245. The Roman ruling class unashamedly noted that to rule does not require public support, but an application of a threat of force, as it is a language all subordinates would understand (Elliott 2010:31). Initially, Rome was a republic ruled with the senate and a consul that changed every 4 years, but Julius Caesar changed the system when he announced himself dictator for life (Porter 2011:164).

(Günther 1978:583–585; Liddell, Scott & Jones 1961:1305).[246] The genitive usually draws the moral sphere means 'stepping over',[247] with the identification of Ἀδάμ [Adam],[248] implying Adam's misstep. Humanity did not transgress in the same way as Adam[249] but suffered the consequences. Jewish literature dating before 70 CE shows little interest in the effects of Adam's transgression (Stowers 1994:86). Paul develops the figure of Adam as a representative of hostility.

The relative clause in Romans 5:14c ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος [who is a mould for the one to come] hints at the completion of the comparison in Romans 5:18. The relative clause functions exegetically to link with ὥσπερ–οὕτως to indicate the similarities and dissimilarities between Adam and Jesus Christ (Michel 1966:188; Wilckens 1978:321; Zahn 1925:275).[250] The audience would have been well aware that unlike Adam, Jesus conquered these forces on the cross dominating as the ultimate victor. The phrase ὅς ἐστιν τύπος [who is a mould] does not appear elsewhere in the entirety of Greek literature and instigates much debate amongst scholars concerning its interpretation.[251] In Jewish tradition, there is no typology between Adam and the Messiah (Betz 1977:414–424; Haacker 1999:120). Adam is not intended as a saving figure, but as the epitome of someone in need of saving. Paul employs τύπος as a metaphor. The source domain of τύπος denotes 'a mark made by striking an impression by something'.[252] Michael Wolter (2014:349) makes a valuable contribution to the debate underscoring the importance of the source domain. He notes τύπος

246. The syntax suggests that violation is not a synonym of sin. It is used six times in connection with Adam.

247. Josephus uses παράβασις with various genitives: παράβασις τῶν νόμων (*Ant*., 3, 218,); τοῦ πατρίου νόμου (18, 263). In *Ant*., 18, 304, ἐπὶ παραβάσει τῶν ἐμῶν ἐντολῶν is to the transgression of human commands (Bauer et al. 2000:758; Schneider 1968:739).

248. The name Ἀδὰμ [Adam] appears twice in Romans 5:13 and functions as a generic reference to humanity.

249. It was Adam who disobeyed a direct command from God according to the original tale in Genesis. The command that Adam received and transgressed was that he was not supposed to eat from the tree of knowledge (Cranfield 1975:283; Schneider 1968:740). The genitive of παράβασις [violation] is used in Josephus to refer to God's displeasure at violating the laws (τοῦ θεοῦ δυσχεράναντος ἐπὶ τῇ παραβάσει τῶν νόμων Jos., *Ant*. 3.218).

250. Cosby (1991:212) regards 'the one who is a type to come' as the rhetorical figure of *antonomasia*, substituting a description for a proper name.

251. Schellenberg (2014:54–63) interestingly proposes that the predicate of τύπος is not Adam, but that παράβασις is deemed as the τύπος in Romans 5:14. Schellenberg (2014:59) supports his theory by indicating that ὅς does not have to refer to Adam and solves the gender problem by using Ephesians 6:17; 1 Timothy 3:15 and Revelation 4:5 as examples to illustrate that ὅς is masculine because it is attracted to the τύπος. Schellenberg (2014:62–63) interprets τοῦ μέλλοντος as an ordinary substantive with τύπος functioning taxonomically similar to ὁμοίωμα. Although this might be a possibility, it is an obscure argument and, in my view, unlikely. Haacker (1999:120) postulates that it is plausible that Paul's audience already had read 1 Corinthians 15:45–49.

252. This is an image of something that is being hit or taking a blow. The result of the hit is that an impression is left. Bauer et al. (2000:1019–1020) interprets τύπος in Romans 5:14 as an indication of the future given by God in the form of persons or things. Cf. Philo, Op. M. 157; Iren 1,6,4; 1 Cor 10:6.

draws, on the one hand, on something that gives form and, on the other hand, something that receives form.[253] Paul uses Adam as a τύπος, as a representation of the consequence of a human succumbing to the forces of Sin.

The fact that Sin and Death are occupants in the human world goads both Sin and Death as hostile forces, ineluctably calling for God's saving action. However, what is more, as Sin is a hostile force, the implication is also that humans are hostile towards God. Sin is not a private matter, but a collective universal problem for humans (Wilckens 1978:315). Referring back to the argument in Romans 5:1–11, especially 5:10, the use of enemies (ἐχθροί) already hinted at the current state of hostility, but the audience is prepared with the knowledge that God has reconciled humans to him.

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 5:15–17

The adversative particle ἀλλά in Romans 5:15a underscores the different outcomes of the figures of Adam and Jesus Christ. The παράπτωμα [trespass] of Adam is not like the χάρισμα [Favour-gift] of God, demarcated by the negative οὐχ ὡς [not like]. Paul replaces παράβασις [transgression] (Rm 5:14) with παράπτωμα, which denotes 'an offense against God' (Bauer et al. 2000:770).[254] A rhetorical contrast between παράπτωμα and χάρισμα forms in Romans 5:15a (Käsemann 1978:145)[255] and refers back to Romans 5:14c.[256] The use of παράπτωμα, instead of παράβασις, is consistent with the rhetorical assonance (homoioteleuton) created by the other -μα endings in the passage.[257] Παράπτωμα is repeated in Romans 5:15, 16, 17 and 18. Paul develops with this pattern of repetition a clear indication of the effect of Jesus Christ on the

253. Wolter (2014:349) convincingly illustrates that, within this understanding of the metaphor, there are examples of a pattern and Diodorus Siculus 14,41,4 names weapons that have to be made again according to their form. The same can be seen in Exodus 25:40 with the heavenly 'model' of the temple that is shown to Moses in Exodus 25:9. Cf. Philo, *Vit. Mos* 2,76. The reverse occurs with representations of the gods as seen in Josephus, *Ant*. 1,310.310 τύποι τῶν θεῶν. Cf. Herodian 5,5,6. The metaphor is also applied to humans as seen in 1 Timothy 4:12; Philippians 3:17; 1 Thessalonians 1:7, and 1 Peter 5:3 and is also applicable to children as τύποι of their parents (Artemidorus, *Oneir*. 2,45 [Pack 179, 20] or a lord for his slaves as τύπος θεοῦ Barn 19.7; Did 4,11.

254. Παράπτωμα etymologically related to παραπίπτω [to fall away] (Hultgren 2011:227). Hultgren (2011:226) posits that Adam becomes more than a symbol, but functions as a mythological figure signifying a rebellion against God whose trespass brought death and condemnation to the entire human race (Rm 5:15–16). Michel (1966:188) notes that Adam trespassed a specific law of God.

255. Berger (2011:1104) remarks that χάρισμα is contrasted with death, which is a surprising opposition.

256. The sentence reads cumbersomely as the comparative clause is introduced with οὐχ, which usually takes an indicative (Longenecker 2016:594). Black (1973:83) notes that the structure may be explained as hendiadys. However, this forms part of the structure of a comparison.

257. Paul uses Georgian figures based on assonance as he plays with -μα nouns, which is a stylistic beautification also found in Epicurus, for example, Cleomede, Meteor, II 1 with excerpts offering κατάστημα, ἔλπισμα, λίπασμα, ἀνακραύγασμα and λήκημα (Blass et al. 1961:§488(3); Fitzmyer 1993:419; Jewett 2007:379; Lohse 2003:180). Longenecker (2016:594) states that the rhetorical assonance drives the impact of Paul's message through to the audience.

many in contrast to the effect of humanity controlled by Sin and Death. Within this pattern, παράπτωμα becomes synonymous with hostility. παράπτωμα is continually contrasted with forms associated with God and Jesus Christ such as χάρισμα (Rm 5:15a), χάρις (Rm 5:15c) and δωρεά (Rm 5:15c) (Lohse 2003:180; Zahn 1925:276).

It is clear that χάρισμα is more than the typical ancient description of just a gift (Shogren 1992:1088).[258] In Romans 12:6 and 1 Corinthians 12:4, 31, χάρισμα is used to refer to the works of the Spirit (Lohse 2003:180; Martin 1992:1015–1018), but in Romans 5:15, χάρισμα is qualified by χάρις (Du Toit 2007b:82).[259] The -μα ending refers to χάρις, implicating that χάρισμα is the result of the action of χάρις (Von Lips 1985:309). Byrne (1996:179) mentions that it is a concrete embodiment or effect of χάρις. It is likely that Paul's connotation of χάρισμα stems from contemporary colloquial language of his time (Harrison 2003:279–280). Importantly, Wolter (2014:351) argues that Christ is not the subject of χάρισμα, but God.[260] Paul argues with the underlying supposition that God's χάρις augments in correlation to the multiplication of the sin and trespasses of humans and surpasses it.

In the simple past conditional clause Romans 5:15b, the protasis (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον) highlights the action of εἷς [one] in contrast to the implication of the actions of the one for the πολλοί [many] (Michel 1966:188; Zahn 1925:277).[261] This rhetorical contrast of the one (εἷς) versus the many (πολλοί) features throughout Romans 5:15–17. The apodosis Romans 5:15c (πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν) spotlights the motif of abundance[262] in a typical *a minori ad maius* style (Fitzmyer 1993:406; Haacker 1999:121; Hultgren 2011:227; Longenecker 2016:595; Mounce 1995:143; Wilckens 1978:324). This style echoes Romans 5:8–11 with τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ showing Favour as averting evil and reconciliation making it clear that the sinners have been justified and enemies have been changed into friends of God.[263]

258. The occurrence of 'gift' in Greek literature also appears rarely (Fee 1993:340).

259. Bultmann (1968:290) also mentions that χάρις is similar to χάρισμα as it is for the benefit of humans. The only other occurrence of χάρισμα linked to χάρις in the New Testament is in 1 Peter 4:10 and in Philo, *Leg*. 3.78.

260. Accordingly, Wolter (2014:351) understands that the contrast is between Adam and God in Romans 5:15a–d.

261. In the Synoptic Gospels, equivalent uses of 'all' and 'many' occur concerning Jesus healing the sick in Galilee; Mark 1:32, 34 notes that 'all who were sick' were brought to Jesus and 'many' were healed (Fitzmyer 1993:419; Longenecker 2016:595; Morris 1988:235).

262. Byrne (1996:179) calls Paul's formulation 'an extravagant statement of superiority'.

263. Wolter (2014:352) mentions that τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a metonymy referring back to Romans 3:14–25 to salvation. However, it is already prevalent in Romans 5:8–11.

The hendiadys ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι refers back to χάρισμα in Romans 5:15a (Käsemann 1978:145). This extrapolates the understanding of Favour. Believers are already aware that they stand in Favour within their relationship with God. However, the implications of standing in this Favour now becomes visible. Firstly, the phrase ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [Favour of God] functions as a force and links to the death of Christ (ἀπέθανον), functioning as an act of patronage that inaugurates the reign of Favour (see Rm 5:21) (Harrison 2003:226). Secondly, χάρις is the subject of περισσεύω (Rm 5:15c, 20),[264] a verb that denotes an overflow and that there is more than enough to be left over (Bauer et al. 2000:805). Michael Theobald (1982:33–62) argues that χάρις in conjunction with περισσεύω underscores the eschatological fullness of God's grace as found in apocalyptic and Jewish rabbinic traditions (2 Esdr 4:29; 8:31; *Sifre* Lv 5:17 [120a]).[265] James Harrison (2003:234) formulates his understanding of the eschatological fullness of grace within a Jewish matrix (cf. Harrison 1999:79–91); the presentation of Christ's work in Romans 5 and 8 might remind listeners of the eschatological motifs of Augustan Beneficence along with the implicit hint for contemporary auditors that Christ's generosity surpassed even that of the Caesars. Paul clearly draws on the source domain of the benefaction language, onto which he maps the Jewish-Israelite belief that God is merciful and compassionate towards humanity (Breytenbach 2010a:226).

The phrase ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι [the gift in Favour] is a metonymy referring to the death of Jesus Christ. Again, the noun δωρεά resembles the 1st-century mentality surrounding gifts, namely, gifts did not have a volunteering character and were often associated with compensatory measures (Wagner-Hasel 1998:226). It should be noted that the preposition ἐν is used in a locative manner, underlining the gift is situated in Favour. The dative (τῇ) in the phrase τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ refers to ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [the Favour of God]. The dative with ἐν indicates being under the influence of the Favour of God that has been given through the one man Jesus Christ. The implication is that believers are dominated by the Favour of God. The action of Adam in the many (Rm 5:15b) is supplanted by the action of Christ as the phrase εἰς τοὺς πολλούς (Rm 5:15c) designates (Michel 1966:188). The preposition εἰς denotes a result indicating the abundance found in Christ when humans have a relationship with God (Oepke 1964b:431). The phrase εἰς τοὺς πολλούς also corresponds to the 'all' of Romans 5:12, 18 (Hultgren 2011:227).

Paul has built on the image introduced in Romans 5:5 of believers standing in this Favour and extrapolated it with images of abundance and Christ's

264. Cf. 2 Corinthians 8:7; 9:8, 15. Cf. Bauer et al. (2000:805); Breytenbach (2010a:220); Schneider (2011:180–183); Theobald (1982:33–62).

265. Cf. Harrison (2003:227).

victorious action. As reconciled people, believers can expect to partake freely in the Favour of God. Romans 5:15 paints a portrait of the abundance of God's Favour bestowed freely on all humans through the death of Christ (Breytenbach 2010a:225–226).

In Romans 5:16a, the argument continues with a statement that the gift is not like the result of one human's sin (καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα). The phrase οὐχ ὡς [not like] (Rm 5:16a) is a rhetorical anaphora repeating Romans 5:15a (Snyman 2016:6). The verb ἁμαρτάνω [to sin] is in the exact same form as in Romans 5:14b, reminding the audience of how Adam's misstep affected all humans. However, Paul elaborates on the notion that the gift is not to be confused with Adam's trespass, as γάρ marks. Paul contrasts the results of the actions of both figures. On the one hand, the result of the actions of Adam is depicted to result in a verdict of condemnation in Romans 5:16b (τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα). Paul employs imagery from the legal source domain, as the noun κρίμα [verdict] denotes a legal decision made by a judge as a result of a transgression made (Bauer et al. 2000:567). This judge's decision results in penalty and punishment as the preposition εἰς with the noun κατάκριμα [condemnation] designates (Bauer et al. 2000:518).

On the other hand, the contrasting result of Jesus' action is seen in Romans 5:16c (τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα), namely, the Favour-gift that separates the many trespasses results in vindication (justification). Again, the noun χάρισμα should be interpreted from the perspective of ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ and ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι (Michel 1966:189). It is the Favour-gift that Christ freely bestowed on believers and all believers can freely orientate themselves in a position of benefitting from God's Favour. The preposition ἐκ signals a separation from all trespasses (πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων). Christ's action for all humans results in δικαίωμα [to clear someone of a violation] (Bauer et al. 2000:249; Haacker 1999:121).[266] In light of Romans 5:16, 18, the violation communicated by δικαίωμα is better described as the opposition to the death sentence humanity faced. The opposite pairs, κρίμα//χάρισμα; ἐξ ἑνός//ἐκ πολλῶν and εἰς κατάκριμα//εἰς δικαίωμα, in Romans 5:16b and 16c highlight the difference in actions of Adam and Jesus Christ. Favour-gift brought on by Christ results in the clearing of all violations for all humans in contrast to the condemnation brought on by Adam.

Accordingly, a believer, who has undergone a status change, cannot remain in a position where the trespasses of Adam affect him or her. When a person receives the Favour-gift and orientates themselves to the Favour of God, the result is justified.

266. Cf. Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 1135a, 13. Kirk (2007:787–792) argues against the mainstream translation of δικαίωμα as 'justification', but rather proposes 'reparation' or if must 'righteous requirement'.

Notwithstanding, the implications of the action of one are significant as Romans 5:17 illustrates. The protasis of another simple past conditional clause in Romans 5:17a (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός) highlights this action, as it draws on a parallel with Romans 5:15b (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον). The trespass of the one brought death to all and enabled Death to reign in humans. The γάρ signals a reason and not an explanation (Lohse 2003:181). Romans 5:17a also forms a chiasmus with Romans 5:14, namely, ἐβασίλευσεν A (Rm 5:14), ὁ θάνατος B (Rm 5:14), ὁ θάνατος B (Rm 5:17) and ἐβασίλευσεν A (Rm 5:17). The chiasmus underscores the association of παράπτωμα with Death. A metaphor of dominion comes to the fore again, as Death is personified as a ruler who manages his reign through the one (διὰ τοῦ ἑνός) (Black 1973:84; Morris 1988:236).

In Romans 15:17b, the reign of believers through Christ is superior to the rule of Death. Paul continues the *a minori ad maius* argumentation as πολλῷ μᾶλλον signals. This reasoning echoes Romans 5:15 as the Favour of God and the gift in Favour surpasses the consequences of Sin and Death precipitated in the figure of Adam. The abundance motif is even heightened as Paul stacks images of the abundance of Favour (τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος) and the gift of Righteousness (καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) to describe the new state of life for believers.[267] Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is bestowed by God (Bauer et al. 2000:247). In light of Romans 5:8, 10, δικαιοσύνη is allotted to people who are not deserving, and yet, Christ's death includes those who are not worthy. Christ's death enacts a status change for people God favours. Accordingly, τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης describes δωρεά clearer as the righteous gift of Christ's self-giving.

A crucial point is that these gifts are embedded ἐν ζωῇ [in life], picking up the theme of life from the preceding pericope Romans 5:1–11 (Zahn 1925:280). In Romans 5:17b, the preposition ἐν designates location. Believers are able to be in this space of life drawing on the Favour of God and the gifts of God because a status change took place.[268] The passive of λαμβάνω [to receive favour, which is like a special reward] illustrates God's activity (Bauer et al. 2000:585; Lohse 2003:181). The verb indicates a change of rulers. The abundance of Favour drawing on the source domain of benefaction indicates believers' bodies are no longer located in a state of death but are now situated in life. This situation is made possible through the one Jesus Christ διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ as the preposition διά is employed instrumentally. Again, the

267. The adjective περισσός is used as a substitute for the comparative and superlative forms of πολύς.

268. There is an inversion of the structure of the protasis and apodosis. Instead of ἢ ζωὴ βασιλεύσει correlating to ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν, Paul uses οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ βασιλεύσουσιν. This magnifies the generosity of God that will not only replace the reign of death with the reign of life, but it will also make those who receive its riches become kings themselves, that is, to live the truly kingly life (Cranfield 1975:288).

actions of the one (τοῦ ἑνός) is emphasised, as one man's actions are determinative in the existence of many (Cranfield 1975:287).

In Romans 5:17c, the apodosis (βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) explicitly states that the recipients of Favour, associated with Christ's saving power, will reign in this life through Jesus Christ. Not only are believers' bodies a location of life wielded through Jesus Christ but also it becomes clear that the recipients of Favour, associated with Christ's saving power, will rule in this life through Jesus Christ (βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rm 5:17c]). For the Roman audience, accustomed to the widely popular words of poet Virgil (70 BCE–19 CE), who depicts the Romans in the Aeneid as a nation suited to rule over other nations, as it is the destiny of Aeneas's descendants to 'crush proud nations' and to 'rule the world', this would have been a riveting image.[269] The legacy of the Romans are not their intellectual capacity nor art but that they rule over those who are thought of as less capable of ruling over themselves.[270] The domination of Rome brought a new culture (Adams 2007:208), with the Roman civic cult that celebrates the rule of a single Caesar (Jewett 2007:384). Moreover, Paul turns this notion around, as believers will share in the dominion as rulers through Jesus Christ. The temporal change of βασιλεύω also signifies the change of lords taking place. Believers are transferred from the reign of death to the reign of Favour as they are incorporated into the triumph of Favour (Byrne 1996:180; Lohse 2003:181). The bodies of believers become a place ruled by Favour enveloping believers to be associated with life and abundance.

The reign of Sin versus the reign of Favour (Rm 5:18–21)

At this point of Paul's argument, the audience should be well aware that the Favour-gift is nothing like Adam's trespass. The inference concerning the

269. Cf. Aeneid 1.263; 6.851–853. Emperor Augustus commissioned Virgil to compose the Aeneid and the poem was particularly popular in the 1st century CE. There is debate whether Virgil subscribed to imperial propaganda, promoting Augustus to stay in power, or whether he was anti-imperial. I would rather argue the former as Virgil links the poem to Homer's Iliad in order to establish Rome as a legitimate power similar to that of Greece. The Romans had respect for Greek culture and preserved it instead of destroying it.

270. Virgil writes: '*tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento. Hae tibi erunt artes: pacique imponere morem. Parcere subiectis et debellare superbos*' (Aeneid 6.851–853) (Zetzel 1996:297). Virgil writes from a Roman perspective, and the nations that the Romans conquered would certainly not deem themselves less capable of ruling themselves. For example, the Cherusci chieftain Arminius from Germania led a coalition of German tribes against the Romans in the Teutoburg forest in 9 CE in defiance of the Romans meddling with their laws. The Germans massacred the Romans, which was followed by Roman punitive raids. However, they managed to elude Roman control, but in doing so, set Rome's sights on Britannia, which even with the uprising of Boudicca was suppressed in 60/61 CE. The best illustration of Roman power is Masada. The Romans exacted their supremacy even in a far desert fortification; without an abundance of supplies, they built a ramp enabling them to meet the Judean rebels. Josephus writes that all the rebels killed themselves before the Romans reached them. The Romans would not tolerate even a small group of rebels.

actions of either one unfolds in Romans 5:18–21. Romans 5:18a compares the one trespass that led all humans into condemnation (ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα) to the one righteous deed that led all humans into justification of life (οὕτως καὶ δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς [Rm 5:18b]). Paul elaborates on these contrasting results in Romans 5:19 with another comparison of the one's actions. Paul compares how just as many were made sinners through the disobedience of the one (ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί [Rm 5:19a]), so too many will be made righteous through the one's obedience (οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί [Rm 5:19b]).

However, in Romans 5:20a, it becomes clear that the Law slipped in (νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν). In order that the trespass might become more (ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα [Rm 5:20b]), but where Sin became more (οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία [Rm 5:20c]), Favour overflowed (ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις [Rm 5:20d]). The reason that Favour overflows becomes clear in a comparison in Romans 5:21. Just as Sin reigned in death (ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ [Rm 5:21a]), so too Favour might reign through righteousness in eternal life through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [Rm 5:21b]).

Detail analysis of Romans 5:18–21

Romans 5:18 commences with the Pauline inferential ἄρα οὖν [so then] expressing the inference with οὖν and signalling the transition to the next part of the argument (Bauer et al. 2000:127).[271] The elliptically formulated Romans 5:18[272] essentially sums up the results of the actions of the one. The result of the action through one (δι᾽ ἑνός)[273] in all humans (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους)[274] is underscored. The preposition εἰς [into] indicates motion towards a place (Bauer et al. 2000:288), namely, all humans (πάντας ἀνθρώπους). Accordingly,

271. The combination ἄρα οὖν is presumably to provide an emphatically inferential connective (Porter 1992:207). The use of this inferential phrase in the beginning of a sentence in classical Greek never occurred (Bauer et al. 2000:103–104; Wilckens 1978:326; Zahn 1925:282).

272. Authors, especially of letters, have their own style and use freer ellipses (Blass et al. 1961:§481). Romans 5:18, ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως, would be unintelligible without the preceding clause.

273. The genitive ἑνός should be taken as masculine and not as neutral, agreeing with παραπτώματος as this section is concerned with the relation of Adam and Christ (Cranfield 1975:289). Contra Longenecker (2016:597) who argues that ἑνός must be neuter, referring to παραπτώματος as the comparison in Romans 5:18, is with δικαιώματος.

274. Paul uses πᾶς alongside κόσμος to reinforce the universal horizon of the letter (Gaventa 2011:267). Romans 5:18–19 is often understood by interpreters to envision redemption universally, although some view Romans 5:17 restricting the scope with faith (Hultgren 2011:230).

the phrase εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους may be surveyed as a container metaphor identical to Romans 5:14b.

Romans 5:18 mimics Romans 5:16.[275] However, in Romans 5:16, χάρισμα leads to εἰς δικαίωμα [righteous deed], but in Romans 5:18, Jesus Christ leads to justification and life (εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς) (Lohse 2003:181; Michel 1966:190; Wilckens 1978:326). Paul develops a theme of justification because in Romans 5:8–10 it becomes clear that Jesus Christ's death already occurred while people were still in a position of animosity. The righteous deed (δικαίωμα) refers to the saving action of Christ that affects all people. However, the death of Christ enables people to be justified before God. This fashions a status change, and people who stand in the Favour of God experience the effects of this status change. The rare word δικαίωσις[276] implies 'the act of executing' and is usually translated as 'justification, acquittal'.[277] The unique expression δικαίωσιν ζωῆς refers to acquittal, which leads to life, and thus again picks up on the theme of life in Romans 5:10. The genitive of result ζωῆς implies that this righteous status has life, and eternal life as its consequence (Cranfield 1975:289; Lohse 2003:182; Wolter 2014:356).[278] The principal clause, marked by οὕτως καί, is throughout the argument applicable to Jesus Christ, accentuating Christ's saving action.

Within the intricate build-up of the justification theme (apart from the build-up concerning the theme of gift), a juridical frame, is evident highlighting the difference of the actions of Christ in comparison to Adam. Adam's misstep, stepping out from the Favour of God, leads to condemnation in contrast to the undeserving righteous deed of Jesus Christ that leads to being able to be orientated to God (justification) and life.

Romans 5:19a elaborates on the cause and ultimate results of Romans 5:18 marked by γάρ. The comparative clause in Romans 5:19a is in antithesis with the principal clause in Romans 5:19b: for as through the disobedience of one, the many were made sinners (ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί), so by the one's obedience, the many will be made righteous (οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί).[279]

275. Bauer et al. (2000:198) note that the verb γίνεσθαι is omitted in the formula εἰς κατάκριμα, indicating an entry into a new condition. The preposition εἰς captures the relation between motion and intention as this preposition, which can be used to refer to a directed action, can also describe the purpose of the result of that action ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος … εἰς κατάκριμα (Rm 5:18) (Porter 1992:152).

276. It only appears here and in Romans 4:25.

277. Cranfield (1975:289) suggests that δικαίωσις denotes a status of righteousness before God.

278. However, Lohse (2003:182) notes that the genitive could also be interpreted as a *genitivus qualitatis* or *objectivus*, indicating the character of δικαίωσις.

279. The particle οὕτως is an adverb but it is also used to draw inferences, often following an introductory ὥσπερ in conclusion to a comparison (Porter 1992:215).

The antithesis is also particularly hinged on the concept of obedience and disobedience (Fitzmyer 1993:421).[280] The disobedience of one human has made many sinners. The word παρακοή [disobedience] denotes the refusal and unwillingness to listen (Bauer et al. 2000:766; Spicq 1994p:29),[281] and *per se*, an unwillingness to submit to a lord. Paul's argument intensifies, as παράβασις (Rm 5:14) and παράπτωμα (Rm 5:15,16,17,18) can be ascribed as infractions, but παρακοή implicitly implies rebellion or defiance. This echoes the notion of enemies in Romans 5:10 (Wilckens 1978:326). The verb καθίστημι has a legal connotation (Bühner 2011:553–555)[282] and renders in the passive voice the meaning 'to be set down'.[283] The disobedience of the one, namely, Adam, has placed humans in a state of animosity and sinfulness (Black 1973:84).

In opposition to the hostility derived from disobedience, Jesus was obedient. This forms part of the established tradition in Philippians 2:8 (cf. Heb 5:8), where Christ was obedient on the cross (Haacker 1999:121; Wilckens 1978:326).[284] The antonym ὑπακοή [obedience] indicates being in a state of compliance (Bauer et al. 2000:1028). The word is a metaphor in itself. The preposition ὑπό denotes 'being under' and accordingly functions as a metaphor of dominion. However, being obedient to God is regarded in a positive light. The result of the obedience of one human is that the many have been made righteous.[285] The future passive of καθίστημι underscores God's activity in the relationship towards humans,[286] but also in contrast to Adam, the righteousness of the many is a current state for believers. Paul wants to accentuate the meaning of righteousness, which also points to a relationship with God (Lohse 2003:182).

280. Longenecker (2016:598) notes that it is the climax of the paragraph.

281. This word is rarely used, and as Spicq (1994p:28) mentions, would have hardly been mentioned if it were not for Romans 5:19.

282. In possible legal sense: POxy 281,14–24 (20–50 CE); cp. PTebt 183; Cat. Cod. Astr. IX/2 p/132, 12 of restoration to a healthy condition. In James 4:4, καθίσταται explicitly refers to 'enemies of God' (Bauer et al. 2000:492). Cf. Black (1973:84); Michel (1966:191).

283. According to Bauer et al. (2000:492), καθίστημι in Romans 5:19 means 'to cause someone to experience something'.

284. Longenecker (2016:598) argues that obedience should be viewed as a cognate theme to Paul's references to 'the faithfulness of Jesus' being a fundamentally Christological expression not just of Paul, but also early believers as seen, for example, in the Christ hymn Philippians 2:6–11. Byrne (1996:181) also highlights the allusion to Philippians 2:8 is cardinal, expressing that Christ willingly died at the cross.

285. Hultgren (2011:231) states that Paul's interest is not primarily anthropological but also Christological and eschatological. The suggestions have been made that Paul draws on the suffering servant song in Second Isaiah (Fitzmyer 1993:421; Harrisville 1980:86; Jewett 2007:387). Contra Käsemann (1978:157) who suggests that Paul might be alluding to the 'fourth servant song' in Isaiah 53:11b. I find this unlikely as Paul's intention here is, from my viewpoint, not nationalist or doctrinal.

286. Wolter (2014:357) argues that it is a *passivum divinum*, indicating that no person can claim himself or herself as justified, but only God can. The future should be understood eschatologically and not logically, according to Michel (1966:191). Contra Lohse (2003:182) who does name that it has a logical meaning.

The adversative clause (νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν) of Romans 5:20a marks the personification of Law, which is truly explained in Romans 7:7–12 (Michel 1966:192). The Law is portrayed as someone who 'sneaks in' as the verb παρεισέρχομαι [slipping in] illustrates.[287] Coherent with the personifications of Sin and Death, it may be assumed that the Law slips into the human world. However, unlike Death and Sin, the Law is not portrayed as a ruler.[288] Philo and Josephus claimed that Judaism was superior because of its constitution and the divine law, which made Jews typically more self-controlled than non-Jews (Stowers 1994:275). However, the Law does not restrict Sin; on the contrary, the final clause in Romans 5:20b (ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα) promulgates that the trespass might increase. The law does not curb the effects of Sin. Παράπτωμα (Rm 5:20b) illustrates humans making a false step or a misstep, thus moving away from the position God gave them (Bauder 1978:586).[289] The Law slips into the human world but does not prevent Sin, but rather only abets the increase of Sin as will become clear in Romans 7:7–13.

In Romans 5:20c–d, a comparative clause unfolds with the apodosis, indicating where Sin becomes more, Favour will abound. The adverb οὗ [where] implies spatiality. The human world is the place of Sin (Wilckens 1978:329). The personification of Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) is reintroduced but Paul also adds another personification, namely, Favour (ἡ χάρις). Again, the definite article with the noun indicates ἡ χάρις as a power. In Paul's time, the gods were perceived to favour humans (Breytenbach 2010a:210). However, it is important to note that ἡ χάρις [Favour] indicates a relation between God and humankind, in which God acts towards humans (Breytenbach 2010a:208). Harrison's (2003:79–80) investigation of the honorific inscriptions indicates that χάρις was subsumed under the ethos of reciprocity, and turning to the papyri confirms the influence of the Caesarean cult and its benefaction ideology on the Diaspora Judaism as far as Egypt. The magical papyri document that people tried to manipulate deities into granting them far-ranging χάριτες, independent of the benefaction system and its reciprocal relations (Harrison 2003:91). Breytenbach (2010a:219) argues that Paul's notion of χάρις is rooted

287. The word has a connotation with 'sneaky' as can be seen in Polybius, Historiae, 8.18.11.2: καὶ παρεισῆλθεν ἔτι νυκτὸς εἰς τὴν ἄκραν [and entered the citadel while it was yet dark]; Polybius, Historiae 2.55.3: 'he slipped inside the walls secretly at night'. Cf. Plutarch, De genio Socratis 596a; Marcius Coriolanus 23.1; Publicola 17.2; De sollertia animalium 980b; Lucian of Samosata, Call. 28; Philo, De Abraham 96; T. Jud 16:2; Galatians 3:19, which have a negative meaning (Wilckens 1978:328).

288. In Diodorus of Sicily, a parallel can be seen as the Egyptian historian Hecataeus of Abdera discusses how even Egyptian kings had to follow the law (νόμος) (1.71.3). Hecataeus characterises the non-Egyptians with the Median saying they know what is right, but they are not able to do it because of their passions. Egyptians are morally superior because they have a superior *politeia* (Stowers 1994:275).

289. Porter (1992:236) lists Romans 5:20–21 to mention the law, with the purpose of increasing sin or more neutrally as introduced with the result that sin increased. Most commentators opt for the former on the basis of Paul's view of the law. In the LXX, παράπτωμα is used as one of several words for sin, emphasising a deliberate act (Bauder 1978:585–586).

within a Jewish theological conception even though it is expressed in terms of language of benefaction. Accordingly, Paul employs the personification of Favour mapping onto the target domain that God's Favour is different from what the audience's assumption is of favour drawn from their context.

The image created with πλεονάζω in Romans 5:20c is subordinated to the main clause of Romans 5:20d and even extrapolated further as the verb πλεονάζω is enhanced with the verb ὑπερπερισσεύω [be in great excess].[290] The verb ὑπερπερισσεύω draws on the image of a scale being on the high end, thus indicating having a huge amount (Bauer et al. 2000:1034). Favour (ἡ χάρις) only increases and even abounds where there is Sin. It becomes clear in Romans 5:20 that Favour triumphs over Sin.

The purpose of the image of abundance follows in the final clause in Romans 5:21a (Moule 1953:143). The final clause reiterates the antithesis between the result of Adam's disobedience and the result of Christ's obedience (Rm 5:19) marked with the comparative particles ὥσπερ and οὕτως. The concluding comparison drives the difference of the reigning rulers, Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and Favour (ἡ χάρις), through in Romans 5:21. Paul indicates the change of Lordship (ἐβασίλευσεν–βασιλεύσῃ) (Michel 1966:193).

The protasis in Romans 5:21a (ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ) indicates Sin ruled specifically in the realm of death. The preposition ἐν functions as a locative, indicating ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ [in the death] as a specific destination. The location may be understood as believers' bodies. This is contrasted to believers being rulers in life ἐν ζωῇ (Rm 5:17b). Believers managed this rule through διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. However, in Romans 5:21b, the absolute superiority of God as a ruler through Christ protrudes in the phrase διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [Jesus Christ our Lord]. The preposition διά indicates 'within the domain of' (Black 1973:85). Accordingly, it functions as a metaphor of dominion.

The principal clause Romans 5:21b (οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) personifies Favour (ἡ χάρις) as a ruling force (βασιλεύω). Instead of Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)[291] as the expected personified antonym for Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) in Romans 5:21, Paul employs Favour (ἡ χάρις), which uses righteousness διὰ Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν [through Jesus Christ our Lord]. The occurrence of Favour as a subordinate force associated with God would also not have been strange as Rome's dominion enlisted a culture of client-kings (Adams 2007:208), thus rulers

290. The verb πλεονάζω is associated with abundance (Bauer et al. 2000:824). It can imply abundance in a negative way, for example, Dio Cassius hist. Rom. 54.25.2; 57.14.8 where a river's bank overflows; Dio Cassius hist. Rom. 44.29.2 rings to victors increasing pride or Dio Cassius hist. Rom. 69.23.3 where a regent commits excess of violence.

291. In the pericope Romans 6:15–23, Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is personified.

being subordinate to greater rulers. Favour, righteousness and life are synonymous with the lordship of Christ (Michel 1966:193). This emphasises the effect of Jesus Christ's death and resurrection in the human world, and the occurrences in Romans 5:17, 18, 19 and 21 form part of a pattern repeating διά Χριστοῦ, which underscores the instrumentality of Christ or the Son.[292] The lordship of Favour is made possible through righteousness with the purpose of eternal life, which is mediated through the agency of 'Jesus Christ our Lord' (Lohse 2003:183; Michel 1966:193; Wilckens 1978:330).

Persuasion in Romans 5:12–21

Romans 5:12–21 is saturated with rich imagery. The rhetorical impetus of the pericope is often highlighted (Cosby 1991:209–226; Snyman 2016:1–6). The anaphora (Rm 5:15, 16), antonomasia (Rm 5:14), homoioteleuton (-μα endings), symploce (Rm 5:16), chiasmus (ἐβασίλευσεν [Rm 5:14], ὁ θάνατος [Rm 5:14], ὁ θάνατος [Rm 5:17], ἐβασίλευσεν [Rm 5:17] and ἐβασίλευσεν, ἡ ἁμαρτία, ἡ χάρις, βασιλεύση [Rm 5:21]), antithetical parallelism (Rm 5:18, 19), repetition of the one, contrast between the one and the many, and comparison between Jesus Christ and Adam are all noted rhetorical devices.

Nonetheless, the imagery of persuasion is often overlooked. Especially, the value spatial metaphors add to an argument. Camilla Di Biase-Dyson (2016: 45–68) makes a case that spatial metaphors have a rhetorical function. Her research is especially focused on Egyptian wisdom literature, elucidating spatial metaphors concerned with movement, particularly along a path, enhances the argumentative value of a text (Di Biase-Dyson 2016:46). The source domain 'life is a journey' is prevailing in Di Biase-Dyson's examples, which evinces spatial metaphors are instrumental in the educational genre. It plays a role in delineating good or bad behaviour and elicits good or bad life choices (Di Biase-Dyson 2016:63).

A similar case that spatial metaphors heighten the argument has been made in Romans 5:12–21. The container metaphor εἰς τὸν κόσμον [in the human world] (Rm 5:12) may be identified. Evidently, this is a spatial metaphor. The phrase εἰς τὸν κόσμον (Rm 5:12) is synonymous with εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους (Rm 5:12), pointing to all humans in the world. Paul is interested in outlining the relationship humans have with God, specifically God's saving action.

At first, in Romans 5:1–11, it is made clear, with the use of spatial imagery, that believers may be in the right relationship with God. Romans 5:12–21 addresses the reason why it was necessary for humans to be justified from enemies into friends. Paul introduces two forces that have affected the container in such a manner that God's saving action was necessary. The verbs

292. Cf. Romans 5:1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 (twice) and 11 (twice).

of movement in Romans 5:12 (εἰσέρχομαι and διέρχομαι) are bound to two forces, Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and Death (ὁ θάνατος), which gain access in the container through the figure of Adam. Throughout the argument, Paul develops the container metaphor. This percolates in the description of the two forces.

Paul's creativity in generating new metaphors becomes prevalent with the use of the personifications for both Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and Death (ὁ θάνατος) (Semino 2008:30). The personification of Sin is unique to Paul, especially in the letter to the Romans.[293] Sin does not draw on the Greek notion of ἁμαρτία denoting 'a mistake, error' (Liddell et al. 1996:77). From a Jewish point of view, Sin is usually deciphered from the vantage point of the Mosaic Law. But in Romans 5:13, Sin is already present in the world before the law. What can be delineated is the fact that Sin is perceived as an invading force, as εἰσέρχομαι may be interpreted as a metaphor of dominion in Romans 5:12.

On the other hand, the Death is also personified. This personification is less unfamiliar to the 1st-century world,[294] but Paul adds a twist, as he introduces Death as a force that came through Sin.[295] This idea is not pertinent in the traditions found in Genesis. Death is portrayed as a king that rules from the time of Adam until Moses. Throughout the argument in Romans 5:15–17, Death is particularly associated with the trespass of Adam. However, in each instance, Paul draws on a language of abundance which refers to χάρισμα [God's gift], ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ [the Favour of God], ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι [the gift in Favour] and eventually the rule of believers in life with Christ to indicate Christ as the surpassing force.

Paul's development of the container metaphor illustrates two possible outcomes for people. The metaphor is repeated in Romans 5:18 (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους), again highlighting all humans and especially drawing attention to the consequences of Adam in contrast to Jesus Christ. The effect Adam's trespass has in Romans 5:18 is applicable to all humans and leads to condemnation. However, the effect of Christ's death and resurrection, which also applies to all humans, leads to justification and life. This imagery is strengthened by the build-up of the justification theme already seen in Romans 5:1–11.

Coherent with the container being associated with these two possible outcomes, the first outcome is based on Sin as an invasive force, the rule of Death and the repeating trespass, which all lead to condemnation, the envisioned container in Romans 5:19 has enveloped humans in a

293. The personification of Sin also functions differently in Romans than Paul's other letters (Southall 2008:97).

294. For example, Euripides, *Alcestis* (5th century BCE).

295. Paul deviates from the Jewish tradition, as Death gaining entrance through Sin is not found in Genesis 2:17b or 3:3, 19. This Pauline addition is highly unusual in comparison to Adamic narratives (Cranfield 1975:279–280; Jewett 2007:373).

rebellious state. Humans have been made sinners through the disobedience of one. Disobedience is a trait that openly signifies subversiveness. Within the context of 1st-century Rome, the audience would have been well aware of the importance of obedience. For the Roman military, obedience to a general could determine a life or death outcome as the success of the military was dependent on their discipline (Rankov 2007:64). However, the second outcome refers to the obedience of Jesus Christ, which in opposition makes the container righteous. This is reminiscent of God's saving action.

If the audience has not understood God's saving action and might still think of the law as a way to curb Sin, Romans 5:20 disappoints this expectation. The law only increases the effect of Sin. The Law (νόμος) is personified in Romans 5:20 as slipping in. The movement is coherent with the spatial metaphor visualised as a container.[296] However, in Romans 5:20, Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) is outweighed by Favour (ἡ χάρις). This image comes into sharper focus in Romans 5:21 when Paul explicitly states Sin as a force used to be a king. Sin is compared with Favour as another force that is also personified and is the true ruler in Romans 5:21. Paul uses the image from the Roman benefaction system that the Roman audience would have known well and mapped it to the Jewish notion of the abundance of God's mercy (Breytenbach 2010a:238).

Paul's illustration of these ruling forces Sin and Death are continually surpassed and supplanted by Favour through 'Jesus Christ our Lord'. However, what is more, unlike these forces, believers are under the life-bringing rule of Favour through Jesus Christ their Lord. Within the reign of rulers, Paul illustrates the good rule and the bad rule. Consequently, the metaphors proffer two possibilities for humans, namely, be under God's Favour through 'Jesus Christ our Lord' or under Sin. This choice is even clearly described in Romans 6 when humans' relationship with these kings or forces becomes pertinent.

Argument reconnaissance (Rm 6:1–7:6)

Romans 6:1–7:6 is in effect an answer to the question arising from Romans 5:20, namely, should we continue to sin in order that Favour may abound (Byrne 1996:189; Fitzmyer 1993:430; Wolter 2014:366)? A key notion is established in the ensuing verse, Romans 5:21, that Sin reigned through death (ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ) and Favour might reign through righteousness, leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν), establishing a contrast not only between life and death[297] but also between

296. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:41) remark that metaphors are seldom haphazard, but often configure coherent systems, which reflect conceptualisations of experiences.

297. Romans 6:2 launches the overall theme of the pericope, namely, 'dead' or 'alive'. This is repeated in Romans 6:11 (Byrne 1996:189).

the different reigns of Favour and Sin. In Romans 6:1–14, Paul ponders over the contrast between life and death, but dissimilar to Romans 5:12–21 where Paul is engrossed in illustrating the saving power of Christ in light of the forces of Sin and Death, Paul shifts the focus on the effect of these forces on believers embedded in the contrast of life and death. Accordingly, Paul crystallises what the reign of Sin and the reign of Favour would embody for believers. Romans 6:1–14 can be delineated in two parts, that is, Romans 6:1–11 focusing on the situation of believers in Christ Jesus and Romans 6:12–14[298] indicating what believers ought to do.

Romans 6:15–23 is essentially superfluous, elaborating on Romans 6:12–14 sketching the different situations of what being for God or for Sin entails. The audience would have been able to understand the argument without it, but Paul further deliberates on the effect of dominators on the dominated space. He personifies more forces constructed upon an evident slavery metaphor. If the believers misunderstood Romans 6:12–14, Romans 6:15–23 offers another chance to comprehend the difference between being a slave of Sin and being a slave of God.

Ostensibly, Romans 7:1–6 seems to be an odd addition to the argument. An analogy of a marriage is wedged between Romans 6:12–23,[299] where Paul has described a change of lordship, and Romans 7:7–25, which explores the relationship between Sin and law. Upon closer inspection, Romans 7:1–6 functions as a transitional argument (Johnson 1997:106)[300] that shifts the focus of the argument to νόμος [law][301] and prepares the audience for Romans 7:7–25. Romans 7:1–6 illustrates that believers have been separated from the law, expounding on the separation from Sin. Romans 7:1–6 consists of a diatribal exchange with three main sections, that is, Romans 7:1; 7:2–4; and 7:5–6.

298. There is no consensus concerning the structure of Romans 6. Some proponents opt for Romans 6:1–11 and Romans 6:12–23 as the main sections. The reasons for this delineation pertain to Romans 6:12–23 being in saturated hortatory language and the notion that Romans 6:12–14 does not fit thematically in with the main argument of Romans 6:1–11. I am amongst the many interpreters whose view is that Romans 6:1–14 is a unit with Romans 6:15–23. In effect, Romans 6:15–23 is superfluous and a repetition of Romans 6:12–14.

299. I consider Romans 6:12–14 to be structurally part of Romans 6:1–14 with Romans 6:15–23 essentially repeating Romans 6:12–14.

300. The new pericope recapitulates various concepts of Romans 6:12–23, such as ἐλευθερόω (Rm 6:18), ἐλεύθερος (Rm 7:3), δοῦλος (Rm 6:17; 19; 20), δουλόω (Rm 6:18), δουλεύω (Rm 7:6), καρπός (Rm 6:21, 22), καρποφορέω (Rm 7:5), θάνατος (Rm 6:23), ἀποθνήσκω (Rm 7:2, 3, 6), θανατόω (Rm 7:4), μέλος (Rm 6:13, 19; 7:5) and ἁμαρτία (Rm 6:12–18, 20, 22, 23; 7:5). Romans 7:1–6 also introduces new themes, for example, 'new' (καινότης) and 'old' (παλαιότης) in Romans 7:6.

301. This is evident in Paul's repetitive use of νόμος appearing in each verse and ultimately eight times in Romans 7:1–6.

Separated from the power of Sin (Rm 6:1–14)

Separated from Sin (Rm 6:1–4)

The premise of the argument and overall theme of the pericope kindles in Romans 6:1–2, that is, believers are separated from Sin (Boers 2001:664). The rhetorical questions in Romans 6:1–2 engage the audience (τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; [Rm 6:1a]) and prompt the question whether believers shall remain in sin so that Favour may abound (ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ [Rm 6:1b–c])? Unsurprisingly, this question is immediately refuted (μὴ γένοιτο [Rm 6:2a]) and ignites the argument that it is preposterous for believers to remain in Sin. Sin is something to which believers have died, how would believers still live in Sin (οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ; [Rm 6:2b–c])? The foundation of believers being separated from Sin derives from their participation in the baptism. Paul starts to elucidate the premise clearer as believers who are supposed to be aware of this fact are seemingly not (Rm 6:3a). He captivates the audience by shedding light on the fact that they who have been baptised into Christ Jesus have been baptised into his death (ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; [Rm 6: 3b–c]). Drawing the inference that believers as well as Paul himself have been buried with Christ through the baptism into death (συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον [Rm 6:4a]), Paul explicates the purpose for believers to be buried with Christ with a comparison. Just as Christ was raised from death through the glory of the Father (ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός [Rm 6:4b]), so too believers might walk in the newness of life (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν [Rm 6:4c]).

Detail analysis of Romans 6:1–4

The different impacts of the rule of Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and the rule of Favour (ἡ χάρις) are explored. Not only is there a significant difference established by the reign of these rulers but also these two rulers appear to be in a deadlocked tête-á-tête, the one power bound to react to the other. The metaphor of dominion in Romans 5:21 confirms Favour (ἡ χάρις) to be the superior power. The contrast created indicates Favour (ἡ χάρις) associated with Jesus Christ as the obvious victor.

Nonetheless, the argument engenders a possibility for the audience to misinterpret Paul's imagery.[302] If Favour becomes more, why not sin more? Why not have two lords? It was a common phenomenon in the 1st century that

302. Kruse (2012:257) mentions that Paul ensures his opponents that he is not encouraging sinful behaviour as the verse is reminiscent of Romans 3:7–8. Cf. Byrne (1996:189); Harrisville (1980:87); Hultgren (2011:242); Michel (1966:204); Schlier (1977:190).

clients had more than one patron. Paul anticipates this reasoning in the next section of the argument opened with the rhetorical question τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν; [what shall we say then?] (Rm 6:1a). Another question ensues ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ [shall we remain in sin, so that favour may abound?] (Rm 6:1b–c). The phrase ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ is significant as the dative (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) is a locative dative.[303] The verb ἐπιμένω with a dative denotes 'to continue in a state or activity' (Bauer et al. 2000:375).[304] Drawing on Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:30) theory, a continued state of being may also be perceived as a container metaphor. Romans 6:2b, ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [shall we remain in Sin] evokes a metaphor of dominion, but from the point of view of the audience.

It is possible to infer Sin as a personified power in Romans 6:1b.[305] However, such a delineation is unadvisable, as firstly, this undermines Paul's metaphor of submission. The hortatory subjective ἐπιμένω unfurls a persuasive shift in Paul's rhetoric drawing on the first-person plural,[306] illustrating the vantage point of the believers (dominated) instead of the rulers (dominators). Secondly, the metaphor of submission illustrates Paul's various use of nuance to communicate his point. Lastly, believers are portrayed as subsumed by sin, which also functions as a metonymy. Paul is referring to the whole of sinful actions. The implicit spatiality of the image heeds a contrast to the Favour in which believers stand seen in Romans 5:2. This use of ἁμαρτία establishes a pattern of recurrence (Semino 2008:23), highlighting different aspects of the source domain.

Believer's misconception of their status change is evident in the final clause of Romans 6:1c (ἵνα ἡ χάρις πλεονάσῃ). The verb πλεονάζω is also used in Romans 5:20 twice. The repetition[307] of πλεονάζω is important. In Romans 5:20, οὗ designates a specific place where Sin becomes more but where Favour (ἡ χάρις) super abounds (Rm 5:20d). The metaphor of dominion ἡ χάρις

303. The locative dative is often employed for the parts of the body, for example, Philippians 1:24 ἐπιμένειν [ἐν] τῇ σαρκί (see Smyth 1956:351).

304. This type of construction is also seen in Philo, *Sobr.* 69, and in Jos., *Ant*. 5.108.

305. Williams (1999:116; contra Wolter 2014:368) contends that a metaphor of slavery is introduced in Romans 6:1. He interprets the phrase ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ to imply 'we are under sin'. Byrne (1996:189) also argues that the idea of 'having died to sin' postulates a continuance of Romans 5:12–21 as a 'power' tyrannising the human race. Dunn (1988:306) has a similar suggestion that ἐπιμένω is more an equivalent to 'remain under the lordship of sin' considering the immediate context, that is, Romans 5:21 and 6:14. Although the slavery metaphor is employed in Romans 6, the construction ἐπιμένω with a dative in Romans 6:1 is at odds with both Williams' and Dunn's designations. Sin is used in Romans 6:1 to describe an array of sinful actions. What sinful actions entail is an open question, but probably along the lines of anything that causes an obstruction in the relationship with God.

306. The hortatory subjunctive adds to the pedagogical character of Paul's argument. Paul does not actually include himself with the use of the first-person plural (Porter 1992:58).

307. Repetition is a typical metaphorical discourse pattern (Semino 2008:22).

βασιλεύση διὰ δικαιοσύνης (Rm 5:21b) affirms Favour as the greater power and is still fresh in the minds of the auditors. In Romans 6:1c, Favour (ἡ χάρις) also functions as a personified entity associated with God as the use of the definite article with the noun signals, coherent with the portrayals in Romans 5:20, 21. The link strengthens the absurdity of believers remaining in sin when they have the possibility to be under the dominion of Favour. The imagery χάρις incites, forms an *inclusio* as the argument begins with ἡ χάρις (Rm 6:1c) and concludes with ὑπὸ χάριν [under Favour] (Rm 6:14b).

Believers might be prone to assume that the hegemonic dimensions of the relationship believers have with Christ are not affected by Sin as Favour incurs. Naturally, such a fallacy is rebutted as Paul continues the argument in Romans 6:2a with the aorist optative μὴ γένοιτο [by no means!][308] However, the absurdity to remain under the control of Sin crystallises in Paul's premise that believers are separated from Sin.

This unfolds in Romans 6:2b–c with the deliberate combination of contradictory traits (Egg 2016:122). Within two metaphorical expressions, Sin is described as something to which believers have died, and yet, they can still continue to live in Sin. The first expression of the relative clause in Romans 6:2b (οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) draws on death, and the second expression in the adverbial clause Romans 6:2c (πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ)[309] educes life. The contrasting metaphorical expressions life and death communicate the same target domain, that is, believers are separated from Sin.

The life and death contrast not only creates an emphasis but also reverberates Romans 5:21. However, instead of the contrast clarifying the better ruler (as was the case in Romans 5:21), Paul employs life and death as a status indicator of believers cemented with the first-person plural use in both ἀπεθάνομεν (Rm 6:2b) and ζήσομεν (Rm 6:2c). In both cases, Paul illustrates the believers' relationship to Sin.

The verb ἀποθνῄσκω (Rm 6:2b) is used with the dative of possession (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ), pointing to Sin as the lord and to believers as the dominated (Lohse 2003:186; Wilckens 1993:10). From the source domain of death, the notion of being separated (Bauer et al. 2000:111) is mapped onto the target domain.

308. Black (1973:86) remarks that the negation serves as a transition to the argument's main theme.

309. A distinction is clearly intended with ὅστις (Moule 1953:124). The relative clause ὅστις is placed at the beginning of the sentence to draw attention to the definite answer of no to the false inference of continuing to live in sin (Cranfield 1975:298; Schlier 1977:191). Usually the meaning of ὅστις does not differ in meaning from ὅς, but Cranfield (1975:298) suggests that in this case it is intended to have a nuanced distinction, namely, 'seeing that'. Jewett (2007:395) explains that ὅστις refers to those sharing in the death of Christ. Jewett (2007:395) is of the opinion that the audience knew that they belonged to this class of persons who died to sin. The idea is also seen in 2 Corinthians 5:14.

The poignancy of the metaphor of death (Rm 6:2b) becomes clear in the contrasting mirroring metaphorical expression of life (πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ [Rm 6:2c]). The first-person plural of the future tense of ζάω pertains to Paul's interpretation of believers' future status.[310] Just as Paul applies a wide array of meanings, ranging from literal to abstract and to death, so too Paul administers various implications with life. However, one constant protrudes in Paul's use of life as not merely a natural phenomenon but an aspect of intentionality of human existence. This culminates in Paul's innate understanding of ζάω to conduct oneself in a pattern of behaviour (Bauer et al. 2000:425). In CMT, life is often interpreted within the frame of the conceptual metaphor 'life is a journey',[311] but this is not an apt determination for Paul's use as he envisions life as a deliberate action. Coinciding with this, living is intrinsically perceived as walking (περιπατέω) (Bultmann 1968:210).[312] Accordingly, in conjunction with the temporal adverb ἔτι denoting 'no longer' (Bauer et al. 2000:400), Paul accentuates that to deliberately continue to live for Sin should not even be considered as an option for believers who have been separated from Sin by death. It is unfathomable to think that believers who have died to Sin would opt to still live in Sin. The preposition ἐν is used in a locative manner with αὐτῇ referring to Sin[313] and allocating Sin as the dominator (Bauer et al. 2000:327). This metaphor communicates a continuation of location, referring to the conceptual domain of 'persistence of location is persistence of a state' (Egg 2016:103–126) and echoing Romans 6:1b to remain in Sin.

As life and death is such a prevalent theme, Paul's ingenuity with the metaphorical mixing (Semino 2008:26) might be easily missed. The past tense of 'to die' (ἀποθνῄσκω) in contrast to the future tense of 'to live' (ζάω) only heightens the absurdity to remain in the dominion of a power from which believers have been separated. This contrast between life and death forms a pattern throughout Romans 6:1–11. This links to the conceptual metaphor 'living from the dead' (Zimmermann 2009:503–520). Paul utilises the source domain developing from human experience with the purpose to communicate a new experience of 'life and death' (Zimmermann 2009:504). Paul's combination of contrasting metaphors is persuasive in communicating

310. This is a linear future indicating continuance (Moule 1953:10).

311. This conceptual metaphor frequently occurs in early Christian literature. It portrays the way people should live according to Jesus and boils down to a negative or positive application in terms of what to follow (positive) and warnings of what to avoid (negative) (Raible 2016:32).

312. Bultmann (1968:210) argues that life is always lived in a sphere and that sphere gives it direction. Black (1984:422) argues Paul's interpretation of life and death is to sharpen the focus on the ethical implications of Christian life. Contrary to Black, I rather think Paul is depicting the implication of being dominated by Sin or Christ. Zeller (1985:124) also remarks that life in Romans 6:2 embroils the end of Sin as a ruler.

313. Lohse (2003:186) already interprets the metaphor as a slavery metaphor. He notes that the dative indicates the lord in whose service a person is obligated to.

believer's status as separated from Sin with the goal of the separation to rather live for Christ.

The argument develops further in Romans 6:3a with another question ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε [or do you not know],[314] preparing the audience for a supporting reason to object the idea of remaining in Sin.[315] Paul draws on the experience of baptism,[316] using it metaphorically. He uses the first-person plural for βαπτίζω, including himself into the experience adding to the fervour of the argument. Believers, who have been baptised into Christ, have also been baptised into his death. The chiastic structures (1) ἐβαπτίσθημεν, B) εἰς χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν,[317] and (2) εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ, A) ἐβαπτίσθημεν place emphasis on the verb βαπτίζω. By the repetition, Paul creates a connection between being baptised into Christ Jesus (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν) and being baptised into his death (εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ).[318] Repetition is a typical signifier for a pattern within a discourse (Semino 2008:22).

The source domain 'being baptised into' (ἐβαπτίσθῆναι εἴς τί/τίνα) involves being dipped into something.[319] Moreover, spatiality is also implied (Breytenbach 2016:281; Moo 1996:359–360; Wolter 2014:371) and the preposition εἰς is typically used with βαπτίζω [to dip into] (Bauer et al. 2000:291).[320] Paul is not interested in defining baptism,[321] but rather his use of

314. The particle ἤ is used in secular and biblical Greek as the opening rhetorical feature of an interrogative sentence. It highlights the question being asked and does not necessarily need to be translated (Longenecker 2016:611–612).

315. The repetition of the relative pronouns ὅστις (Rm 6:2b) and ὅσος (Rm 6:3b) links Romans 6:2 and 6:3 structurally, respectively, indicating a continuance of being separated from sin.

316. There have been debates concerning whether the origin of baptism derives from the Ancient Near Eastern cults of Mithras and Isis, but these types of arguments are no longer relevant in modern scholarship as the mystery cults date to 2nd century CE (Longenecker 2016:612). In contention, Dunn (1988:309) and Jewett (2007:396–397), who are aware of Greco-Roman cult texts dating 100–120 years later than Paul, indicate that similar themes were probably routed in the Isis cult. Wedderburn (1983:344) cogently argues that the influence may have rather been the reverse, namely, from early Christianity on the cult on Cybele and Attis. Cf. Wedderburn 1983:337–355. Wedderburn (1987:54) also lists another problem, namely, reading mystery cults in the text identifying 'initiation meant dying with the deity'. Again, this idea does not hold ground (Wedderburn 1987:53–72).

317. The chiastic expression ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν can also be found in Galatians 3:27 and 1 Corinthians 10:2.

318. In Mark 10:38–39 and Luke 12:50, Jesus refers to his death as his 'baptism', thereby connecting the idea of baptism and death (Longenecker 2016:613).

319. The verb means 'to plunge'. Polybius employs the verb with regard to a 'sinking' ship. See Polyb. I, LI.7. Morris (1988:246) especially notes the meanings of drowning and sinking points to associations of violence. Josephus used βαπτίζω metaphorically of crowds who flooded into Jerusalem and 'wrecked the city' in Bell. 4.137. Moreover, baptism has already acquired a specific meaning in early Christian communities.

320. Contra Schlier (1977:192) who argues that the formula is used in the Hellenistic law and administration language.

321. Paul's intention is not to provide a comprehensive definition of baptism (Byrne 1996:189).

this metaphor indicates two assumptions. Firstly, believers were baptised and thus familiar with the image (Byrne 1996:189; Kruse 2012:258) and secondly, baptism during Paul's lifetime was always associated with being converted. Accordingly, the image connotes strongly to believer's status prior to belonging to Christ and after becoming believers in Christ (Wolter 2014:370).[322] Paul coherently employs the distinction between the audience's past situation and present situation.

The parallel notions 'into Christ Jesus' (εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν) and being baptised 'into his death' (εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ) underscore believers' participation into the death and sharing in the resurrection of Christ Jesus. The phrase εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν also harbours a spatial interpretation as the preposition εἰς is used in a locative manner. It is not physically possible to be 'in Jesus Christ', and concomitantly, Lakoff and Johnson's (1980:29) container metaphor provides a helpful tool in unlocking the metaphor.[323] Humans are physical beings and accordingly think in terms of containers, projecting the possibility of their in-or-out orientation. However, container metaphors can also be conceptualised as a state, for example, he is *in* love (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:371–372). Paul clearly links Christ Jesus with his death, reminiscent of the cross event. That Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς also signifies the power of Christ's victory over death with the resurrection[324] becomes explicit also in the ensuing verse. Accordingly, believers orientate themselves into this present state of Christ's victory over death, which inherently implies to be able to live. If a believer is orientated 'in', they have access to life, but 'out' becomes synonymous with death. Accordingly, being in Christ is perceived as a state of affairs attained through baptism.[325] The in–out orientation would entail that if one were not baptised, he or she would not be part of being in Christ. To be in Christ means to be in his death and thus to be separated from Sin.[326]

322. Baptism is used as a Christian sacrament of initiation after Jesus' death (Bauer et al. 2000:164; Liddell et al. 1996:305). There are many references in Jewish scripture to the purification of people through water, but baptism as an initiatory religious rite is foreign to these scriptures. Excavations of the southern end of the Temple Mount at Jerusalem and throughout Judea indicate that Jews of the 1st century CE constructed ritual baths for purification purposes. There were even ritual baths at Qumran (Longenecker 2016:612–613).

323. Understanding the metaphor proves to be problematic. Byrne (1996:190) mentions that believers are drawn into a sphere of influence, that is, 'the milieu of salvation'. However, what does Paul intend with a sphere and what is envisioned by a 'milieu of salvation'? Kruse (2012:261) also interprets baptism as a sphere of influence or lordship. Schlier (1977:193) notes that baptism integrates believers into Christ.

324. Cf. 2 Corinthians 13:4.

325. Harrisville (1980:89) remarks that Paul's idea of incorporation into the body of Christ does not necessitate a Hellenistic awareness of the Stoic notion of the animate creation as single organism indwelt by Reason or Soul, but ample evidence suggests that Judaism also conceived existence as corporate, and thus for a Jew to be cut off from his community is a far worse fate than the cessation of biological functions.

326. Byrne (1996:190) notes that baptism does not simply involve being joined but also integration into the death, burial and risen life.

The baptism metaphor enforces Paul's premise of believers being separated from Sin. The source domain 'baptised into' maps believers' relationship with Christ onto the target domain, conveying if a believer is baptised, then it is impossible to remain in the dominion of Sin (Lohse 2003:185; Michel 1966:205; Mounce 1995:149).[327]

Paul expounds the metaphor of baptism with a declaration (οὖν) (Rm 6:4a) (Bauer et al. 2000:736) that believers have been buried with Christ. The baptism imagery is repeated, but in Romans 6:4a, Paul creates the noun βάπτισμα,[328] which has an instrumental function becoming the vehicle by which a person can be buried with Christ into death (διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον) as the preposition διά signals. The phrase εἰς τὸν θάνατον[329] is repeated from Romans 6:3c, which refers to the death of Christ Jesus. If the audience had not grasped that through baptism they are transported into the death of Christ, Paul accentuates again utilising imagery coherent with death. The verb συνθάπτω is in the passive, meaning 'to be buried with' (Liddell et al. 1996:1716). The source domain 'to be buried with someone' draws on the notion to share in his or her fate of death (Breytenbach 2016:277). The idea of 'being buried with' is not strange in the ancient world. In Herodotus 5.5, a wife is buried with her husband. In Plutarch (Anton. 84.7), a mourning Cleopatra wanted to be buried with Marcus Antonius, and in Dion Chrysostomos (Or. 13.1), the practice of the Scythians was to bury cupbearers, cooks and concubines with their kings (Bauer et al. 2000:971). However, the metaphorical meaning of 'being buried with' is not that commonly seen,[330] and the audience is taken along in this image as believers are buried specifically with Christ in his death through baptism. The appearance of 'with' (σύν) in the verb συνθάπτω is important as Paul creates a pattern of repetition throughout the periscope,[331] underscoring the shared status of believers when orientated in Christ. Paul includes himself in this status utilising the first-person plural.

327. Käsemann (1978:157) reminds that the participation in the reign of Christ has already been presented in Romans 5:12, but a person does not yet belong to this new status without the death of the old person. However, this notion becomes prevalent in Romans 6:6.

328. The noun βάπτισμα is novel and introduced by Paul in Romans 6:4 (Liddell et al. 1996:306). Harrisville (1980:90) notes that it is an error to connote baptism as analogous to Christ's death as the conjunction 'so that' and the translated correlative adverb in Romans 6:4 make it clear that only by an actual death can real life occur. I do not think this is a literal–metaphorical opposition as Paul focuses on the resurrection and life. Interpreters opting for the possibility that one can drown during baptism, thus inducing death, are in my opinion superfluous and an example of reading more into the text.

329. The article is omitted in the prepositional attributive (Blass et al. 1961:§272).

330. Cf. figuratively in Lycurgus, Or. in Leocr. 50 συνετάφη τοῖς τούτων σώμασιν ἡ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερια (Bauer et al. 2000:971; Liddell et al. 1996:1716). It features also in Colossians 2:12.

331. Cf. Romans 6:5, 6, 8; Colossians 2:12–13 (Kruse 2012:258; Wolter 2014:373).

The purpose (ἵνα) of being transported through the baptism into Christ's death is elucidated in a comparison that just as Christ has been raised from the death through the glory of the Father (ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός [Rm 6:4b]) so too believers might walk in the new life (οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν [Rm 6:4c]).

The audience is already aware that Christ was resurrected from the dead (ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν).[332] The aorist passive of ἐγείρω is a *passivum divinum* indicating the situation that it was God who raised Jesus from the dead and, hence, this action of rising in Christ.[333] Zimmermann (2009:505–509) coherently indicates that Paul draws on the backdrop of early Jewish tradition, thematising the important aspect of God as 'to cause to live/make alive'. In the experience of believers in Pauline communities, the exalted Christ features as a present and active power that influences and controls lives, individually and corporately (Fatehi 2000:17). Nonetheless, Paul draws on the traditional formula and connects it with δόξα, which is usually not linked with resurrection formulae.[334] Christ has been resurrected through the glory of the Father (διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός). However, the phrase (διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός) is not instrumentally used but serves as a description of circumstances, that is, God's majesty manifested for all to see (Wolter 2014:374).[335]

Just as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so too believers are similarly enabled to walk in the newness of life. Romans 6:4c especially engages the audience with the emphasis on the elliptical formulation οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς creates. The use of the first-person plural of the verb περιπατέω also refocuses Paul's rhetoric on the believers, but he also includes himself. The prepositional phrase ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς in conjunction with the verb περιπατέω refers to the type of space in which a person ought to live (Bauer

332. This is a powerful contrasting image as ἐγείρω indicates to enter into or be in a state of life as a result of being raised (Bauer et al. 2000:272) and this is done from νεκρός, which refers to no longer being physically alive, thus a dead person (Bauer et al. 2000:667). The traditional formula of Christ's resurrection also appears in Romans 4:24; 8:11; 10:9 with ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν (Jewett 2007:399).

333. The phrase ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν stems from a pre-Pauline tradition.

334. This combination does not normally appear in biblical or patristic texts or in other Pauline writings (Jewett 2007:399).

335. Louw and Nida (1988:682) mark δόξα as a semantical domain with a manifestation of power characterised by glory. It is a 'glorious power, amazing might'. In the LXX, δόξα is specifically used to translate Hebrew words concerning power (Cranfield 1975:305). Schlier (1977:194) notes that δόξα is used instead of δύναμις as seen in 2 Corinthians 13:4; cf. Ephesians 1:19. Paul links χάρις with the language of glory (Harrison 2003:243). Cf. Ephesians 1:6a, 6b; wealth (1:7; 2:7), mystery (3:2–3) and power (3:7) themes throughout Ephesians. However, Ephesians is not an authentic Pauline letter.

et al. 2000:803).[336] The expression ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς[337] describes the life that believers did not have before they participated in the life enabled by Christ (Bauer et al. 2000:803).[338] The verb περιπατέω is used to express the way in which a person will act, which is contrasted to prior conduct (Bauer et al. 2000:803; Blass, Debrunner & Funk 1996:§337[1]).[339] The verb's reference is of note as it entails the 'whom' responsible to for life's conduct (Bergmeier 2011:178–179). The new life of the believer corresponds to the new life in Christ who has been resurrected by the glory of the Father (Blass et al. 1961:§337[1]).[340]

The burial metaphor (Rm 6:4) connotes with the baptism metaphor (Rm 6:3), illustrating Paul's pluriform use of life (Zimmermann 2009:517). Believers are buried with Christ by the baptism into the death of Jesus Christ, in order to share in the manifestation of God's power in Christ that enables believers to walk in the newness of life. Accordingly, it is unthinkable that believers would remain in Sin in order for Favour to increase, as they embark into a new life in Christ.

Constituting life and death (Rm 6:5–11)

Paul's argument splits into two supporting arguments elucidating Romans 6:4, that is, Romans 6:5–7 and Romans 6:8–11. Both supporting arguments start with conditional clauses (Byrne 1996:191). In Romans 6:5–7, the first supporting argument is mainly concerned with addressing the first result of

336. There are multiple examples of this expression, such as Ephesians 2:2, where the sphere is 'in sins'. Cf. Colossians 3:7; in good deeds Ephesians 2:10; and in Philo Congr. Erud. Gr. 87 in the lord's ordinances.

337. The combination of καινότης with a genitive function as a *genitivus epexegeticus/appositivus* is also seen in Isocrates, Helena 2; Philo Vit, Cont. 63; Thudycides 3.38.5; Diodorus Siculus 17.110.2; Plutarch, Sulla 34.1; Sert. 11.3 (Wolter 2014:375).

338. The phrase καινότητι ζωῆς should be interpreted in the same manner as καινότητι πνεύματος 'new spirit' in Romans 7:6 as καινότης is Hebraistically used for πνεύματος. Usually καινότης refers to something extraordinary like in Philo, Vi. Cont, 63. In this case, ζωή is used without eschatological implications but describes the life of grace and holiness (Bauer et al. 2000:430). Contra Wolter (2014:375) who states that the final clause ἵνα … περιπατήσωμεν indicates that this life is nothing as envisioned on a day-to-day basis, and continues for eternity. In a similar fashion as Paul redefined death in Romans 6:2, he now also reconstructs what should be understood when speaking of life.

339. Dunn (1988:315) argues that the employment of the aorist subjunctive active περιπατήσωμεν is not typically used in Greek thought and reflects a Hebrew understanding of how to conduct oneself. Hultgren (2011:248) also argues that the roots lie in the Jewish tradition – particularly, one's manner of life is a 'walk' in which one's 'steps' are guided precepts of the Torah (the *halakhot*). However, περιπατέω is often used in Pauline epistles to denote a person's conduct (Cranfield 1975:305). Michel (1966:205) marks that περιπατέω entails to be obedient. This seems inherent as the subjunctive leaves the possibility that a believer might step out of the space of new life. Paul also forms a conceptual metaphor pattern of repetition with obedience already started in Romans 5:12–21 and repeated in Romans 6:12–23 (Hultgren 2011:248). However, I do not think obedience is the focus point in Romans 6:4.

340. Moo (1996:366) aptly puts it: 'newness of life is a life empowered by the realities of the new age', although I would rather say of the new status.

being buried with Christ, focusing on the death and resurrection of Christ, and the second supportive argument in Romans 6:8–11 is primarily concerned with walking in the newness of life, eliciting the relationship between Jesus' resurrection and believers' status (Lee 2010:318).

☐ Uniting in the likeness of Christ (Rm 6:5–7)

The first supporting argument posits that if – as argued in 6:4 – believers have become united in the likeness of Christ's death (εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [Rm 6:5a]), certainly believers will also become united in the likeness of Christ's resurrection (ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα [Rm 6:5b]). Paul again gleans on the information the audience already is aware of in Romans 6:6a (τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι). In this instance, the audience should know that their old person has been crucified with Christ (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη [Rm 6:6b]) with the purpose that the body of sin might be nullified (ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 6:6c]). The result is that believers are no longer slaves to Sin (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [Rm 6:6d]). Paul elaborates further on this slavery image in Romans 6:7a claiming that the one who has died has been set free from Sin (ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 6:5–7

The first supporting argument starts with an emotional future conditional clause elaborating on οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς 'so we too' (Rm 6:4c) as γάρ designates (Greijdanus 1933:296; Schlier 1977:195).[341] The protasis (εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [Rm 6:5a]) draws attention to Christ's death, but the apodosis creates a sharp contrast focusing on the resurrection of Christ (ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα [Rm 6:5b]). Again, the life and death contrast can be traced, accentuating the possibility believers may have when they embrace their changed status.

However, the protasis of Romans 6:5a is riddled with difficulties, amongst which are the interpretation of the likeness of death (τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου) and the more notorious interpretation problem σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν. The perfect γεγόναμεν signifies a result (Greijdanus 1933:297; Morris 1988:250; Zeller 1985:125) in conjunction with the noun σύμφυτος and is predominantly perceived to be a botanical metaphor meaning 'grown together' (Fitzmyer 1993:435; Wolter 2014:376).[342] Coinciding with this, the source domain is

341. Contra Fitzmyer (1993:435) who interprets εἰ to denote 'because' in this sense. The conditional clause is reminiscent of Romans 5:15, 17.

342. Kruse (2012:261) notes that the phrase means 'if we have been grown together with (him) in the likeness of his death'.

associated with the concept of plants growing together (Bauer et al. 2000:960).[343] However, defining the source domain as horticultural is aberrant as Breytenbach convincingly shifts the understanding of σύμφυτος from 'grown together' to 'uniting'.[344] Breytenbach (2016:279) argues that Paul expresses with σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν a relationship that indicates the likeness with the death of Christ. This interpretation also fits Paul's argument better as the focal point of the target domain is the relationship between believers and Christ.

The misunderstanding of the phrase τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ is a direct result of the erroneous reading of the metaphor of unification as a botanical metaphor.[345] But part of the difficulty lies in the question whether τῷ ὁμοιώματι [the likeness] is dependent on σύμφυτοι [uniting with] or whether the dative of the personal pronoun αὐτός should be supplied, rendering if τῷ ὁμοιώματι should be delineated as a dative of respect or an instrumental dative? It is not clear, but I think the former is more likely, as it is grammatically possible.[346]

In addition, there is no consensus concerning how to comprehend ὁμοίωμα. Sorin Sabou (2004:219–229) provides an overview of scholarly interpretations concerning ὁμοίωμα sorting the meaning into two main categories, namely, 'a corresponding reality' and a 'form'. Sabou (2004:227–228) uses two extra-biblical Greek literature examples, namely, Aristotle, *Politics* 1340a–b, and Plato, *Laws*, 812b, to argue that an additional understanding of ὁμοίωμα as 'representation' should be considered. Sabou's argument is not compelling, as more evidence is required to convincingly posit 'representation'. In this case, Bauer et al. (2000:707) offer a good solution that in Romans 6:5 ὁμοίωμα is best understood as indicating a state of having common experiences, thus

343. Σύμφυτος refers to 'growth', 'plant along with', 'unite'. In the passive 'grow together', 'become assimilated' as seen in Pindar (Isthm. 3.14) and Aeschylus (Ag. 107 and 152). This is the only case of σύμφυτος in the New Testament. Cranfield (1975:307) and Liddell et al. (1996:1689) assumed that Paul draws on grafting an organic image of union with Christ.

344. Breytenbach (2016:278) adds to the Liddell Scott Jones list of understanding the expression with examples from Pseudo-Plato, Definitiones 413c indicating a relationship and shifting the understanding of σύμφυτος as principally 'grown together' to rather 'uniting'. Even in a horticultural example in Theophrast, Historia plantarum I 2,4, the growing aspect of plants is not the main focus (Breytenbach 2016:278). Cranfield (1975:307) suggests that a translation of 'united' or 'assimilated' would better represent Paul's meaning than 'grown together'. Zeller (1985:125) also notes the dative makes the interpretation of 'growing together' impossible and it must be read as 'united'. Contra Jewett (2007:401) who suggests that Paul is shifting the metaphor of baptism to an organic unity. This is highly unlikely.

345. Fitzmyer (1993:435) notes that such an interpretation is problematic voicing how is it possible that 'one can grow together with a likeness'.

346. It is unlikely that an adjective of identification takes a genitive in Romans 6:5 as τῷ ὁμοιώματι is rather instrumental belonging with σύμφυτοι, even if taking the genitive with ὁμοίωμα comes more naturally and features elsewhere in Paul (Black 1973:88; Dunn 1988:316; Käsemann 1978:160. Contra Fitzmyer 1993:435; Michel 1966:206).

translated as 'likeness'.[347] The phrase τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ refers to 'the death of Christ'. In light of the metaphors 'baptised into his death' and 'being buried with', being 'united in the likeness of his death' is a coherent extension of the concepts and continues Paul's emphasis on the participation of believers (Fitzmyer 1993:435).[348]

However, the image is not complete. The elliptically formulated apodosis (ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα [Rm 6:5b]) is established with the strong alternative consideration ἀλλὰ καί [certainly] (Bauer et al. 2000:45). The future tense of εἰμί is gnomic (Fitzmyer 1993:435; Greijdanus 1933:298) repeating Romans 6:4 as the newly baptised walks in the present reality of salvation (Wolter 2014:377). It also points to Romans 5:17, 21, as the newly baptised realisation of the implications of the status change by having partaken in Jesus's death and resurrection becomes clear (Wolter 2014:377). Although Romans 6:4 has already indicated this sharing in the manifestation of God, Romans 6:5 makes it explicit that a believer also shares in Christ's resurrection. The noun ἀνάστασις means 'to rise up/raising up the dead' (Liddell et al. 1996:121). Believers do not partake in the exact same form of the resurrection of Christ, as it is a past event,[349] but share in the same power that made it possible. The metaphor of baptism is expanded, as it entails to share not only in Christ's death but also in his resurrection (Fitzmyer 1993:435). This also supports understanding τῷ ὁμοιώματι as a dative of respect. It refers to the Christ event evoking a metaphor of dominion as believers' relationship with Christ is implied. Christ is the ultimate power to which believers have become united.

Paul draws his listener's attention with the phrase τοῦτο γινώσκοντες ὅτι [this you should know] in Romans 6:6a, which functions as a cataphoric reference recapitulating Romans 6:3–4.[350] Paul employs imagery enforcing the past status of believers versus their new status with the image in the adverbial clause Romans 6:6b ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη [our old person has been co-crucified]. The source domain παλαιός draws on the meaning of that which is obsolete and inferior because of being old (Bauer et al. 2000:751).

347. Wolter (2014:376) and Zahn (1925:301) suggest that it is easiest to understand ὁμοιώμα with Romans 5:14 in mind, as Paul wants to express a similarity as well as a difference at the same time. This entails understanding ὁμοίωμα as a 'type' and interpreting τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ as a 'genitive of apposition'. Greijdanus (1933:297) rightly notes, '*dat is gewrongen*' as such an understanding does not express to which ὁμοίωμα is equal.

348. Morris (1988:250) notes that this image is strange as Paul usually illustrates believers to be united with Christ himself or his body, but not the likeness. Byrne (1996:191) attempts to solve it by noting that it is the ethical 'pattern' expressed in Christ's death to sin (Rm 6:6). However, I am of the opinion that although the uniting metaphor is correctly spotted, Paul's use of the likeness of his death is not that peculiar.

349. The noun ἀνάστασις refers to the past of Jesus' resurrection (Bauer et al. 2000:71). Orig. C. Cels. 5,57,25.

350. The participle γινώσκοντες replaces an indicative with an imperative meaning, presenting the meaning, 'this you know, you should know this' (Blass et al. 1996:§468; Moulton 1963:352–356; Schlier 1977:196).

The plural use of the personal pronoun in conjunction with ἄνθρωπος indicates a specific place, the old person of believers. The old human was in a state where the whole of the human was controlled by Sin (Cranfield 1975:309; Kruse 2012:263).[351] This is especially effective conveying the status change because the theme throughout Romans 6:1–11 has been being separated from Sin, which is no longer relevant to believers' current situation.

The finality of the old self becomes magnified as the metaphor is used in conjunction with συσταυρόω [to crucify together with] (Bauer et al. 2000:978).[352] Again, Paul employs the preposition σύν connecting with the images of being buried with Christ in Romans 6:4 and the image of being united with the likeness of Christ's death in Romans 6:5. The source domain is 'crucifixion', which was particularly popular in the 1st-century Roman Empire (Green 1993:197). Descriptions of crucifixion in extant literature of antiquity are rare primarily because of aesthetic concerns that Greek and Roman authors considered it to be brutal and did not dwell long on the procedure itself (Green 1993:197–199). Furthermore, it was not inflicted upon Roman citizens but reserved for those of lower status, especially dangerous criminals and insurrectionists (Green 1993:198).[353] Paul himself was instrumental in interpreting the folly of the cross as God's wisdom, changing it from a shameful death into a positive image of victory.[354]

The final clause (ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) elucidates why this drastic metaphor of 'crucifixion of the old self' was necessary so that the body of sin (τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας) might be rendered ineffective (καταργηθῇ). The verb καταργέω forms part of the semantic domain communicating force and power and describes to render ineffective the power or force of something (Louw & Nida 1988:683).[355] This is centripetal to the metaphor 'the body of sin'

351. Sin is to be understood as an invading power in Paul. The phrase is semantically an isotope for παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος [old self] and accordingly Hellenistic concepts of the soul and body do not fit this genitive of quality as it describes the quality of the 'self' (Wolter 2014:378). Paul usually uses flesh, not body, when he uses it in conjunction with sin, but also uses body in Romans 6:12 (Kruse 2012:263).

352. Bauer et al. (2000:978) mentions that συσταυρόω functions in a transcendent sense in Romans 6:6 as a figurative extension identifying with Christ's crucifixion. What is intended with a 'transcendent sense'? This is the first explicit occurrence of συσταυρόω in the scope of Romans 5–8. Cranfield (1975:309) argues that it is a stark reminder, as the cross has not yet been rendered mellow by centuries of Christian piety.

353. According to Williams (1999:115), crucifixion was the most common form of execution for slaves. In Judea, crucifixion was especially used as an effective deterrent against open resistance to Roman occupation up until the Jewish war. In Roman practice, a crucified person was usually denied a burial. The corpse was left on a cross as carrion for the birds or to rot (Green 1993:198). There was no uniform manner to be crucified, as Josephus writes that the method of crucifixion was subject to the whims of military leaders (Jos., J.W. 5.11.1.449–451).

354. Greijdanus (1933:299) remarks that the crucifixion also had the association of being a 'cursed death' and, accordingly, interprets the image to indicate believers' old person is struck by God's curse for sins. Cf. Deuteronomy 21:23.

355. Bauer et al. (2000:525) interprets καταργέω in Romans 6:6 to mean 'to cause something to come to an end or to be no longer in existence'.

(τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας), illustrating the bodies of believers as the place where Sin exerts its influence.[356] The genitive is a possessive genitive rendering the meaning 'the sin-possessed body' (Moule 1953:38). This is a metaphor of submission as the body of the believer is controlled by Sin, but it is not the body that is perceived as the origin of Sin or that the body is inherently sinful (Morris 1988:251).[357]

The consecutive clause[358] (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) explains the result of the crucifixion of the old self with Christ, namely, believers are no longer slaves of Sin (Rm 6:6d).[359] Paul links to the main argument of being free from the dominion of Sin through being in Christ as highlighted in the 'we are no longer slaves for Sin' (Wolter 2014:378). The adverb μηκέτι expresses 'no longer', which signifies that the state of being a slave has come to an end. The dative τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [for sin] is a dative of advantage (*dativus commodi*) expressing the benefit of Sin having believers submitting themselves as its slaves.[360] Sin is personified as a slave master but has been rendered ineffective.

Metaphorical clustering (Semino 2008:24) is prevalent in Romans 6:6 with the dense imagery drawing on several metaphors, 'the obsolete old person', 'crucified with', 'the body of sin' and the image of 'slaves to Sin', all coherently underscoring believers' separation from Sin. Believers' participation in the death of Christ Jesus also encompasses the participation in the power of the resurrection of Christ Jesus, which triumphs over all powers.

The finality of the separation from Sin is elaborated on (γάρ) further in Romans 6:7a with the general rule Paul states ὁ γὰρ ἀποθανὼν δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας [for one who has died has been set free from Sin]. This is reminiscent of a well-known legal principle stating that death frees a person from his or her sin.[361] The aorist participle of ἀποθνῄσκω is utilised again forming

356. Croasmun (2014:127–156) argues that evolutionary theory offered by contemporary science provides a view of the body as an adaptive unit aiding in the interpretation of the body of sin and the body of Christ. Coincidently, Paul describes a choice between bodies simultaneously being a choice between worlds (Croasmun 2014:127–156).

357. I understand Paul implies the physical body and not the 'sinful self'. This concept becomes particularly clear in Romans 7. See Morris (1988:251) for the debate concerning the interpretation of the 'sinful body'.

358. In fact, the genitive of the articular infinitive τοῦ δουλεύειν has very little of the consecutive sense left, and the relationship with other elements in the sentence is loose (Blass et al. 1961:§400(8)).

359. The verb δουλεύω denotes 'to be a slave'.

360. This image will be discussed in more detail in the elucidation Paul presents in Romans 6:15–23.

361. As seen in Numbers 15:31 or similarly in Sirach 18:21–22 (Michel 1966:206; Schlier 1977:198; Wolter 2014:379; Zeller 1985:126). Morris (1988:253) notes that the imagery points to a master claiming a slave who proves to be dead while the legal verdict is that the slave is no longer answerable. However, it does not make sense that a master would want to claim a dead slave. Although Morris (1988:253) argues that a slave who dies is quit of his master, and those who die with Christ are acquitted from their old master, Sin. However, this is not what Paul has argued as believers have been separated from Sin, as seen already in Romans 6:2.

part of an intricate thread repetition throughout the argument. The perfect indicative passive of δικαιόω means 'to cause someone to be released from the legal claims of a personal institution, which are no longer considered pertinent or valid', accordingly it illustrates 'to make free from sin' (Bauer et al. 2000:249)[362] The source domain of δικαιόω is forensic drawing on Jewish law that a dead person is absolved or 'freed' with regard to sin no longer having a legal claim over the person (Fitzmyer 1993:436).[363] It is from Sin (ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) that a believer is freed by being baptised into the death of Christ. The phrase ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας illustrates that Paul does not have a specific sin in mind, but he views Sin as a personified power (Wolter 2014:380).[364] It is from the power of sin that a human must be set free. Paul's use of this maxim in conjunction with his deviation of using the first-person plural (Morris 1988:252) has incited debate whether Romans 6:7 is an interpolation. However, most interpreters regard it as genuinely Pauline (Fitzmyer 1993:436).

☐ Dead to Sin and alive to God (Rm 6:8–11)

The life and death contrast continues in the second supporting argument in Romans 6:8–11. Paul propounds that if believers have died with Christ (εἰ δὲ ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ [Rm 6:8a]), believers have to trust that they shall also live with Christ (πιστεύομεν ὅτι καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ, [Rm 6:8b–c]). Paul creates a link between what the believers trust and what they ought to know in Romans 6:9 with the use of εἰδότες ὅτι (Rm 6:9a). What believers should know culminates in the fact that Christ, being raised from the dead implies he can no longer die (Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει [Rm 6:9b–c]). The result is, death is no longer a master over him (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει [Rm 6:9d]). Paul elaborates further, referring to the implication of Christ's death and life for believers in two parallel sentences that the death which he died (ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν [Rm 6:10a]), he died once and for all for Sin (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ [Rm 6:10b]), but the life he lives (ὃ δὲ ζῇ [Rm 6:10c]), he lives for God (ζῇ τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:10d]). Paul engages the audience in Romans 6:11a emphasising that believers must consider themselves to be dead for Sin, but alive for God in Christ Jesus (οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς [εἶναι] νεκροὺς μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 6:11a–c]).

362. Paul retakes this legal image in Romans 7:2.

363. Cf. Kruse (2012:264) rightly remarks that Paul is keeping the law-court metaphor in his audience's mind even while expounding baptism and Christian solidarity in Christ.

364. Wolter (2014:380) aptly explains that Paul is not concerned with absolution, but with being set free from the lordship of Sin.

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 6:8–11

The second supportive argument also commences with a more vivid conditional clause.[365] The recurrent pattern of 'life and death' shines through the protasis with the death with Christ (Rm 6:8a) and in the apodosis with the life in him (Rm 6:8c). Based on the condition that believers have died with Christ (εἰ … ἀπεθάνομεν σὺν Χριστῷ [Rm 6:8a]) in baptism (Bauer et al. 2000:111),[366] the possibility is rather plausible that believers will live with Christ as seen in the apodosis (καὶ συζήσομεν αὐτῷ [Rm 6:8c]). Romans 6:8a marks the only occurrence of σὺν Χριστῷ in Romans.[367] This idea has surfaced in the pericope and intricately connects central ideas of the σύν 'with' argument, such as being buried with Christ (συνετάφημεν [Rm 6:4a]), to become united with Christ (σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν [Rm 6:5a]) and to be crucified with Christ (συνεσταυρώθη [Rm 6:6b]).

The future tense of συζάω builds on the image of σύμφυτος connoting the believer's life with the exalted Lord in Romans 6:8 (Bauer et al. 2000:954).[368] Accordingly, a believer's life is to be a life with Christ drawing on his resurrection as the σύν compounds guide the connection (Cranfield 1975:313; Morris 1988:253). The clause εἰδότες ὅτι [you ought to know] (Rm 6:9a) links with the clause πιστεύομεν ὅτι [we believe that] (Rm 6:8b), expanding the argument from believers having trust (πιστεύομεν ὅτι) to believers knowing (Michel 1966:208; Morris 1988:254). The verb πιστεύω denotes to consider something to be true and worthy to trust, thus believe (Bauer et al. 2000:816). Käsemann (1978:162) and (Wolter 2014:381) convincingly state that the clause illustrates the trust in being 'with Christ'. The audience is already aware that Christ was raised from the dead (Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν) and Paul appeals to this knowledge with the phrase εἰδότες ὅτι [knowing that].

Χριστός is repeated in Romans 6:9 and is central to the argument unfolding Romans 6:9–10 as Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν functions as the supporting arguments' foundation (Wolter 2014:381). God has proven to be the superior power, as the powerful contrasting image, as ἐγείρω indicates to enter into or

365. Longenecker (2016:615) argues that the particle δέ is used as a substitute for γάρ. He views it to be used not in an adversative sense, but in a correlative manner resuming the discourse.

366. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:14; Colossians 3:3. Jewett (2007:405) claims that the analogy to mystery religions may render the phrase understandable, but the first-person plural verbs in this sentence make it clear that he operates within a 'communal or corporate mysticism'. However, there are no grounds to suppose links with mystery religions.

367. The formula 'with God' is not found in the LXX or the rest of the New Testament, but frequently appears in Hellenistic Jewish writings (Philo Somn. 1.158; Abr. 18.3; Josephus Bell. 6.411), classical Greek writings (Homer Il. 9.49; Hesiod Theog. 444; Pindar Nem. 8.17), in magical tablets (MM 600 IG 3.3. Nr. 108) and mystical writings (Odes Sol. 5:14–15) (Jewett 2007:405).

368. Kruse (2012:265) and Dunn (1988:322) note that Paul is not referring to the new life of believers in the present, but expressing their belief that they will be raised with him on the last day.

be in a state of life as a result of being raised (Bauer et al. 2000:272) and this is done from νεκρός, which refers to no longer being physically alive, and accordingly a dead person (Bauer et al. 2000:667).

The focus shifts from the believers' experience with Christ to Christ. Christ is the triumphant power. The resurrection of Christ from death is further elucidated with Paul showing Christ's dominion over death. The first clause Romans 6:9c (οὐκέτι ἀποθνῄσκει) indicates that the risen Christ cannot die. The adverb οὐκέτι [no more] implies that death had power over Christ for a short period of time as he died. However, the situation changed when Christ was raised from death and accordingly Death has no more effect on Christ. In the second clause Romans 6:9d (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει), the personification of Death (θάνατος) resurfaces (Bauer et al. 2000:443).[369] A metaphor of dominion unfolds as the verb κυριεύω signifies to have lordship or control over something. However, as the repetition of the adverb οὐκέτι [no more] enforces, Death is no longer master over Christ. In Romans 5:12, 17 and 21, Death was portrayed to have infiltrated the human world and reigned in humans, but as believers have undergone a status change, believers have been unified with Christ and participate through baptism in his death and resurrection. Accordingly, believers share with Christ in God's triumph over Death.

The life and death contrast continues in Romans 6:10 with two parallel relative clauses that the death which he died, he died once and for all for Sin (ὅ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν ἐφάπαξ [Rm 6:10a–b]) and that the life which he lives, he lives for God (ὅ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:10 c–d].[370] Both relative clauses are dependent on Χριστός (Rm 6:9a) as γάρ signifies and carries the chain of reasoning.[371] The contrast fosters Paul's distinction between believers past situation and current status. The fact that the neutrum accusative relative pronoun ὅ is object of ἀπέθανεν or ζῇ with Χριστός as subject of the verb (6:9a) underscores a believer's position. Both verbs 'to life' (ζάω) and 'to die' (ἀποθνῄσκω) are repeated. In both instances of ἀποθνῄσκω, the verb is in the past tense indicating dying belonged to Christ's past status.

To Sin (τῇ ἁμαρτία) as the dative of advantage or disadvantage (Lee 2010:318; Wolter 2014:382) specifies the death which Christ has died once and for all. The adverb ἐφάπαξ [at one time] describes the death of Christ as a

369. Cf. Romans 5:14, 17. Cranfield (1975:313) suggests that the use of κυριεύει refers to the Jewish use of *salat* in connection with the angel of death.

370. Adjectives and pronouns are often used alone instead of a modified substantive, but seldom in a way that the substantive is still mentally supplied as in Luke 12:47, rather the adjective is usually in the neuter: ὃ γὰρ ἀπέθανεν, τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ἀπέθανεν … ὃ δὲ ζῇ, ζῇ τῷ θεῷ [the death which he died … the life which he lived/that he died, lived] (Blass et al. 1961:§154).

371. Cf. Morris (1988:253).

unique and final event.[372] In contrast to the death Christ died for once and all with reference to Sin, Paul sheds light on the life, which Christ presently lives for God. Both occurrences of ζάω are in the present tense reflecting the current status of Christ. The dative of advantage (τῷ θεῷ) (Lee 2010:318; Wolter 2014:382) signifies the life intended to be of benefit for God.[373]

How this change of status affects believers, becomes clear in Romans 6:11. The elliptical formulation οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς [so you also] engages the audience emphasising their position pertaining to Paul's argument. It also echoes Romans 6:4 reminding the audience of the possibility to walk in the newness of life and Romans 6:5 as believers have become united with Christ in his death and resurrection. Paul's deliberative reasoning is reflected as λογίζομαι takes the double accusative,[374] rendering the meaning 'consider' (Bauer et al. 2000:597).[375] It is an imperative (Michel 1966:208) placing strong emphasis on the fact that believers must consider themselves dead to Sin (Kruse 2012:266). The audience should consider themselves to be dead for Sin like Christ, but as he, alive for God. The *dativus incommodi et commodi* rather expresses the possessor in both τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ and τῷ θεῷ (Blass et al. 1961:§188(3)). The argumentative links (μὲν … δέ) connotes the command to the audience to consider them dead to Sin, but on the other hand, alive to God, specifically in Jesus Christ.[376] The present participle of ζάω presents the idea of life in the present and the continuance thereof (Greijdanus 1933:302). The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is significant as it is the first occurrence in Romans. Paul often applies ἐν to designate a close personal relation with regard to the referent of the ἐν term functioning as the controlling influence (Bauer et al. 2000:327). However, in Romans 6:11, the preposition ἐν has a locative application. It functions as a metaphor of dominion indicating the close relationship believers have with Christ. Since baptism, Christ is the controlling influence. Believers undergo a status change when they are baptised in Christ, allowing the risen Christ to be the controlling power in their lives.

372. The word is unknown in the LXX and in Philo, Josephus and the papyri before the 6th century (Spicq 1994c:142). The finality of Christ's death to sin is stressed and not necessarily the meaning of Christ's death to sin according to Cranfield (1975:314).

373. Bauer et al. (2000:426) list the verb ζάω, meaning in this instance 'to live for someone or something for the others benefit'.

374. An accusative of the object and a predicate accusative (Blass et al. 1961:§157(3)). The rest of the clause is to be taken with εἶναι. The infinitive with a subject accusative identical to the governing verb is seen in Romans 6:11: λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς νεκροὺς (Blass et al. 1961:§406[1]).

375. Blass et al. (1961:§157(3)) suggest 'to regard as'.

376. Contra Jewett (2007:408) who considers the argumentative links (μὲν … δὲ) to suggest that the verb λογίζεσθε ἑαυτοὺς [you are considering yourselves] is indicative rather than the imperative 'consider yourselves!'

A change of lords (Rm 6:12–14)

The argument in Romans 6:12–14 paints two rulers, namely, God and Sin, of which the latter is not truly envisioned as a ruler. The prohibitive indicates Sin is ruling in the body, although it should not rule. This is highlighted in the negations in Romans 6:12–14. At this point, the audience is well aware that Christ has defeated Sin through his death and resurrection, as seen in Romans 6:1–11. Paul has encouraged those baptised to consider themselves to be dead to Sin and alive to God in Christ. However, Paul has yet to clarify to the audience how they can allow Christ to be the controlling influence in their lives. Paul shifts to the imperative mood in Romans 6:12–14. The commands that follow answer the parallel lines of thought derived from the argument of Romans 6:5–11 as an elucidation of Romans 6:4.

The first command in Romans 6:12a (μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι) urges believers to not allow Sin to rule in their mortal bodies and draws on the first supportive argument in Romans 6:5–7, where Paul mentions the concept of Sin's ruling power. Although the power of Sin has been rendered as naught, believers may still find their bodies subjected to sin and death as a result of being obedient to the desires of the body (εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Rm 6:12b]) (Fitzmyer 1993:446; Hultgren 2011:259; Wolter 2014:387).

The second command in Romans 6:13a (μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) warns believers that they should not present the members of their bodies as instruments of unrighteousness, but present themselves to God, as those that are alive from death, and the members of their bodies for God are instruments of righteousness (ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:13b–d]). Romans 6:13a reflects the second supportive argument in Romans 6:8–11, especially Romans 6:10–11 pertaining to syntactical similarities crystallising in the utilisation of the datives.

The third command in Romans 6:14a (ἁμαρτία γὰρ ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει) explicates that Sin shall have no lordship over believers and functions as support to the commands in Romans 6:12–13, as the causal conjunction γάρ indicates. Also, Romans 6:14b (οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν) re-establishes the current situation of believers as they are not under the Law, but under Favour. The command in Romans 6:14 refutes the interlocutor's objections, while simultaneously affirming Paul's other commands in this periscope.

Excursus: Military imagery

There are two predominant views concerning the imagery created with ὅπλον and παρίστημι in Romans 6:13, that is, Paul uses a military metaphor or the

metaphor connotes to slavery.[377] The only undisputed notions of the imagery are that it is metaphorically employed and that there is no evidence of Paul drawing on a Hebrew or Aramaic pre-literary tradition (Du Toit 1979:272). The noun ὅπλον denotes 'weapon', but also 'instrument, implement or tool' (Bauer et al. 2000:1028; Kuhn 1968:292–294)[378] and παρίστημι means 'to be at the disposal' (Bauer et al. 2000:778). If Paul's use of ὅπλον terminology is checked with other Pauline letters, the deduction that the imagery derives from the source domain of the military would be quite sound.

In Greek literature, a tradition describing the virtuous man, especially the philosopher, in terms of war imagery existed (Malherbe 1989:91–119).[379] According to Abraham Malherbe, not only was Paul familiar with this tradition, but his readers would have also been accustomed to this technique (Malherbe 2008:297–298). Paul's utilisation of military metaphors is not strange.[380] There are ample examples, such as Romans 13:12: ἐνδυσώμεθα [δὲ] τὰ ὅπλα τοῦ φωτός [and put on the armour of light]; 2 Corinthians 6:7: τῶν ὅπλων τῆς δικαιοσύνης τῶν δεξιῶν καὶ ἀριστερῶν [by the weapons of righteousness on the right hand and on the left] and 2 Corinthians 10:4: τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς στρατείας ἡμῶν οὐ σαρκικὰ [the weapons we fight with are not the weapons of the world], describing a transcendental conflict between God and other powers in which man is both actively and passively involved (Kuhn 1968:292–294). Another example is 1 Thessalonians 5:8: καὶ περικεφαλαίαν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας [and for a helmet the hope of salvation].[381] Christina Eschner (2009:136–137) convincingly indicates that Paul uses the triad (love, hope and faith) with imagery of militaristic defensive gear to portray God's protection.

377. In the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, it is stated that ὅπλον in the New Testament and early Christian literature is always used in the plural (except Barn., 12,2) and used to denote a weapon (Kuhn 1968:294). Cf. Jn 18:3; Barn, 12,2; Mart. Pol. 7,1; Cl. Al. Strom., I 24, 159, 3. Fitzmyer (1993:446) also contends that it is a military image as the second part of the verse also hints at it and the expression can be found in Romans 13:12 and 2 Corinthians 6:7; 10:4. Cf. 2 Apoc. In Bar. 29:3, the military figure in Romans 6:13 draws on the social institution of slavery, which better suits the idea of law. Fitzmyer (1993:448) argues that many people sold themselves into slavery in the Mediterranean world especially in urban centres. Fitzmyer (1993:446) mentions that παρίστημι is sometimes employed in a cultic or sacrificial sense as seen in Polybius, History, 3.109.9, but in Romans 6:13, it is used in a military sense as members become weapons. The metaphor is also military; Paul says: 'don't let sin take command of any part of your body and use it as a weapon for evil purposes' (Mounce 1995:154).

378. The meaning of ὅπλον as 'weapon' is especially prevalent in the tragedians, Eur. Herc. Fur., 161 (Kuhn 1968:293).

379. Cf. Dio Chrysostom *Oration* 49.10, Laertius, *The Lives of Eminent Philosophers* 6.12, Epictetus, *Dis.* 3.22. 94–95; Seneca, *On Anger* 1.17.2; *Epistle* 74.19–21; Plutarch, *On Chance* 98DE.

380. He even describes his missionary service as *militia Christi* and considers it the task of all baptised people (Kuhn 1968:294).

381. This type of language is also used in Ephesians 6:14 and 6:17, but I do not consider Ephesians to have been written by Paul.

However, in Romans 6:13, Paul does not use military imagery. The problem lies in the lack of any Greek evidence supporting the use of ὅπλα employed with παρίστημι, ἑαυτοῦ and a dative stemming from a military background.

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 6:12–14

The inferential particle οὖν (Rm 6:12a) refers to Romans 6:11 as Paul deduces how believers should consider themselves to be dead to Sin and alive to God. Paul implores the audience not to allow the reign of Sin in their mortal body. The phrase μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω is the semantic complement of μηκέτι δουλεύειν in Romans 6:6 functioning as a reminder that Sin in truth has no real power.[382] Nonetheless, the metaphor of dominion provoked is Sin as a king reigning specifically in the mortal body of believers (βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι). The definite article is used with the noun ἡ ἁμαρτία signifying Sin as an entity and underscoring the personification. Again, the verb βασιλεύω draws on the source domain 'to be a king/reign'. Believers are implored not to allow the reign of Sin in their mortal bodies. The bodies of believers are the specific place of dominion suggested with ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι as the plural of the personal pronoun σύ also signifies.[383] The preposition ἐν is employed in a locative sense in Romans 6:12a making it explicit that the space contested is in the believer's bodies.[384]

Again, drawing on Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor as a heuristic tool, ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι [in your mortal body] may be understood as a container metaphor. However, the mortal body functions specifically as a contaminated container. The adjective θνητός [mortal] describes the result for the body when it adheres to Sin. Accordingly, ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι describes a state that will succumb to death.[385]

A believer could regress[386] into a state of being dominated by Sin as the result of being obedient to the desires of the self (εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [Rm 6:12b]).[387] The personal pronoun (αὐτοῦ) refers to the body. Accordingly, believers should not allow Sin to reign over their own bodies,

382. The connection with Romans 6:6 is important as it indicates that the power of sin is nullified (καταργέω) when our old self was crucified.

383. The space that Sin reigns over is more precisely defined than in Romans 5:21a ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ [in death].

384. Wolter (2014:388) mentions that it is not only locative but also instrumental as Sin could use the body to adhere to it and rule the body again even if the person was baptised.

385. Cranfield (1975:317) suggests that ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι should not just be interpreted as the physical body, but the whole man in his fallenness. Σῶμα can be used in the sense of a person, especially in the sense slaves as opposition to other goods (Liddell et al. 1996:688).

386. Believers are orientated in Jesus Christ; they have died to sin and it no longer has the authority to enforce its demands (Fitzmyer 1993:446; Mounce 1995:153).

387. The construction of εἰς and an infinitive (τὸ ὑπακούειν) indicates result (Blass et al. 1961:§337[1]).

which only renders a state of death. The verb ὑπακούω is in itself a metaphor of dominion, as obedience entails to act according to the will of someone else.[388] Obedience also recalls Romans 5:19. Moreover, ἐπιθυμία is also a metaphor of subjugation. The noun ἐπιθυμία is associated with sexual or other physical interests in someone (Bauer et al. 2000:372).[389] In 1 Corinthians 6:12–20, Paul makes a strong case that the body is not meant for sexual immorality, but intended for the Lord. The Augustan moral revolution helps in understanding Paul's teaching on self-mastery in Romans (Harrison 2009:330). Paul is not the first writer to use ἐπιθυμία as a metaphor of subjugation.[390] An example can be noted in Xenophon, Apol. 16: δουλεύειν ταῖς τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμίαις [to be slave to the desires of the body]. The threat of Sin persists as a result of believers' obedience to the desires of the self.

Another hortatory negation ensues dissuading believers in an apotreptic manner not to present the members of their body as instruments of unrighteousness to Sin (μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [Rm 6:13a]). In contrast, Paul protreptically urges believers to present themselves to God (ἀλλὰ παραστήσατε ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:13b]), as those that are alive from death (ὡσεὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας [Rm 6:13c]) and their members to God as instruments of righteousness (καὶ τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:13d]).

Two metaphors of dominion envelop within the antithetical parallelism by means of slavery imagery. The utilisation of the combination of ὅπλα with παρίστημι, ἑαυτοῦ and a dative does not appear in any Greek literature within the context of soldiers. The dative, the double accusative of the object in conjunction with the predicate points to a slavery image.[391] Accordingly, ὅπλον should be interpreted as 'instrument' because there is no ground to sustain the translation as 'weapon'. Ancient legal sources define a slave in terms of a

388. The verb ὑπακούω intrinsically reverberates subjection. In its strictest sense, the word entails to obey, follow instructions, follow and to be subject to (Bauer et al. 2000:1028).

389. Jewett (2007:409) explains that to obey the ἐπιθυμία [desires] is to continue to aspire engaging in relationships of domination that were endemic in the honour-shame culture of the ancient Mediterranean world. Although benefactor–beneficiary was an integral part of society, I think ἐπιθυμία is used by Paul in the same light as in Romans 7:7. It is linked to Paul's understanding of the flesh being associated with Sin. It is rather part of the meta-slavery metaphor functioning as an agent of Sin that incurs bondage.

390. See also Jos., *Ant.* 15, 91; Dionysius of Halicarnassus Ant. Rom. 2,3,5; Philo, Cher. 71; Galen, Hippoc. et Plat. 3.214.10–20.

391. Bauer et al. (2000:778) notes that Romans 6:13 renders the translation 'to whomever you yield yourselves as slaves (to obey)'. However, Wolter (2014:390) has an inclusive approach, namely, that it includes instruments and weapons. This seems like a safe solution. The source domain of ὅπλον draws on various connotations, accommodating both instruments and weapons. However, within the consistency of the slavery metaphor in Romans 6 and the lack of Greek evidence to support a military interpretation, understanding 'instrument' is in my view advisable. Cf. Romans 6:6, 16–20 and 22.

piece of property or tool.[392] The phrase τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν functions as a metonymy referring to the whole of the body. The antithetical parallelism accentuates the instruments of unrighteousness belonging to Sin (ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ) in contrast to the instruments of righteousness belonging to God (ὅπλα δικαιοσύνης τῷ θεω).[393] Both genitives indicate a goal, thus it is using body parts as instruments for either God or for Sin (Blass et al. 1976:§166.1).[394] The repetition of παρίστημι also highlights the prior conduct in contrast to the coming of conduct for God.[395]

Sin is personified as a slave owner implementing the body as an instrument for unrighteousness. However, Paul persuasively motivates believers to present themselves as instruments of righteousness to God. The comparison particle ὡσεί signals a metaphor.[396] Paul draws again on the metaphor ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῶντας [to live from death], which links to Romans 6:11, referring to believers' new life since baptism.[397]

Believers have a choice between presenting themselves as an instrument for God (τῷ θεῷ) or for Sin (τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ). Paul dissuades the audience from the latter option focusing them on the ability they have to live, as they should live like those who are alive from death.

In Romans 6:14a, Paul makes the status change evident. The imagery elaborates on the motivation of believers to present themselves to God in Romans 6:13, as the conjunction γάρ marks. Paul deviates from using βασιλεύω [to be a king/reign] and switches to κυριεύω [to be a lord]. Again, Paul illustrates that Sin is not lord over believers. However, the metaphor is implicit as Sin is portrayed as ruling over believers. Believers are the specific space where Sin rules as the personal pronoun (ὑμῶν) signals. Even though Paul omits the article with the abstract noun, Sin functions as a power (Blass et al. 1961:§258[2]). Sin (ἁμαρτία) is the subject of the future indicative κυριεύσει functioning as a substitute for the imperative (Blass et al. 1961:§195).[398]

392. Cf. Pol. 1.1253b30–32; in Varro, Rust. 1.17 slaves are articulate instruments (*instrumenti genus vocale* (Nasrallah 2010:56).

393. Paul uses δικαιοσύνη as the opposite of ἀδικία, rendering an ethical meaning instead of a soteriological meaning. It is used in a manner similar to the ethical tradition as one of the four cardinal virtues (Wolter 2014:391). The list of the four cardinal virtues has been compiled since Plato, Resp. 427c–434c.

394. Du Toit (1979:273) considers both δικαιοσύνη and ἀδικία as personifications.

395. The past conduct, as reflected in the phrase μηδὲ παριστάνετε, is also contrasted with μὴ βασιλευέτω in Romans 6:12 (Blass et al. 1976:§173).

396. The comparative particle ὡσεί should not be understood as 'as if you were' but as 'being, as you are' (Cranfield 1975:318).

397. A *parallismus membrorum* is interrupted with a *participium coniunctum* as ἑαυτοὺς is syntactically the object of the sentence. Romans 6:11 is picked up with ἑαυτοῦς.

398. However, Wolter (2014:392) argues that it is not a hidden imperative but describes a current state of being.

However, the negation is important, as Sin shall not rule over believers. The reason why Sin shall not rule over believers is stated in Romans 6:14b as γάρ marks. Believers are not under Law but under Favour. Both Law (νόμος) and Favour (χάρις) are personified in Romans 6:14.[399] In Romans 6:14b, the preposition ὑπό [under] in conjunction with the noun imparts subjection (Smyth 1956:388).[400] The human aspect attributed to both law and favour is constituted in subjection. Both ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ χάριν are metaphors of dominion. Believers are however orientated under Favour and not under Law.

Paul's use of νόμος is dubious. It is contrasted with χάρις, which is unequivocally positive. Believers are orientated under the favour of God. Χάρις indicates divine favour as a source of blessings for the believer wrought by God through Christ (Bauer et al. 2000:1080). Χάρις also serves as a metonymy with reference to the Christ event (Wolter 2014:394). Conversely, the structure renders the interpretation of νόμος, in contrast to χάρις, to be negative as the divine favour associated with χάρις is undoubtably positive. Being subjected under the Law is unfavourable. This must have been perplexing for the audience. In Romans 3:31, Paul has exhibited a positive attitude towards the law.[401] The personification of Law was common in the ancient world.[402] The audience would have been accustomed to the law as a positive point of orientation. Even if categories such as Jewish or Greek were applied, the law would have been perceived as an integral part of order facilitating a link to the gods. The Romans even saw it as their task to spread their law to rule nations less capable of ruling themselves. The nation to be ruled would have a different understanding of this idea, but the law in a Roman-ruled world meant subjection. The Roman jurist Gaius wrote in the *Institutes,* which is the most complete Roman law book existent close to the lifetime of Paul, that the most basic distinction in the law of persons is that all men are either free or slaves (Lyall 1970–1971:75).

However, the Law is associated with Sin in Romans 6:14. In Romans 7, Paul will argue that the Law is negative when manipulated by Sin.

399. Both expressions ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ χάριν are only found in Pauline literature. The first in Romans 6:14–15; 1 Corinthians 9:20 (four times); and the latter in Romans 6:14, 15; 1 Corinthians 9:20 (four times); Galatians 3:23; 4:4; 5:18, 21.

400. It could also indicate motion, but in this context, it is not applicable.

401. Cf. Romans 7:12; 14a; 8:4; 13:8–10; can be traced, especially the references in Romans 7:22, 25; 8:7 to God's law (Cranfield 1975:320).

402. The phrase ὑπὸ νόμον also appears twice in Ps-Plato, Def. 415c; Ps–Longinus, Sublim. 33.5. Comparisons can also be made with Aristotle, Resp. 1270a6–8; Demosthenes, Or. 24,131; Josephus, C. Ap. 2210.

Persuasion in Romans 6:1–14

Paul builds on the argument that Favour increases and abounds Sin. Romans 6:1–14 replies to Romans 5:21, but instead of the instrumental use of διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [through Jesus Christ our Lord] (Rm 5:21), this phrase is modified in Romans 6:11 to ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [in Jesus Christ our Lord], with a locative connotation that conveys the position of believers in Christ Jesus. Believers are under the lordship of Jesus Christ because they have been separated from Sin during baptism into Christ.

Believers in–out status becomes prevalent in Romans 6:1–14. Paul develops a metaphorical chain gyrating the life and death contrast as a denominator for the in-or-out orientation of believers. Life is associated with being part of Christ's group, and death is associated with the group under the lordship of Sin. Conceptual metaphors contribute in the characterisation of a particular group (Semino 2008:33).

Believers' position within hegemonic relationships unfolds in Romans 6:1 as believers remaining in Sin evoke a spatial understanding. Believers are reminded of the spatial image of Romans 5:2, where they have stood and continue to stand in favour. Believers have been separated from Sin. Accordingly, it is ludicrous for believers to remain in Sin, that is, a position where Sin dominates. The metaphorical imagery in Romans 6:2 expounds believers' relationship with Sin using the life and death contrast. Believers have died to Sin and, accordingly, cannot continue to remain in Sin. The 'baptism' metaphor in Romans 6:3 plays a pivotal role in the argument illustrating the status change believers have undergone from the old to the new life (Michel 1966:208).[403] The spatiality of the image 'being baptised into' is picked up in Romans 6:4 and expounded on with a metaphor of 'being buried with'. Believers are transported through the baptism into the death of Christ and should orientate themselves as being in Christ. Accordingly, Romans 6:5–7 and 8–11 elucidates the 'life and death' contrast found in Romans 6:4.

The imagery in Romans 6:5–7 illustrates that believers have become united with Christ, repeating the life and death contrast of the old person that has been crucified with Christ. The crucifixion image is significant, illustrating that not only are believers no longer slaves to Sin, but Sin as a power has been nullified by Christ. The body of believers serves as the space where the dominion takes place and becomes a space where Sin exerts no power when a believer is transferred to the dominion of Christ. The metaphors of 'buried with' and 'crucified with' is underscored with the repetition of the preposition

403. It would be erroneous to consider baptism as a mark of identity. Firstly, baptism is used as a point of reference for the metaphor in which Paul has another strategy, namely, to indicate believers are unified with Christ.

σύν [with]. The image in Romans 6:7 again repeats that death functions as a way to be set free from Sin with the verb ἀποθνῄσκω resonating with Romans 6:2.

Romans 6:8–11 introduces a powerful metaphor integral to Romans. In Romans 6:8, the 'with' pattern of repetition 'death and life' features again, but is employed to illustrate believers also live with Christ. The cardinal metaphor 'from death to life' in Romans 6:9 (Χριστὸς ἐγερθεὶς ἐκ νεκρῶν) establishes Christ as the ultimate power. Romans 6:9–10 explains that Christ is the ruler of both death and life. Life and death are not mere metaphors in Romans 6:9–10 but refer to the physical aspect of living as well as dying.

Believers have been separated from the dominion of Sin and via baptism are dominated by Christ. Death is associated with Sin, but Paul illustrates that the resurrected Christ even rules over death. Accordingly, believers are urged to participate in the dominion of a dominator who lives 'from death to life' and to consider themselves to be dead for Sin but alive for God. Paul successfully illustrates the superiority of God as the death and resurrection of Christ are utilised to persuasively indicate that God even rules over death.

Although the power of Sin is a defeated power, a believer could continue to enable Sin to have power when he or she submits to Sin. This becomes prevalent in Romans 6:12–14 as Paul urges believers not to present themselves to Sin, but to God. The act of presenting yourself to either God or Sin describes submission, and accordingly, Paul enlists slavery imagery with the purpose to illustrate the consequences of believers' in–out status.[404] Paul's use of spatial metaphors construed pertaining to the contrast of life and death to reinterpret believers' understanding of what it entails to be under the lordship of Christ.

The implication of being under Favour (Rm 6:15–23)

Romans 6:12–14 illustrates powers contending for control of believers' bodies. Paul incites believers that only Christ should be given the power to control their bodies. However, the believers' actions, namely, to which force they present their bodies, determine which power they subdue to. Romans 6:15–23 mirrors Romans 6:1–14. Paul continues to illustrate the implications of being a slave to Sin or a slave to God, with the latter as the obvious preference.

A slave to God (Rm 6:15–23)

The following segment of the argument starts in a manner similar to Romans 6:1 with the question, what then, shall we sin (τί οὖν; ἁμαρτήσωμεν [Rm 6:15a])?

404. Past Paul's time, the master had *ius vitae necisque*, the power of life and death over a slave (Lyall 1970–1971:76).

The reason for the re-evaluation of this question unveils in Romans 6:15b. The imagery of Romans 6:14 is repeated as Paul determines that he and the believers are not under the Law, but under Favour (ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν; [Rm 6:15b]). A misconception of what the metaphors of dominion already encountered in Romans 6:14 entail, may prod believers to assume that because they are not under the Law they may continue with wrongdoings, even though they are under Favour. Similar to Romans 6:1, the immediate rebuttal μὴ γένοιτο [by no means] (Rm 6:15c) negates the fallacy.

In Romans 5:16–23, Paul especially draws on antithetical parallelisms to convey the difference between slavery to Sin and slavery to God. In Romans 6:16, Paul engages the audience with a question unfolding in an antithetical parallelism, that is, do you not know that to whom you present yourselves as slaves to obey, you are slaves to whom you are to obey, either of Sin to death or of obedience to righteousness (οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν, δοῦλοί ἐστε ᾧ ὑπακούετε, ἤτοι ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον ἢ ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην;)? Giving thanks to God (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:17a]), Paul again draws on a contrast to illustrate believers past situation of slavery to Sin in contrast to their present situation of slavery to God. In Romans 6:17b, believers are described, for they were slaves of Sin (ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 6:17b]), but from the heart, they accepted the form of teaching that had been handed over to them (ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς [Rm 6:17c–d]).[405] Romans 6:18 solidifies that believers have been freed from Sin (ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 6:18a]) and have been made slaves for Righteousness (ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ [Rm 6:18b]).

Paul continues in a human way, owing to the weakness of believers' flesh (ἀνθρώπινον λέγω διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν [Rm 6:19a]). He explains the slavery metaphor in a comparison elucidating just as believers presented their members as slaves for uncleanliness and for lawlessness that lead to lawlessness, so too believers presented their members as slaves for righteousness, leading to sanctification (ὥσπερ γὰρ παρεστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ τῇ ἀνομίᾳ εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, οὕτως νῦν παραστήσατε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ εἰς ἁγιασμόν [Rm 6:19b&c]).

The antithetical parallelism structuring continues in Romans 6:20–23. The final section in the pericope Romans 6:15–23 elaborates on the effect slavery to either Sin or God on believers has. Romans 6:20 reminds believers of their past situation of slavery, with the temporal clause stating: when you were slaves of Sin, you were free for righteousness (ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ [Rm 6:20a]). Paul extrapolates the past situation of being a slave to Sin with a question in Romans 6:21a (τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε) prodding the audience what fruit were they having at that time? The

405. For this reading, cf. Wolter (2014:397–398).

ensuing relative clause (ἐφ᾽ οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε [Rm 6:21b]) inherently answers the question as the fruit is referred to as those that the audience, in their present status as slaves to God, are ashamed of. The end result of being a slave to Sin is elaborated on in Romans 6:21c (τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος) underscoring that the end of those things is death. In stark contrast, Paul focuses in Romans 6:21 the argument to believers' current situation of being slaves to God. This is perceived as a positive situation. However, now believers have been set free from Sin (νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 6:22a]) and have become slaves for God (δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ [Rm 6:22b]). The present situation is marked with believers who have fruit leading to sanctification (ἔχετε τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν [Rm 6:22c]) and the end result is eternal life (τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον [Rm 6:22d]). This is further explicated in Romans 6:23 with a final contrast between the wages of Sin is death (τὰ γὰρ ὀψώνια τῆς ἁμαρτίας θάνατος [Rm 6:23a]) and the gift of God is eternal life in Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [Rm 6:23b]).

Detail analysis of Romans 6:15–23

At first glance, Romans 6:15 seems similar to Romans 6:1 as both commence with the interjection τί οὖν [what then?] (Haacker 1999:131; Hultgren 2011:261; Käsemann 1978:170; Michel 1966:210; Schlier 1977:205; Wilckens 1993:34; Zahn 1925:315).[406] However, the ensuing arguments deal divergently with the same quandary. Romans 6:1 draws on a container metaphor formulated in the present tense, suggesting believers remain in a state of continuing for Sin, expecting Favour to incur. Conversely, the deliberative aorist subjunctive of ἁμαρτάνω [shall we sin][407] designates a once-off instance in Romans 6:15a (Longenecker 2016:621; Morris 1988:260).[408] The reason for the believers to commit a wrong becomes clear in Romans 6:15b, with another question ὅτι οὐκ ἐσμὲν ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν; [because we are not under the Law but under Favour] repeating the contrasting imagery of Romans 6:14.

406. Τί is used in an elliptical manner (Blass et al. 1961:§299(3)). Cf. Josephus *War* 2.16.4 (Blass et al. 1961:§364); Xenophon Memorabilia 4.2.17. Dunn (1988:340) remarks that τί οὖν does not designate a break in the argument, but is employed to keep the argument flowing lending 'rhetorical flourish'.

407. The verb ἁμαρτάνω, as already seen in Romans 5:14, 16, denotes 'to commit a wrong usually against a divinity, custom or law' (Bauer et al. 2000:49). Käsemann (1978:170) remarks that sin should not be taken as a parallel force to describe under the law as the curse of the law.

408. The deliberative subjunctive question does not refer to a future fact, but to what is under present circumstances advantageous or proper to say (Smyth 1956:405). Koine often uses a first aorist modelled after a sigma-future in addition to, or as a substitute for, an Attic second aorist, thus – σομεν (Blass et al. 1961:§75). Jewett (2007:415) interprets the subjunctive as an exhortatory in light of the pattern set in Romans 6:1, 13, with ἁμαρτήσωμεν as 'let us not sin'. I do not agree with understanding ἁμαρτήσωμεν as another command, as the possibility of choice I find to be intrinsic in understanding the text. The possible pitfall in this case would be to think that sinful acts no longer concern believers.

The contrast between ὑπὸ νόμον and ὑπὸ χάριν is identical to the discussion of Romans 6:14. Both νόμος [Law] and χάρις [Favour] function as metaphors of dominion. In both instances, νόμος and χάρις are personified and function as a power, even if the definite article is not employed with the noun in either phrase. The preposition ὑπό draws on the source domain of 'dominance', illustrating believers to be under the power of these forces. The difference between Romans 6:14 and Romans 6:15 is that Paul employs the first-person plural of εἰμί in Romans 6:15b, including himself within the group of believers. Believers cannot have two lords and accordingly can only be obedient to one lord (Longenecker 2016:622; Wilckens 1993:34; Zeller 1985:127).[409]

The repetition emphasises that believers are however under Favour (ὑπὸ χάριν), signifying their position within the relationship with God. Without the context of legal constraint (ὑπὸ νόμον), believers might interpret their status as under Favour as a free pass to position themselves in a state paramounting Sin (Black 1973:91; Byrne 1996:201; Fitzmyer 1993:448; Greijdanus 1933:306; Kruse 2012:280; Moo 1996:298; Wilckens 1993:34). The assumption that Sin no longer affects believers may prove as a stumbling block.[410] Believers cannot persist with sin because of their position under Favour as signalled by the rebuttal μὴ γένοιτο [by no means!], similar to Romans 6:1 (Kruse 2012:280; Lohse 2003:199).[411]

Paul sharpens his argument with slavery imagery to clarify the status change constituent for believers who are ὑπὸ χάριν [under Favour] in Romans 6:16–23. The audience is addressed directly in the second person (Kruse 2012:280). Paul not only assumes the audience is already acquainted with the imagery of slavery but also highlights the status change believers have undergone as the rhetorical question οὐκ οἴδατε [but do not you know] (Rm 6:16a) also echoes the baptism metaphor (Rm 6:3) (Fitzmyer 1993:448; Käsemann 1978:171; Kruse 2012:280; Moo 1996:398; Morris 1988:261).[412]

Romans 6:16b (ᾧ παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους εἰς ὑπακοήν) states the axiomatic position as that to whom believers present themselves as slaves

409. An autonomic state is an illusion (Haacker 1999:32).

410. A believer is no longer bound by sin, but may choose to be in the realm of sin by adhering to sin (Cranfield 1975:321; Michel 1966:210).

411. Schlier (1977:206) adds that μὴ γένοιτο refers back to the whole of Romans 6:2–14.

412. The question links back to ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι (Rm 6:3) refreshing the baptism formula in the audience's mind. In Romans 6:4, the baptism metaphor has already indicated that believers undergo a status change with the result that they belong to a new lord, that is Jesus Christ, and as they function within a world where there is continuous dominion and forces that have an influence, this status change is positive and means freedom as it manages these other forces (Dunn 1988:341; Käsemann 1978:171; Wolter 2014:394; Zahn 1925:317). Jewett (2007:416) suggests that Paul alludes to Matthew 6:24 'no person can have two masters' or to John 8:34 'sinners becoming slaves'.

they should obey (Black 1973:91).[413] Obedience functions as a key notion in the motif of the slavery metaphor. This is already evident in the metaphor of dominion ὑπὸ νόμον, which inherently requires obedience.[414]

The disposition of control and power in the Roman Empire may be seen as a vertical system of class and rank with fundamental contrasts between rulers and ruled, slaves and freedmen, and citizen and non-citizen (Aageson 1996:86; Nasrallah 2010:57). In the case of slave/master relations, power or control entailed a transfer of ownership to another agent of control (Aageson 1996:87). The source domain of slavery is especially effective within a hegemonic framework as the image of slavery clearly involves status (someone being owned by another) and control (being subjugated to someone else) (Aageson 1996:75–89; Kruse 2012:280). This is mapped onto the target domain, which describes the relationship between believers and God (Longenecker 2016:626).

The phrase παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους [present yourselves as slaves] in Romans 6:16b designates believers' option to voluntarily enter slavery (Wilckens 1993:34; Zahn 1925:317). The reoccurrence of the verb παρίστημι in Romans 6:16 recalls the slavery imagery already used in Romans 6:13. The phrase παριστάνετε ἑαυτοὺς δούλους reiterates Romans 6:13, 19 (Zahn 1925:317). However, the slavery imagery is even more explicit in Romans 6:16 compared with Romans 6:13, as δοῦλος [slave] features, and it is linked with ὑπακοή underscoring that obedience belongs to servanthood (Haacker 1999:132; Michel 1966:211; Wilckens 1993:34).

Obedience was an essential ingredient of slavery, namely, the purpose of a slave was to do as he or she was told (Bauer et al. 2000:1028; Byrne 1996:201; Dunn 1988:342; Lohse 2003:199; Morris 1988:261; Wilckens 1993:34).[415] A change of master entailed that a slave was no longer required to obey the previous master, but obedience was transferred to the new master (Fitzmyer 1993:448; Morris 1988:262). The phrase ᾧ ὑπακούετε (Rm 6:16c) picks ᾧ παριστάνετε (Rm 6:16b) up (Zahn 1925:317), enforcing the source domain of slavery. Romans 6:16b–c parallelly emphasise ὑπακοή [obedience].[416] Both verbs παρίστημι and ὑπακούω function as metaphors of dominion as they point towards the masters (Malan 1981:118–138; Schlier 1977:206). The masters become clear in the antithetical parallel Romans 6:16d–e with the possessive genitives of ἁμαρτία and ὑπακοή identifying the masters to whom believers could be slaves to (Greijdanus 1933:307; Schlier 1977:206; Zahn 1925:318).

413. The relative pronoun (ᾧ) denotes 'to the one to whom' (Bauer et al. 2000:725).

414. To be 'under law' would entail to follow the Torah (Käsemann 1978:170).

415. Dunn (1988:342) remarks that obedience also hints at the problem with Sin, namely, a human's disobedience and that the origin of sin is a human error.

416. The idea of obedience is particularly emphasised in Romans 6:16–17 (Cranfield 1975:325; Schlier 1977:206). The theme of obedience is not new to Paul's argument, as it has already surfaced in Romans 5:12–21.

Accordingly, ἁμαρτία [sin] and ὑπακοή [obedience] are personified as slave masters to whom believers could be bound.

Paul's alternative use of the slavery metaphor is evident as Paul's understanding of ἁμαρτία [sin] and ὑπακοή [obedience] culminates in the outcomes these masters produce for their subordinates (Schlier 1977:206; Wolter 2014:394). From the viewpoint of ὑπακοὴν πίστεως (Rm 1:5), ὑπακοή should be understood as a metonymic description for belief (πίστις) (Schlier 1977:206; Wolter 2014:394).

Coherent with the voluntary aspect of believers offering themselves as slaves, the ἤτοι[417] [either or] clause in Romans 6:16d–e elucidates to which of these states believers can choose (Michel 1966:211).[418] Paul employs a strange contrast explaining these choices. The phrase ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον is contrasted with ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην. It would have been logical to contrast εἰς θάνατον with εἰς ζωήν, or as in Romans 5:21, δικαιοσύνη εἰς ζωήν. Here, θάνατος renders eternal death (Bauer et al. 2000:443). Within this contrast of θάνατος with δικαιοσύνη, δικαιοσύνη may also be understood as righteousness leading to life as believers are essentially saved from death.[419] In Romans 6:18, δικαιοσύνη is explicitly depicted as a slave owner, freeing believers from any other dominion apart from that of the crucified and risen Christ. Δικαιοσύνη functions as an accompanying power that enables the rule of Favour (Du Toit 1979:290). The goal (εἰς) of the dominions of each of these masters, Sin (ἁμαρτία) and obedience (ὑπακοή), is expressed as specific states of being, inducing either εἰς θάνατον pertaining to the Sin or εἰς δικαιοσύνην pertaining to obedience (Smyth 1956:376). Believers can choose to be obedient to Sin that leads to death (ἁμαρτίας εἰς θάνατον [Rm 6:16d]) or to be obedient to obedience, which leads to justification (ὑπακοῆς εἰς δικαιοσύνην [Rm 6:16e]).[420] It is the continued belief in the right slave owner that will result in acquittal.

A thanksgiving follows in Romans 6:17a (χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ) for those who already made the right decision.[421] The reason for the thanksgiving derives

417. This is the only time that ἤτοι appears in the New Testament.

418. A person could sell themselves into slavery, Dio Chrys. 15:23; Petronius, Satr. 57:4; 1 Clement 55:2 (Haacker 1999:132). In 1 Corinthians 7:23, Paul uses slavery as a person's own choice.

419. Käsemann (1978:171) succinctly states: '*Freiheit ist die weltbezogene Realität der Rechtfertigung*'. Bauer et al. (2000:248) lists δικαιοσύνη to denote the quality or characteristic of upright behaviour especially in Romans 6:16 with regard to sin, which functions as the dominating power at hand before God comes into play.

420. The preposition εἰς is used to denote the result of an action or condition indicated thus 'into/to/so that' (Bauer et al. 2000:290). Michel (1966:211) draws a link between the teaching of righteousness and the teaching of baptism. If a believer is not obedient, then the baptism is not complete (Michel 1966:211).

421. In Romans 6:14 and 15, χάρις has been personified, but this is not the case in Romans 6:17. Here, χάρις displays a form of prayer of thanksgiving to God (Cranfield 1975:323; Greijdanus 1933:307; Haacker 1999:132; Käsemann 1978:172; Lohse 2003:200; Michel 1966:212; Schlier 1977:207; Zahn 1925:319; Zeller 1985:127). Paul also uses this thanksgiving in Romans 7:25; 1 Corinthians 15:57; 2 Corinthians 2:14, 8:16 and 9:15. Cf. Philo, Alleg. 2.60.

from the antithesis of Romans 6:17 and Romans 6:18 (Cranfield 1975:325; Käsemann 1978:172).[422] Paul does not give thanks to God because they were slaves to sin but because they have obeyed Christ as ὅτι marks. The hegemonic framework becomes pertinent. The past as well as the present situation of believers is reflected in the antithesis, as the past slavery to Sin has ended, and under the dominion of God, freedom is possible (Byrne 1996:201; Käsemann 1978:172; Kruse 2012:281). The imperfect of εἰμί in the causal clause Romans 6:17b (ὅτι ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας) is significant as it centres on the previous state of being of believers having been slaves to Sin.[423] The possessive genitive (τῆς ἁμαρτίας) specifies Sin as the slave master who used to have control over believers, creating a metaphor of dominion.

The flow of the antithetical parallelism between Romans 6:17a and 18 is disturbed by ἐκ καρδίας and τύπον διδαχῆς (Cranfield 1975:323; Käsemann 1978:172; Schlier 1977:208).[424] Hence, Romans 6:17b is often ascribed as an interpolation derived from pre-Christian tradition,[425] but the argument is not convincing (Cranfield 1975:323–324; Fitzmyer 1993:449; Gagnon 1993:667).[426] However, Paul's use of the slavery imagery again takes a unique turn in the parataxis clause in Romans 6:17c (ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας). Obedience functions as a metaphor of dominion and is paired with ἐκ καρδίας [from the heart].[427] Slaves were required to be obedient but may have resented it from an internal vantage point (Byrne 1996:202; Greijdanus 1933:307; Moo 1996:400).[428] The active tone of ὑπακούω designates believers' choice to be

(footnote 421 continues...)
A similar form is found in Epictetus Diss. 4.4.7, however, in the plural form 'thanks be to the gods' and χάρις should be translated as 'gratitude' (Bauer et al. 2000:1080).

422. Michel (1966:212) remarks that thanks is relevant to the second part of the sentence, namely, that believers have been handed over to the form of teaching.

423. In the phrase ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας, the imperfect is used to portray the manner of the action (Blass et al. 1961:§327; Greijdanus 1933:307).

424. It is on account of these concepts that Bultmann (1947:193–198) deems this verse as a gloss.

425. It is not clear whether Paul is using a credo or catechism that was used in baptism, but τύπον διδαχῆς refers for Paul to a compact Christ message (Haacker 1999:133; Käsemann 1978:172–173; Lohse 2003:200; Michel 1966:212; Spicq 1994t:386; Wolter 2014:398). Hultgren (2011:262) interprets it as a 'standard of teaching' handed over by catechism and by freely being obedient believers are transferred from their slavery to sin to freedom of obedient assent. Jewett (2007:419) argues that it is an interpolation and was not originally drafted by Paul.

426. Paul also uses καρδία in Romans 10:9; 10. The simple relative is assimilated to the case of its antecedent even though it should take another case. Accordingly, the antecedent is incorporated in the relative clause, in which the case of the article is congruent with the noun itself and attracted to the case of the relative (Blass et al. 1961:§294). Käsemann (1978:172) postulates that the attraction is perhaps the clue that τύπον διδαχῆς is a teaching handed down from rabbis to students.

427. This is the only Pauline case for the phrase ἐκ καρδίας and features also in 1 Peter 1:22 (Schlier 1977:209).

428. According to Haacker (1999:134), the aspect of willingness latches onto Romans 6:16, where the choice of slavery was made willingly.

obedient from the heart and is closely followed with the passive of παραδίδωμι (Morris 1988:262; Schlier 1977:208).[429] It functions as a container metaphor with the heart referring to what the body should be obedient to. Accordingly, obedience is not only a moral action but also an orientation enabling a believers' position towards God (Käsemann 1978:173).

The preposition εἰς should not be interpreted with παρεδόθητε.[430] Paul could have used the expression in the sense of 'transmitted to us', coherent with the slavery imagery recalling the interpretation 'surrendered up to it' (Black 1973:91; Longenecker 2016:625; Zahn 1925:321). Conversely, more plausible is interpreting εἰς with ὑπακούω, identifying τύπον διδαχῆς as the object (Wolter 2014:397).[431] The phrase ὃν παρεδόθητε is a relative clause subordinate to τύπον διδαχῆς (Wolter 2014:397).

The phrase τύπον διδαχῆς is problematic and requires a closer look. The most helpful suggestion concerning τύπον διδαχῆς derives from Robert Gagnon's (1993:667–687) proposal that Paul draws on a Hellenistic Jewish *topos* with the use of τύπον διδαχῆς. Usually, it is interpreted as a type of catechism.[432] Gagnon (1993:682) convincingly argues on account of the frequency of τύπος in Philo,[433] a contemporary of Paul, along with antecedents in Greek philosophical thought, that it should be translated as 'imprint'.[434] The source domain of τύπος is 'a mark made as the result of a blow or pressure'

429. This is the only occurrence of the phrase ἐκ καρδίας in the New Testament (Kruse 2012:281). Καρδία is a figurative extension not occurring in the New Testament in the literal sense but as a location deep within a larger area 'depths are inside' and is in the semantic domain of space according to Louw and Nida (1988:715).

430. The expression παραδίδωμι with εἰς refers to slavery or war but also as a military term meaning to 'surrender' (Bauer et al. 2000:762). It also denotes to hand someone over, for example, in Matthew 10:17; Mark 13:9; Luke 21:12; Acts 8:3; Jos. Bell 1.655 'hand someone over to guard them' cf. Xenophon, An. 4, 6, 1. ἑαυτοὺς εἰς δεσμά [give oneself up to imprisonment] in 1 Colossians 55:2a; Matthew 26:2 (Bauer et al. 2000:762). This expression is also more frequent than transmission. According to Spicq (1994o:17) and Popkes (2011:42–48), παραδίδωμι is used in Romans 6:17 as a transmission of information. Philo uses παραδίδωμι to denote 'to pass on/transmission' of old fables as can also be seen in Plato, Phlb 16c describing, 'the ancients transmitted this tradition to us' (Spicq 1994o:16). Josephus also speaks of passing on a password *Ant.* 19.31, 2.11 and of history passing on memories for those who want to learn, but especially the transmission of facts recorded in sacred books (*Ant*. 2.347; 3.89).

431. The expression ὑπακούω εἰς is found in Josephus, *Ant.* 14.60; Diodorus Siculus 20.40.6; Ps-Lukian, Asin. 48; Brutus, Ep. 31.3–4.

432. Zeller (1985:127), Schlier (1977:209) and Harrisville (1980:96) interpret τύπος as a baptism symbol or a catechism tradition. Cf. 1 Corinthians 11:23; 15:1. Moo (1996:402) and Longenecker (2016:624) interpret τύπον διδαχῆς as Paul's specific delineate between Christian teaching and Jewish teaching. Especially in light of believers not being under the law, they are bound by a specific code of teaching.

433. For Philo, it denotes basic character and the orientation of individuals. In conjuncture with Paul's argument of a person walking in a new life with Christ with his notion that the inner person is changed in Christ and the fact that he does not deem following the law as sufficient in forming the human heart (1993:685).

434. However, the word may also indicate 'something that suggests a model or pattern' (Bauer et al. 2000: 1019–1020).

(Bauer et al. 2000:1019–1020). According to Gagnon,[435] this interpretation is closer to the original meaning of τύπος as a 'blow'. Nonetheless, in light of Paul's use of τύπος in Romans 5:14; 1 Corinthians 10:6; Philippians 3:17 and 1 Thessalonians 1:7 as a pre-existing image (Lohse 2003:200), I translate τύπον διδαχῆς as 'form of teaching'. Believers were handed over to the form of teaching.

Believers who have chosen to be obedient to God can be thankful for the change of status evinced by aligning with God. Believers were slaves of Sin, but by being obedient from their whole being they were handed over to the form of teaching. It can be inferred that the form of teaching is associated with God, which accordingly implies believers are handed over to God's form of teaching.

For Paul, a person is always under the dominion of something/someone (Käsemann 1978:172; Schlier 1977:208; Zeller 1985:127). If it is not being a slave to Sin, then it is being a slave to righteousness. Paul makes the transferral of lordship explicit in Romans 6:18a (ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) and Romans 6:18b (ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ).[436] The clause is dependent on Romans 6:17 as this transferral of lordship is possible on account of believers being obedient to God. Both verbs (ἐλευθερόω and δουλόω) connote metaphors of dominion. In Romans 6:18a, God has freed believers from the dominion of Sin (ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας). The source domain of ἐλευθερόω ἀπό denotes 'to cause someone to be freed from domination' (Bauer et al. 2000:317). Accordingly, Sin no longer has dominion (Morris 1988:263).

However, this image in Romans 6:18a is subjected to the image in Romans 6:18b. Freedom does not mean to be devoid of domination. In Romans 6:18b, God has made believers slaves of δικαιοσύνῃ. Δικαιοσύνη is personified as it is portrayed as a slave owner (Southall 2008:7).[437] Δικαιοσύνη is associated with the crucified and risen Christ that calls believers to live in obedience to God (Du Toit 1979:291). The dative of respect (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) is used to indicate a relationship to righteousness. Again, this is a positive image harking back to Romans 6:16 where obedience leads to being in a state of righteousness, resulting in life. Moreover, Romans 6:18a (ἐλευθερωθέντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) recalls ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Rm 6:2), παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη

435. Gagnon (1993:687) also considers 'imprint' consistent with the imagery employed throughout Romans 6:1–7:6.

436. Romans 6:17c ὑπηκούσατε δέ pushes against ἐλευθερωθέντες δέ in Romans 6:18a (Schlier 1977:210). This is the first appearance of ἐλευθερόω in the argument. Cf. Romans 6:22; 7:3; 8:2, 21 (Zeller 1985:127).

437. Southall (2008:89) argues that the master–slave system permeates all aspects of the believer's communal life as the present lordship is the principal focus of their lives. Southall points out that Dale Martin correctly indicates that the slavery metaphor is not merely used by Paul to persuade hearers to behave morally, but it takes on a soteriological dimension. For Martin (1990:63), a person may raise his or her status by becoming the slave of a good and powerful master.

(Rm 6:6), δεδικαίωται ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rm 6:7) and νεκροὺς … τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ (Rm 6:11) (Schlier 1977:207). In contrast, Romans 6:18b (ἐδουλώθητε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) echoes καινότητι ζωῆς (Rm 6:4) and ζῶντας δὲ τῷ θεῷ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Rm 6:11) (Schlier 1977:207). Romans 6:18 makes the status change of believers explicit referring to the preceding verses as well as the whole pericope; Paul drives the argument that through baptism and to be buried with Christ, believers have been transferred from the dominion of Sin to the dominion of Δικαιοσύνη (Fitzmyer 1993:450; Schlier 1977:208; Zeller 1985:127).

In Romans 6:19a, Paul adds a parenthetical expression elaborating on the reason for his use of the slavery imagery (Kruse 2012:283; Moo 1996:403). The expression ἀνθρώπινον λέγω is a general saying designating 'to speak in human terms as people do in everyday life' (Bauer et al. 2000:80).[438] This is not an apology but a renewed attempt of Paul to elucidate his argument, which is righteousness as a new master requires absolute obedience (Moo 1996:404; Schlier 1977:210; Zeller 1985:128).[439] Romans 6:19a reverberates Romans 6:16. Slavery to God is utilised in a positive manner[440] as an image of freedom from Sin and death (Harrison 2003:340).[441] In conjunction with the phrase 'because weakness of the weakness of your flesh', Paul drives the image through of the natural weakness of man (Käsemann 1978:174; Link 1978:994–995; Zeller 1985:128).[442] It is a reminder that Paul is engaging the audience and wanting to persuade them of his argument. It is not sure whether Romans 6:19a refers to Romans 6:18 or Romans 6:19b–20, but what is clear is that Paul is making an effort to sharpen his imagery.[443] Paul utilises for the first time in the argument

438. Cf. Plut., Mor. 13 c; For example, a contemporary of Paul, Philo (Som 2:288) also uses the expression: καὶ τί δεῖ ἀνθρώπινα λέγεσθαι [and why need I speak of matters of human history?]. This expression is not found in the LXX or other New Testament writings (Fitzmyer 1993:450). Schlier (1977:210) views the expression as an analogy to indicate human relationships.

439. Greijdanus (1933:309) cogently remarks that the severity of Paul's words links to his message of the liberation of the weak (cf. Rm 5:6; 8:26). Longenecker (2016:260) notes that 'the language fits like a glove'. Cf. Galatians 5:13; 1 Corinthians 9:8. Contra Jewett (2007:419) and Fitzmyer (1993:450) who note that Paul apologises for speaking about 'holy realities' in terms of enslavement and liberation because of the social and political background thereof. Hultgren (2011:262) argues that this expression refers to Paul's use of the slavery metaphor as an explanation for drawing from such a degrading source domain. There is no indication in Paul's argument that he views slavery in such terms. On the contrary, the slave metaphor is deliberately used, and Paul rather uses the image, negative or positive, to convey how instrumental it is to be a slave to the right master (cf. Cranfield 1975:325; Fitzmyer 1993:450; Kruse 2012:283; Morris 1988:264).

440. Especially in Romans 8:14–17, the image of slavery is substituted with the image of being co-heirs (Harrison 2003:241).

441. Philo never uses slavery to God in his discussion of freedom, but opts for the term 'friend of God', Philo, Quod Omn. Prob. 42. For Philo, no person is willingly a slave, but Paul's view is different.

442. Michel (1966:213) remarks that Paul might have a specific situation in the Roman church in mind.

443. Wolter (2014:399) remarks that Paul is aware that his added metaphorical language has not yet hit the mark in communicating the relationship between God and humankind.

σάρξ [flesh] in the pejorative sense.[444] The phrase διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν is a metaphor of dominion.[445] The flesh is instrumentally used by Sin as domain for rule causing weakness. The flesh is described as a transcendent power that fosters human rebellion.[446] However, σάρξ [flesh] is also metonymic, as it specifically refers to the bodies of believers signified by the plural use of the personal pronoun and describes believers' flesh as weak (Bauer et al. 2000:142).[447] The weakness of the flesh refers to a bounded state of being (Käsemann 1978:174; Lohse 2003:201), in which a believer is being dominated.

An elaboration follows concerning the weakness of the flesh as the coordinating particle γάρ signals in Romans 6:19b.[448] The imagery in Romans 6:19b–d repeats Romans 6:13 (Zahn 1925:324).[449] The comparative conjunctions ὥσπερ and οὕτως draw attention to the past and present status of believers. Just as believers presented their members as slaves for uncleanness and lawlessness, resulting in lawlessness, so too believers now have to present their members as slaves for righteousness in holiness.

The verb παρίστημι at first occurrence is in the indicative and describes the state of 'then' in contrast to the second occurrence in the imperative and urging the current state of being (Blass et al. 1961:§335). The emphatic use of νῦν emphasises the current status of believers, and accordingly, they should be enslaved to Righteousness. Again, τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν δοῦλα is used indicating being slaves for ἀκαθαρσία [uncleanness], ἀνομία [lawlessness] or δικαιοσύνη [righteousness]. 'Ακαθαρσία [uncleanness], ἀνομία [lawlessness] and δικαιοσύνη [righteousness] are personified as they are served like slave owners. 'Ακαθαρσία and ἀνομία are associated with heathenism (Bauer et al. 2000:34; Michel 1966:214).[450] Both situations of slavery have a specific goal and destination as the preposition εἰς signifies (Michel 1966:214). The difference between being slaves of uncleanness and lawlessness and being slaves of righteousness is that the former condition of slavery leads to εἰς τὴν ἀνομίαν, in contrast to the

444. This is an important category to Pauline thinking, as it will become clear in Romans 7 that for Paul σάρξ is synonymous with being in Sin (Harrisville 1980:97). Contra Dunn (1988:345).

445. This is unusual language. In Josephus *Ant.* 3:5, women and children are depicted as too weak to take words of teaching in. Seneca Ep. Mor 59,6 refers to the weakness (*imbecillitas*) of the reader (Haacker 1999:134–135). The flesh (σάρξ) functions as an adnominal genitive describing ἀσθένεια [weakness].

446. Apart from Romans 9:3, 5, 8; 11:14, Paul employs σάρξ as an environment hostile to God (Harrisville 1980:97).

447. In Romans 6:19, ἀσθένεια denotes a lack of confidence or a feeling of inadequacy. Käsemann (1978:174) remarks that it means the contestation of the flesh.

448. Schlier (1977:211) notes that the particle γάρ has a general meaning '*man kann ja so sagen*'.

449. Horst (1967:561) contends that sin in Romans 6:19 is like a military leader, but the metaphor soon changes to that of a slave owner.

450. Hauck (1966:428) dramatically defines ἀκαθαρσία to be permeated by Paul's Jewishness, ensuing ἀκαθαρσία as a total estrangement from God.

latter state of slavery, which leads to εἰς ἁγιασμόν [sanctification].[451] Accordingly, the past slavery is marked with servitude to uncleanness and lawlessness, which lead to a state of lawlessness in contrast to the believers current slavery situation, which is bondage to righteousness, which in turn leads to a state of sanctification. These outcomes are also expressed in Romans 6:23. Here it becomes clear again that bondage to Δικαιοσύνη results in eternal life. Paul always has the final destiny of humans in view.

Romans 6:20–23 elaborates (γάρ) on Romans 6:19 with fruit imagery illustrating the past and present status of believers (Byrne 1996:203; Zeller 1985:128).[452] The slavery metaphor resurfaces in Romans 6:20a (ὅτε γὰρ δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας) with the possessive genitive indicating the full might of Sin (τῆς ἁμαρτίας) functioning as the slave owner (Greijdanus 1933:310). There is a wordplay between 'slave' and 'free' (Fitzmyer 1993:451; Zeller 1985:128) as the noun ἐλεύθερος is applied for the first time in the argument befittingly opposite δοῦλος. In Rome, at the end of the republic, ἐλεύθερος was mainly used against the rule of a king (*affectio regni)* and the power of persons or groups (*factio*) (Raafland 1998:650–652). The meaning of ἐλεύθερος in Rome was not political, but relevant to the population's equality before the law and protection from the magistrate's despotism (Raafland 1998:651).[453] Before baptism, believers were men and women bonded to Sin; then Righteousness had no claim on them. Δικαιοσύνῃ is a dative of respect (Schlier 1977:212)[454] and describes the relationship to righteousness as the power from whose control the believers were then exempted.[455] The contrast between ἁμαρτία [sin] (Rm 6:20b) and δικαιοσύνη [righteousness] (Rm 6:20a) is continued. The dative (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) is connected with τῷ θεῷ (Rm 6:22b), revealing God as the true power behind Δικαιοσύνῃ (Malan 1981:131).

The rhetorical question in Romans 6:21a (τίνα οὖν καρπὸν εἴχετε τότε) again sheds light on the past situation of believers' slavery. Paul draws on a botanical source domain with the use of καρπός.[456] The fruit metaphor derived from the

451. Bauer et al. (2000:10) suggest that εἰς ἁγιασμόν means 'for consecration' in Romans 6:19 and 22. Hultgren (2011:264) proposes that sanctification carries with it the sense of living out one's baptismal identity in a struggle against immoral behaviour.

452. Fitzmyer (1993:451) adds that Romans 6:20–23 emphasises the incompatibility of the two ways of life.

453. For the Romans, freedom (ἐλεύθερος) also pertained that freed slaves could immediately participate in civil rights (Raafland 1998:652); cf. Lyall (1970–1971:78). In the imperial times, *libertas* was a popular propagandised slogan especially evoking the divine protection from the Caesar in 300 CE (Raafland 1998:652).

454. Contra Greijdanus (1933:310) remarks that the dative is a *limitationis* dative as it renders '*met betrekking tot*'.

455. Δικαιοσύνη is in itself a relational concept. The root δίκη refers back to a path, and since Hesiod's use of the word, it is also personified and divinised (Neschke 1998:951–953).

456. Usually καρπός is associated with the positive products of being for Christ. The noun καρπός denotes any type of fruit part of plants, including grains and pulpy fruit (Louw & Nida 1988:32). Paul refers to the τὰ γενήματα τῆς δικαιοσύνης [harvest of righteousness] (2 Cor 9:10) and καρπὸς τοῦ πνεύματος [fruit of the Spirit]

Jesus tradition signifies expressing outwardly that what is within (Hultgren 2011:271).[457] The relative clause in Romans 6:21b (ἐφ᾽ οἷς νῦν ἐπαισχύνεσθε) expounds the type of fruit believers had, as they are in their current situation ashamed of it.[458] The verb ἐπαισχύνομαι expresses a feeling and has a strengthened meaning with ἐπί (Bauer et al. 2000:365).[459] In Romans 6:21c (τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος), the reason for shame unfolds, as the possessive genitive (τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος) is emphatically placed in the predicate position to indicate eternal death (θάνατος) (Bauer et al. 2000:443; Fitzmyer 1993:451; Greijdanus 1933:311), a result of being a slave to Sin (Blass et al. 1961:§284(3)).

In contrast to the past reality of slavery depicted in Romans 6:20–21, the temporal clause in Romans 6:22a (νυνὶ δὲ ἐλευθερωθέντες ἀπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) highlights believers' current reality. The repetition of ἔχω in Romans 6:21–22 also places emphasis on believers' past and present situations. Again, the expression ἐλευθερόω with ἀπό is used, illustrating believers were freed from the dominion of Sin. Believers' present state as already enslaved to God (δουλωθέντες δὲ τῷ θεῷ) results in their fruit rendering sanctification (Rm 6:22) (Kruse 2012:285; Moo 1996:407).[460] The adverbial clause Romans 6:22c (τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον) is also in contrast with Romans 6:21c (τὸ γὰρ τέλος ἐκείνων θάνατος). It highlights the result of the present state of being enslaved to God, rendering eternal life (Greijdanus 1933:312).[461] Romans 6:22 reiterates Romans 6:18, with the exception that righteousness is already revealed to belong to God in Romans 6:22.[462] Accordingly, Paul's focus in Romans 6:22 is the transfer of the believers' status, as their fruit was producing death, but in their current position under the dominion of God, their fruit renders sanctification, which heralds eternal life (Moo 1996:407).

(footnote 456 continues…)
(Gl 5:22) (Schlier 1977:212; Zeller 1985:128). However, in this verse, καρπός implies the results of evil as it is (Bauer et al. 2000:510). Harrison (2003:240) situates the botanical imagery within the context of Paphlagonian loyalty oaths, which focuses exclusively on the unfruitfulness (μηδὲ καρπούς) that disobedience to Caesar brings as Paul contrasts the unfruitfulness of sin with the fruitfulness of the sanctified life. The loyalty oath of the Paphlagonians to August and his descendants (6 March 3 BCE) sworn by the inhabitants and roman businessmen of the province affirmed their goodwill towards the *imperator* (Harrison 2003:240).

457. Cf. 1 Corinthians 9:7.

458. The relative pronoun ἐφ᾽ οἷς denotes 'from the things of which' (Bauer et al. 2000:726). There exists debate whether the question mark should be placed after τότε or ἐπαισχύνομαι, but Nestle et al. (2012) place it after τότε.

459. See Isocrates, Panegyr. 77. Ps. Plato, Theages 130.

460. Cranfield (1975:329) and Haacker (1999:135) remark that as slaves of God, believers obtain the beginning of the process of sanctification. Contra Hultgren (2011:264) and Greijdanus (1933:311) who note that sanctification is not a process in Romans 6:22 but is conceived as a proleptic eschatological state of holiness.

461. Hultgren (2011:264) and Fitzmyer (1993:452) deem τέλος not to mean 'the end', but as the eternal life in contrast to the first clause.

462. Up until this point, slavery to God has been hinted or assumed by the use of righteousness (τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ) or slavery to obedience (δοῦλοί … ὑπακοῆς) (Cranfield 1975:328; Kruse 2012:285; Moo 1996:407).

Romans 6:23 elaborates (γάρ) on the result of being a servant to Sin and being a servant to God. The wages of Sin lead to death in contrast to receiving the Favour-gift of God, which is eternal life. Both Romans 6:23a and 6:23b feature metaphors of dominion. The image in Romans 6:23a stems from the source domain of war/military, although ὀψώνια became applied to various situations in the 1st century. The noun ὀψώνια refers to the monthly money that was usually paid to a soldier (Bauer et al. 2000:747; Heidland 1967:591–592; Spicq 1994n:600),[463] but apart from the military scene, it should be interpreted generally as 'compensation'.[464] The ὀψώνιον of Sin cannot truly be described as a payment, but rather the price of impious work is sin (Spicq 1994n:603). However, the predominance of slave imagery in Romans 6 navigates towards understanding ὀψώνιον as the pay of slaves,[465] provoking an image of dominance. The problem often commented on with the image of ὀψώνιον is the continual payment that the term implies, which does not make sense in Romans 6:23 as the payment of death can only function as a one-time occurrence (Heidland 1967:592).[466] The death Paul intends is a one-time status changing reality for slaves of Sin to becomes slaves of God (Kruse 2012:285).

In contrast (δέ) to death, the wages Sin provides, God graciously bestows believers' eternal life (Fitzmyer 1993:452). Χάρισμα may refer to the *donativum*, the largess handed out by an emperor or a victorious general, which was given to a soldier by the emperor on his accession, introduction to public life or other extraordinary occasions (Michel 1966:216; Spicq 1994n:603; Zahn 1925:328).[467] However, this notion is disputed.[468] Rather, the close link with

463. Augustus had set up a permanent army, under his command and in direct control of his appointed legates, swearing loyalty to him and bound to do so as they were financially dependent on him (Adams 2007:211; Rankov 2007:37). Augustus managed this link in several manners, that is, (1) through an oath of allegiance, (2) imperial propaganda portraying him as a fellow soldier (*commilito*), and (3) the armies' reliance on the emperor for its pay and donatives (Adams 2007:211). The bond between the army and the Caesar continued with Tiberius famously describing the relationship with the army as 'holding a wolf by its ears'. Cf. Suetonius Tib. 25.1.

464. Outside the military sphere, it is used for salaries of state officials or for wages generally. The word has also been used in situations depicting the remuneration of teachers, officials, secretaries, guardians, fishermen, musicians, farmers, workmen and slaves, thus meaning wages or pay (Bauer et al. 2000:747; Spicq 1994n: 602–603). Contra Michel (1966:215; Zahn 1925:328).

465. Paul also uses ὀψώνιον in 2 Corinthians 11:8 and 1 Corinthians 9:7. In these two instances, Paul does draw on the metaphor of militia Christi and his use of ὀψώνιον reflects the emphasis of the legal claim to have it. However, by his not claiming the money, he ascertains his freedom from the churches as well as a venture of faith (Bauer et al. 2000:747; Heidland 1967:592). Cf. Polyb. 6.39.12., is also an example of a military context.

466. In Romans 6:23a, θάνατος denotes 'eternal death' (Bauer et al. 2000:443).

467. 'Οψώνια also has a legal implication in contrast to the χάρισμα (Heidland 1967:591). The emperor in turn for the army's loyalty was expected to show devotion to his soldiers (Rankov 2007:65).

468. Cranfield (1975:330) disputes an interpretation in favour of interpreting χάρισμα as *donativium*, as it is not a well-established 1st-century equivalent of *donativum* (Lohse 2003:203; Michel 1966:216).

Romans 5:15 centred in Christ's saving action,[469] in conjunction with obedience (Berger 2011:1102–1105; Lohse 2003:203), fits better with the argument hinging on slavery imagery.

Paul employs another metaphor of dominion in Romans 6:23c, which is reminiscent of Romans 5:21, 6:11 (Lohse 2003:203; Michel 1966:216). The preposition ἐν designates a close personal relationship with regard to the referent of the ἐν-term functioning as the controlling influence (Bauer et al. 2000:327). However, in Romans 6:23c (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν), Paul uses ἐν to illustrate believers' bodies as the location where Jesus Christ 'our' Lord protects them from calamity. In Romans 5:6–8, Christ's bodily act on the cross has illustrated the possibility for believers to be protected from powers such as Sin. Believers have undergone a status change through baptism (cf. Rm 6:4), accordingly the new life and reality may be maintained as slaves of God. Believers partake in the continual fruit of Christ protecting them when they are obedient to God as slaves are.

Persuasion in Romans 6:15–23

Paul uses the slavery metaphor as a positive image. The verb παρίστημι [to present yourself] is repeated in Romans 6:13, 16 and 19. The repetition forms a discourse pattern highlighting abstract controlling agents, such as Sin, death, law, uncleanness and lawlessness, in contrast to God, Favour, Obedience and Righteousness (Aageson 1996:88). This sharp contrast prevails throughout the pericope of Romans 6:15–23. Du Toit (2007a:35–44) highlights that what he labels 'hyperbolic contrasts' are often overlooked. Contrasts are part of the diatribe style, which is particularly prevalent in Romans 6, but it especially appears in passages where some 'existential wrestling' occurs (Du Toit 2007a:41). Believers have a choice to which they want to be slaves to. Being a slave entails having a relationship with the master in which loyalty and obedience are expected.

The status of the master had an effect on the slave. The wealth, position and disposition of the owner were directly relevant for the slave's own position in society as well as a predictor of his or her future (Holland 1992:188). Slaves are the *potestas*, the power of their masters, and it is in the detail of this power that Paul's analogy should be seen (Lyall 1970–1971:75). For the law, a slave was a *res,* a commercial asset to be owned (Lyall 1970–1971:75).

Harrison (2003:235) notes that if Paul's metaphor of two types of slavery (one positive and one negative) is to be successful, it must resonate with its Roman social context accordingly. Alternatively, Harrison notes that the metaphor in Romans 6:12–23 functions at best as a metaphor regarding entry into the *familia Caesaris* as the background of Romans 6:16b, 18b, 19b,

469. The death on the cross disrupts the sequence between human sin and death (Breytenbach 2005:71).

20b and 22b–23.[470] Accordingly, imperial slaves would draw a distinction between slavery to God and slavery to Caesar (Harrison 2003:236).

The slavery metaphor becomes a particularly effective image indicating Jesus Christ as the Lord to submit to. Although the power of Sin is a defeated power,[471] a believer could continue to enable Sin to have power when he or she submits to sin. To be a slave is to be attached to a master (Spicq 1994g:381).

Freedom from the Law (Rm 7:1–6)

Freedom from the law – marriage analogy (Rm 7:1–6)

The premise of the argument in Romans 7:1–6 is that believers are free from the law. Paul appeals to the audience in Romans 7:1 and calls upon their knowledge of the law. Paul speaks differently to the audience as seen from Romans 7:7 onwards. The motive in Romans 7:1c is the law rules over all humans as long as he or she lives. In Romans 7:2–3, Paul employs a marriage analogy. Paul drives the point that like a married woman who is released from the law of her husband when he dies, so too, a believer is released from the law through the body of crucified and resurrected Christ to be able, like the wife, to enter a new legitimate marriage. This enables believers to partake in a second marriage with the risen Christ. The purpose of this second marriage is to bear fruit for God. Romans 7:5–6 throws light on the distinction between the past (ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν) (Rm 7:5) and the present (νυνὶ δέ) (Rm 7:6) situations for believers. There was a past period in which believers were in the flesh on accord of sinful passions having worked through the law in their bodies to bear fruit for death. In contrast, the present situation describes that believers have been released from the law, having died in which they were bound, so that they serve in newness of spirit and not in the oldness of letter.

Detail analysis of Romans 7:1–6

In Romans 7:1a, Paul addresses the audience directly with the rhetorical question ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε [do not you know?] echoing Romans 6:3a.[472] For the first time since Romans 1:13, Paul also calls the audience ἀδελφοί [brothers]. This is

470. Assuming a Roman origin for Philippians and τοὺς ἐκ τῶν Ναρκίσσου (Rm 16:11) referring to members of the household of the wealthy freedman of Claudius, Narcissus, Harrison (2003:235–236) posits that it is possible that Christians belonged to the imperial household (Phlp 4:22; Rm 16:11).

471. Sin as a defeated power unfolds within the argument.

472. Cf. Romans 6:3; 1 Corinthians 6:2, 9, 16, 19. Cf. Cranfield (1975:332); Kruse (2012:289); Michel (1966:219); Wilckens (1993:63); Wolter (2014:409); Zeller (1985:131). Cranfield (1975:332) mentions that the argument refers back to Romans 6:14b creating the impression that the audience would have agreed with Romans 6:15–23.

repeated in Romans 7:4, but does not appear in Romans 7:7–25 again (Cranfield 1975:332; Jewett 2007:430; Michel 1966:219).[473] Moreover, ἀδελφοί [brothers] is a kinship metaphor including both male and female auditors.[474] The source domain [family] is mapped onto the target domain of Jesus' believers as a close-knit group.

Paul's supposition unravels[475] in Romans 7:1b (γινώσκουσιν γὰρ νόμον λαλῶ) that the audience is already apprised with the law. The progressive present (λαλῶ) heightens Paul's engagement with the audience (Greijdanus 1933:314). The question is what law has Paul in mind: Jewish or Roman? A good argument for either Jewish or Roman law can be easily made. For the former, the argument states that Roman believers would have had contact with Jewish law as part of their initial Christian instruction (Byrne 1996:210; Cranfield 1975:333; Moo 1996:412; Van Bruggen 2006:101; Wilckens 1993:64).[476] For the latter, Rome is evinced as the seat of law with Roman law well-known to both churches in Rome and Corinth (Käsemann 1978:187; Lyall 1970–1971:74; Wilckens 1993:66). However, here the law should be understood in a general sense (Wolter 2014:410; Zahn 1925:330).[477]

This becomes particularly clear in the causal clause in Romans 7:1c (ὅτι ὁ νόμος κυριεύει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) illustrating the law is lord over all humans. The noun ἄνθρωπος is utilised in a general sense representative of all humans (Liddell et al. 1996:141).[478] Coinciding with this, the all-inclusive use of ἄνθρωπος also underwrites to a general understanding of the law (νόμος) in Romans 7:1b (Wolter 2014:410).[479] The general application divulges another assumption of Paul, namely, all people in some way are 'under the law' as already seen in Romans 6:14, 15 (Stowers 1994:278).

Moreover, the imagery of dominance continues in Romans 7:1c as the law is personified as a lord that rules over all humans until their death. The definite article (ὁ) and the noun (νόμος) signify the law as a definite entity. This is not

473. Byrne (1996:210) argues that the occurrence of the address ἀδελφοί [brothers] in such a short span results in a suspicion that a type of 'in talk' occurs within a community of experts in the law. I would rather argue that Romans 7:1–6 is indicative of a different rhetorical style of Paul's creating a familiar atmosphere. Considering the audience as law experts seems fantastical.

474. Greijdanus (1933:314) rightly argues that Paul's use of ἀδελφοί [brothers] refutes the notion that Paul is only addressing a part of the church and not the whole church.

475. The conjunction γάρ marks an elaboration.

476. Bauer et al. (2000:677) mentions Mosaic law is probably intended.

477. Contra Michel (1966:220) who argues that, for Paul, a general law still implies Mosaic Law. The term νόμος acquired the general meaning of 'a commonly agreed public order or the multiple laws that regulate life' (Esser 1976:439–444).

478. Man (ἄνθρωπος) is also used in a generic sense including all of humankind. Man delimits the inclusiveness.

479. Cf. Wolter (2014:410).

the first time in the argument that the law is personified. However, unlike Romans 5:20a, the law in Romans 7:1c is portrayed as a ruling force. The source domain of κυριεύω is 'to become κύριος, the lord', and consequently to specifically dominate or have control over persons.[480] The rule of law is restricted to the lifespan of a person as seen in the adverbial clause Romans 7:1d (ἐφ᾽ ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ).[481]

Within the discourse, a pattern of repetition materialises with κυριεύω occurring three times. In all three instances, another lord/power is set against Christ, but Christ proves to be the better lord: (1) in Romans 6:9, Death no longer rules (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει); (2) in Romans 6:14, Sin no longer rules (ἁμαρτία οὐ κυριεύσει); and (3) in Romans 7:1, believers are no longer subjugated to the law. The latter example must be cogitated within the analogy illustrating Christ as the new husband. In Romans 7:1, the law reigns over a person, and within the frame of the succeeding analogy, marriage law is established as putting a woman in a position of bondage. The point Paul wants to convey in Romans 7:1 is that the law is relevant for as long as the man lives. Romans 7:2–3 enunciates that the law only rules for the lifespan of the husband seen in Romans 7:1c as γάρ signals.

The analogy in Romans 7:2–3 aims to draw a parallel between a married woman and Jesus' believers. In Romans 7:2a, the believers in Rome are like a married woman who is under the authority of a living husband (ὕπανδρος γυνὴ τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ) bound by the law (δέδεται νόμῳ).[482] However, it is not certain to whom or to what the married woman is bound to. It could syntactically be to her husband while he is living (τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρί) or to the law (νόμῳ) (Hultgren 2011:270; Zahn 1925:331). The dative (νόμῳ) indicates that the law functions in an instrumental manner, as Paul is careful to create the perception that the law in itself is problematic. In an attempt to solve this problem, the simplest solution is to understand the first dative as the direct object of the verb δέω (Blass et al. 1961:104; Hultgren 2011:270). In 1 Corinthians 7:39, Paul bluntly states that a woman is bound to her husband as long as he lives, which aids in navigating Paul's use in Romans.[483] Accordingly, the wife is bound to the husband as long as he lives (Michel 1966:220; Zahn 1925:331; Zeller 1985:132).

480. The verb is common in the LXX and especially denotes foreign rule and oppressive rule or usurpation, for example, 1 Maccabees 10:76 (Bauer et al. 2000:576; Foerster 1964b:1097).

481. There is a possibility that Paul is citing a maxim of the rabbis, namely, 'if a person is dead, he is free from the Torah and the fulfilling commandments' (Michel 1966:220; Zeller 1985:131). However, caution should be heeded, as the dates are relative according to Moo (1996:412).

482. The verb δέω means to be constrained by law and duty in this instance (Bauer et al. 2000:222). In Romans 7:2, the verb δέδεται is used intransitively as similarly seen in 1 Corinthians 7:39 rendering the meaning that νόμῳ should be interpreted as a dative of instrument. The phrase τῷ ζῶντι ἀνδρὶ is also a temporal dative. In Proverbs 15:7, δέδεται is also employed with a dative of instrument as well as in Plato, Resp. 567d (Wolter 2014:413).

483. In LXX Proverbs 15:7, δέδεται is used with a dative of instrument, as in Plato, Resp. 567d (Wolter 2014:413).

The expression used for marriage, ὕπανδρος γυνή, means 'woman under the power of a man' (Bauer et al. 2000:1029)[484] The verb δέω [to bind] provokes imagery of domination conveying bondage as the law binds a wife. The death of the husband renders the marriage obsolete, as seen in Romans 7:2b (ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ). The verb δέω [to bind] is contrasted to ζάω [to live]. This image describes a position of subjugation and functions accordingly as a metaphor of dominion. The image communicates that the only way this situation can change is with the death of the husband.

However, the bondage (δέω) imagery is also contrasted with the phrase κατήργηται ἀπό [released from] in Romans 7:2d.[485] This phrase draws on legal imagery depicting the removal of the binding of the law and is employed to illustrate the wife's possibility to marry again (Bauer et al. 2000:526).[486] It would not be acceptable for the wife to be involved with another man while her husband is alive, but if he is dead, she is allowed to marry again.[487] A chiasm forms within Romans 7:3 with γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (Rm 7:3b) A; ἐλεύθερος ἀπό ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ (Rm 7:3c) B; ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου (Rm 7:3d) B and γενομένην ἀνδρὶ ἑτέρῳ (Rm 7:3d) A, which places emphasis on the freedom from the husband and freedom from the law.

A contrast between being under the dominion of something and being free occurs, as the clause ἐὰν δὲ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνήρ is repeated (Rm 7:2c; Rm 7:3d). The dominion that Romans 7:2c refers to is the law of the husband, as the genitive (τοῦ ἀνδρός) illustrates that while the husband is alive, the wife is bound to him. Again, the law in itself is not the source of trouble for Paul. Both notions conveying freedom are contrasted with each other: κατήργηται ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ ἀνδρός (Rm 7:2c) and ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου (Rm 7:3d). The latter phrase is also the semantic antithesis of ὁ νόμος κυριεύει in Romans 7:1c (Wolter 2014:411). Paul emphasises the target domain, namely, believers are free from the law that dominates. The idea of the analogy is that Jesus' believers are bound to the law until their death by being incorporated into Christ through baptism (cf. Rm 6:3), in order to be released from the law, so that they can be bound to the risen Christ just like a married woman is bound to her husband until his death, only to be able to marry again after his passing.

484. This is the only occurrence of ὕπανδρος in the New Testament. It also appears four times in the LXX in Proverbs 6:24, 29, and Sirach 9:9; 41:23, in combination with forms of γυνή meaning 'married' woman (LXX Spr 6:24, 29; Sir 9:9; 41:23; Nm 5:19, 20, 29; TestAbrB 12:2; TestRub 3:10; Theophilus Autolyc. 3:13; Polemon Perieg. Fragm. 59; Claudius Aelianus, Nat. Anim. 3, 42; Plutarch, Pelop. 9:4).

485. The genitive with adjective 'independent of' (Blass et al. 1961:§182(3)).

486. This is also seen in Galatians 5:4.

487. The gnomic future expressing that which is to be expected in certain circumstances is seen in χρηματίσει ἐὰν γένηται (Blass et al. 1961:§349[1]).

Paul's marriage metaphor build-up unfolds in the consecutive clause Romans 7:4a marked by ὥστε. This brings the audience to an epiphanous moment.[488] The moment is heightened as Paul directly addresses the audience as ἀδελφοί μου [my brothers], strengthening the familial image as he employs the personal pronoun. The emphatic phrase καὶ ὑμεῖς (Rm 7:4a) also marks the participation of the audience. They, like Paul, have been put to death to the law through the body of Christ (ἐθανατώθητε τῷ νόμῳ διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ). The use of the verb θανατόω in the passive emphasises the death inflicted upon the believer through the incorporation into the body of Christ crucified and brings Romans 6:3 into view again (Hultgren 2011:267; Michel 1966:332; Wilckens 1993:64; Zeller 1985:132). The phrase διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ [through the body of Christ] [489] is used metonymically to indicate the death of Jesus and the implication thereof.[490] Paul has previously used this term in his letters, but in Romans 7:4, it is not intended in an ecclesial sense[491] but has an instrumental function (Hultgren 2011:271). The decisive baptism metaphor of Romans 6:3 is reiterated. Metaphorically, the believers were baptised into the body of the crucified Christ and, being incorporated into him, the believers have died to the law, free to belong to the risen Christ (Hultgren 2011:271; Wilckens 1993:65).

The purpose of being free from law crystallises in Romans 7:4b (εἰς τὸ γενέσθαι ὑμᾶς ἑτέρῳ)[492] as believers enter a new marriage.[493] Believers undergo a status change as this second marriage is illuminated as transference to him who was resurrected (Cranfield 1975:336). The subordinate clause Romans 7:4c (τῷ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἐγερθέντι) reaffirms the metaphor 'as from death to life' seen in Romans 6:9, reminding the audience of the status change associated with Christ who was resurrected from the dead.[494]

488. In this case, ὥστε does not mark a subordinate clause, but the consequence of the analogy (Wilckens 1993:64; Zahn 1925:332).

489. This is the first appearance of the phrase in Romans and the only occurrence of the phrase outside of Eucharistic texts (Schweizer 1971b:1067).

490. Σῶμα never denotes the substance of flesh σάρξ but refers to the totality of man. The *passivum divinum* of θανατόω refers to the action of God in Jesus Christ's death on the cross. The body of Christ refers to Romans 3:25 and Romans 5:9 'through his blood' and Romans 5:10 'through the death of his Son' (Cranfield 1975:336; Wilckens 1993:65; Wolter 2014:415).

491. This is especially seen in the Christ hymn in Colossians that answers the questions of Hellenists for whom the mastering of the cosmos was an urgent concern. The cosmos has escaped their power causing them to be subjected to evil forces. Paul's hymn becomes a cosmic interpretation of the body of Christ. The σῶμα is the universe, and the κεφαλή is Christ. The body of Christ becomes the church and Christ the head. Heaven and earth are reunited with his ascension (Schweizer 1971b:1075).

492. The construction εἰς τό in conjuncture with an infinitive expresses purpose in Romans 7:4, namely, to belong to another (Blass et al. 1961:§402; Hultgren 2011:267; Zahn 1925:334).

493. Cf. Philippians 3:4–11 (Zeller 1985:132).

494. The resurrection of believers with Christ has already been seen in Romans 6:4–11.

Paul does not envision the body of the resurrected Lord in material terms, but as a spiritual body that of the one exalted to the universal personality of all things (Oepke 1964a:335).[495] The passive of ἐγείρω establishes the source of the resurrecting power as God, but also intrinsically belongs to the Son (Coenen 1978:281). This is already established in Romans 6:4, as through baptism, believers who have partaken in Christ's death and are raised like Christ from the dead by the glory of the Father can live a new life. In Romans 5:21, this was still a possibility for believers as they might partake in the reign of Favour that leads to eternal life through Jesus Christ. However, a status change occurred after baptism. Romans 8:29 illustrates that believers are predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son. The body is the intended place where the glory of God will be reflected. The final clause in Romans 7:4d (ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ) elicits the purpose of having been put to death to the law through the body of Christ, and enabled to enter a second marriage with the purpose to bear fruit for God.[496] Paul changes from the second-person plural 'you' to the first-person plural 'we', including himself in the fruit imagery (Greijdanus 1933:319; Hultgren 2011:271). The dative (τῷ θεῷ) is significant as it expresses the possessor (Blass et al. 1961:188(2)). Accordingly, it can be inferred that if a believer is under the lordship of Christ, bearing fruit is a consequence. In Romans 7:4d, the image of fruit is positive. This also links back to Romans 6:22 where believers are depicted as having fruit when they are slaves for God.

In Romans 7:5, Paul explains by drawing attention to the past situation of believers. The temporal clause in Romans 7:5a (ὅτε γὰρ ἦμεν ἐν τῇ σαρκί) refers back to the time when believers were ἐν τῇ σαρκί [in the flesh] and is linked to Romans 7:4 as γάρ signals. In Romans 7:5a, ἐν τῇ σαρκί [in the flesh] is also a metaphor of dominion (Schweizer 1971b:125; Wilckens 1993:68; Wolter 2014:418; Zahn 1925:335).[497] Paul uses σάρξ as a metonymic expression to imply the body as a whole (Schweizer 1971b:101). The preposition ἐν functions instrumentally with the dative signalling 'to be controlled by the flesh'. In Romans 6:19a (διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν), the metaphor of being under the control of flesh has already surfaced. However, the metaphor in Romans 7:5 is similar to the metaphor of the mortal body in Romans 6:12, as both describe sinful desires culpable for being in the body. The difference is the

495. Paul accepts an empty tomb Romans 6:4. Contra Michel (1966:220) and Wilckens (1993:65).

496. Michelle Morris (2012:107–115) argues Romans 7:1–6, from the perspective of Roman law, specifically *Lex Iulia et Papia et Poppaea* instituted from 9 CE. This law requires women to marry again after a short mourning period as the law requires a woman of childbearing age to bear children. Accordingly, Morris (2012:108) contends that infertile women in the Roman congregation would have experienced the suppression of the law picking up on the theme of submission and understood fruit in a literal manner as children. However, fruit imagery is associated with the Jesus tradition.

497. In Romans 8:3, Paul connects flesh with sin. In the LXX, *basar* is translated with σάρξ referring to the whole living creature, human or animal (Spicq 1994r:233).

contested space in Romans 7:5 is described with σάρξ and not σῶμα. Paul uses σάρξ and not σῶμα, but this is probably to keep the audience focused on the contrast between the controlling influences of 'the body of Christ' in contrast to the influence of the flesh.

In Romans 7:5b (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν), the subordinate clause elaborates on the controlling situation of being in the flesh. There are a few surprising elements. The imagery is reminiscent of Romans 6:12b, where Sin is king in the mortal body and believers should not obey the body's desires. Firstly, Paul uses πάθημα instead of ἐπιθυμία seen in Romans 6:12b. Πάθημα is mostly used in *malam partem*; 'misfortune' or 'suffering' refers to a bodily or spiritual condition induced by external events (Michaelis 1968:930–931). In Romans 7:5, πάθημα implies 'an inward experience of an affective nature' (Bauer et al. 2000:748; Michaelis 1968:930), which is clearly a position of adhering to Sin (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν).[498] But what is more, this position occurs through the law (διὰ τοῦ νόμου) within the bodies of believers (ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν). The phrase ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν [in our members] metonymically functions as a reference for the body and is closely associated with ἐν τῇ σαρκί (Rm 7:5a). The expression resonates with Romans 6:13, 19 (τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν), reminding the audience to whom they should present themselves.

However, in Romans 7:5, the option of choice is not in the equation, as ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν [in our members] illustrates the state of the body already influenced by Sin. The phrase ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν ἡμῶν has a spatial connotation, as it becomes a place of activity, which is also marked by the intransitive imperfect ἐνεργέω [to be at work] (Cranfield 1975:338). Unlike Romans 6:12, where ἐπιθυμία functions as a metaphor of subjugation, πάθημα already sheds light on the believers' relationship with Sin, namely, it is being in a state of suffering. The genitive (τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν) indicates Sin as the origin of the state of suffering, concretised in the relationship to Sin (τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν), which is repeated by the articles. The function of the repetition is to avoid misunderstanding (Blass et al. 1961:§269(2)). Paul compares being in the flesh with being in the Spirit, which will be picked up in the argument of Romans 8:1–11 (Michel 1966:221; Wilckens 1993:67; Zeller 1985:132).

The result clause in Romans 7:5c (εἰς τὸ καρποφορῆσαι τῷ θανάτῳ) is in contrast parallel to the purpose clause in Romans 7:4d (ἵνα καρποφορήσωμεν τῷ θεῷ). The fruit metaphor with καρποφορέω [to bear fruit] is repeated in Romans 7:5, but in a negative manner as the sinful passions were then in control. These metaphors link with the fruit metaphors in Romans 6:21 and Romans 6:22 (Wolter 2014:416). The contrast of τῷ θανάτῳ and τῷ θεῷ reminds of the

498. The noun πάθημα has also been used by Paul in Galatians 5:24 as bad affections or passions. In Romans 8:18, Paul uses πάθημα to denote 'suffering' (Bauer et al. 2000:747). The genitive could be a genitive of quality or an objective genitive (Cranfield 1975:337). Wolter (2014:419) posits that the expression παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is perhaps a Hebraism as is the case in Romans 1:26.

distinction made between being a slave to God and a slave to Sin in Romans 6:15–23. The former leads to fruit for God (Rm 6:21) and fruit that leads to eternal life (Rm 6:22) in contrast to the latter that renders the type of fruit that leads to death (Rm 6:21). In Romans 7:5c, θάνατος denotes 'eternal death' (Bauer et al. 2000:443).

The temporal clause Romans 7:6a (νυνὶ δὲ κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου) sheds light on the current position of believers marked with νυνὶ δέ in contrast to Romans 7:5. The verbs καταργέω [to be released] and κατέχω [to be bonded] (Bauer et al. 2000:532) are opposites. Paul draws on legal imagery illustrating 'we' were released from the obligation of the law with the phrase κατηργήθημεν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου (Bauer et al. 2000:526). The repetition of καταργέω ἀπό [to be released from] echoes Romans 7:2c underscoring being free from the law. Strengthening his point, Paul also uses the antithesis of being released, ἀποθανόντες ἐν ᾧ κατειχόμεθα (Rm 7:6b–c) to illustrate believers having died to that in which they have been held captive, namely, the law.[499] The preposition ἐν describes the body that had been a place of captivity, but believers have metaphorically died to Sin within their bodies as their bodies are a space intended to be in the image of Christ (cf. Rm 8:29). They have been released from any prior commitments, like a widow from marriage law, to be fully committed to Christ.

The result of being released from the law comes to the fore in Romans 7:6b as ὥστε δουλεύειν indicates.[500] Paul's engagement with the audience enhances as the personal plural pronoun ἡμᾶς [we] depicts Paul with the believers as slaves in the newness of spirit and not in the oldness of the letter. The slavery metaphor surfaces again. Paul moulds the slavery image again with a contrast, namely, ἐν καινότητι πνεύματος [in the newness of life] against παλαιότητι γράμματος [the oldness of letter].[501] Paul's use of newness (καινότης) picks Romans 6:4 up, namely, to walk in the newness of life (Bauer et al. 2000:497). The word παλαιότης refers to 'obsolete, old' (Bauer et al. 2000:751). Γράμμα refers to the written law functioning as a metonymy (Bauer et al. 2000:206; Zahn 1925:337).[502] This is an important image, as it conveys a lifeless law is nothing but a letter (Bauer et al. 2000:206). Paul's argument will illustrate

499. The prepositional phrase ἐν ᾧ does not indicate a relative clause dependent on τοῦ νόμου but refers back to ἀποθανόντες (Zahn 1925:336).

500. The construction of ὥστε with an infinitive introduces a dependent clause showing actual result (Bauer et al. 2000:1107). Examples can be seen in Matthew 13:2, 54; Acts 1:19; Romans 15:19; Philippians 1:13. Wolter (2014:421) postulates that ὥστε is just as consecutive as εἰς τό in Romans 7:6 and thus continues the slavery metaphor of Romans 6:16–20, 22.

501. The genitives πνεύματος and γράμματος are possibly genitives of apposition or could also be genitives of origin, as Paul would then be expressing the newness of the Spirit and the oldness of the letter (Cranfield 1975:339; Wolter 2014:421). Cf. 2 Corinthians 3:6.

502. Zeller (1985:133) also notes that γράμμα does not inherently entail obedience.

from Romans 7:7 onwards that the law, when manipulated or contaminated, is problematic, but the law, when understood as a believer's body that is being obedient to Christ, is living law. The slavery metaphor underscores believers' present situation associated with the newness of the spirit converse with their past situation of bondage to the law, which is now obsolete.

Persuasion in Romans 7:1–6

Romans 7:1–6 serves as a transitional argument. Paul reiterates themes from Romans 6:12–23, especially concerning lordship. In Romans 7:1–6, Paul also refocuses the argument on νόμος [law]. He commences with the personification of Law ruling in Romans 7:1. This general image is described in more detail with the ensuing metaphor of an analogy of marriage in Romans 7:2–3.

However, the analogy is not really successful. Apart from the fact that it is difficult to understand, it also offers various interpretation pitfalls. Firstly, there is uncertainty to whom or to what the wife is bound, namely, the husband or the law of the husband? Secondly, the image's communication of boundedness has flaws, seeing that even if marriage law is abided, a married woman could be an adulterer even though there would be consequences on being caught. Lastly, there is a discrepancy between the death of the husband and the believer self. The husband really dies, whereas the believer does not literally die. Rather, the believer is baptised to illustrate a new state of being. Attempts to rectify the discord of the analogy dilute the purpose of Romans 7:1–6. An important element of conceptual metaphors is that the focus is on the communicative intention, rather than the emergence and development of the metaphor (Steen 2007:79).

Paul's analogy draws on the source domain of marriage and maps the legal terminology of being free from the subjugation of marriage on the target domain that believers are free from the law. The rhetorical success of the analogy should be purveyed. The source domain is a well-known image for the audience, and whether viewed from Roman law or Jewish law, the death of a spouse implies the remaining spouse is exempt from the marriage arrangement. The analogy is from the perspective of the wife. There is no suggestion in the text of what type of husband the woman is bound to, but Paul is interested in indicating the bounded situation she finds herself in. This introduces a horizontal level in the purview of metaphors of dominion in Paul's argument. The metaphor of dominion focuses on a relationship between humans (human to human). Up until this point, the dominators, such as Sin, Law and Death, have been 'up' and the dominated 'under', accordingly from a vertical perspective (abstract power–human). Being under the power of a man (ὕπανδρος) has the same restrictions as being under Law (ὑπὸ νόμον) or under Sin (ὑφ᾽ ἁμαρτίαν). Nonetheless, the argument continually underscores, Christ has freed believers from these forces in order

that they can enter a new bondage situation. This image describes Christ as a worthy lord to be subjected to.

The implications of lordship are especially highlighted with the utilisation of botanical metaphors. In Romans 7:4 and Romans 7:5, these botanical metaphors illustrate that being subjected to the one lord leads to fruit for God and being subjected to another leads to bearing fruit for death. The imagery connects to Romans 6:17–21, reminding the audience of the consequences of being a slave for God or being a slave for Sin.

The slavery imagery is explicitly used again in Romans 7:6. Paul decisively indicates that the law's reign has ended drawing on a sharp antithesis between images, indicating having been released from the law and no longer being captive by the law. These images also highlight the past and present situations of believers, having been slaves of the obsolete letter in contrast to the current situation of slavery, the newness of the spirit.

Paul and the law (Rm 7:7–25)

The 'I' debate

It is impossible to examine Romans 7:7–25 and not mention the infamous ἐγώ [I] debate. There are various interpretations developed in pursuit of solving the problem of ἐγώ [I].

A summation of the various views:

- Ἐγώ [I] is often interpreted from an autobiographical vantage point (Denney 1900:640; Dunn 1988:201; Jewett 2007:450; Zahn 1925:341–344). Within this stance, Paul's own turmoil of previously having been a Jew persecuting believers of Jesus, who changed into a believer himself, is projected onto the 'I'. There are examples of Paul's use of the first-person discourse as self-referential, such as 1 Corinthians 9. However, the first-person discourse is seen again in 1 Corinthians 13 but intended as illustrative and exemplary (Johnson 1997:107). It comes as no surprise that an autobiographical interpretation proves to be inadequate. It lacks insufficiently dealing with the historical milieu of the text. Accordingly, deeming Romans 7 as autobiographical is not advisable based on the occurrence of other Pauline references.
- Werner G. Kümmel's (1929) seminal book 'Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus' ushered a new era of understanding ἐγώ [I] as rhetorical. The rhetoric in Romans 7:7–25 differs from that in Romans 7:1–6. The audience is no longer directly addressed. Paul uses three tenses in Romans 7:7–25: beginning with the past (Rm 7:7–11), moving to the present (Rm 7:14–24a, 25) and followed by the future tense (Rm 7:24b). Paul draws on a

fictional person as a rhetorical tool to make his argument (Cranfield 1975:351).[503]

- Another traditional view is that ἐγώ [I] refers to Adam. The argument is ἐγώ [I] picks up on the Adamic discourse in Romans 5. Romans 7:7–12 is interpreted to wholly apply to Adam as it is through Adam that sin entered the world (cf. Rm 5) (Käsemann 1978:192–197).[504]
- Peder Borgen (2006:35) argues that Paul uses in Romans 7:7–8:4 a conventional form of an autobiographical crime-and-punishment story to characterise the representative 'I' as a contrite wrongdoer, who reacts with an existential outburst and receives a verdict. A large number of parallel stories about contrite wrongdoers are found in Jewish and Greek sources (Borgen 2006:17–35). A special point in Paul's version is the conviction that condemnation is avoided by those who are in Christ Jesus (Borgen 2006:35).
- When Paul wrote to the Romans, Ovid's and Euripides' Medea works were popular reading in Rome. In recent years, it has become clear that Romans 7:7–25 is reminiscent of the tale of Euripides' Medea.[505] Medea and her ἀκρασία were well-known in all circles of the empire (Marrou 1956:163).[506] In several ways, Romans 7:7–25 resembles the prosopopoeia of a person in a tragic situation. This type of language is not typical in Hebrew Bible/Old Testament or earlier Jewish literature but rather of what scholars often call the fragmented personality of Homer and the Greek poets (Stowers 1994:272). Greek polytheism facilitated the expression of the common human dilemma of conflicting goods and obligations (Stowers 1994:272). In Hellenist and Roman times, philosophers and moralists rationalised language of powers that the powers were not really external, but internal.[507]
- Antonio Pitta (2015:310–311) postulates that ἐγώ [I] has a mimetic nature set in the light of tragic genre. The 'I' is an exemplary 'I', which cannot be reduced within the boundaries of autobiography (Pitta 2015:309–310) The 'I' is tragic not only because of ἀκρασία but also because the relationship with Sin forces the 'I' to do evil (Pitta 2015:319). Pitta (2015:316) views Romans 7:7–25 in sapiential terms, with only two options possible for the 'I' on account of Sin's coercion. As is the case with sapiential literature, one choice leads to life and another to death. The 'I' is forced by Sin to do evil and the law does not cause this. The law is life, but in the hands of Sin,

503. The rhetorical 'I' is also seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls especially in 1 QH 1:21–23; 3:24–26; 1 QS 11:9–10 (Kuhn 1967:102).

504. Kidwell's thesis 'The Adamic backdrop of Romans 7' (2012) harmonises the 'I' as Adam.

505. Amongst others, Carter (2002:190–191).

506. Marrou (1956:163) mentions that the Euripides' – who was considered the great master of classical tragedy – version of Medea was placed in school syllabuses overshadowing Aeschylus and Sophocles.

507. Cf. Epictetus Diss. 4.1.147 (Stowers 1994:272).

it is harmful. Accordingly, Romans 7 consists of a well-known and highly developed rhetoric, employed by moralists and philosophers to treat issues (Stowers 1994:272).

- Part of the complexity of the ἐγώ [I] problem lies in background questions. A shift has succinctly occurred between a Jewish and a Greek background. In recent years, the focus of scholarship has moved to include both Greek and Roman backgrounds (Schröter 2013:195–223). This has resulted in a wide acknowledgement of the influence of Euripides' Medea and, what is more, a focus on Eve instead of Adam. An example of this view is Samuel Byrskog (2015:279) who suggests that Paul blends Jewish, Greek and Roman *topoi* in an epistolary process of communication from a Christ-believing Jew to a Christ-believing gentile in Rome. He combines the motifs related to Adam and the motifs of ἀκρασία related to Medea and proposes that concepts associated with Eve played a crucial role for Paul in making the Christ-believing Jew to move from one to the other and yet maintain a rhetorical purpose with the characterisation of the 'I' (Byrskog 2015:279).

In conclusion, the 'I' is best understood as a rhetorical tool within the diverse context of the Greco-Roman world. Accordingly, Romans 7 'I' is a Christian adaptation of Greco-Roman discourse about the problem of ἀκρασία in service of an argument against gentiles attempting to gain self-mastery by following the law (Stowers 1994:279). Romans 6–8 uses Sin in a similar way to the concept of ἀκολασία, a set disposition to do wrong. Paul adds the assumption that sin is wrongdoing against God and his law (Stowers 1994:279). In Hellenistic moral thought, habitual ἀκρασία becomes *akolasia*. Ancient moralists debated whether ἀκρασία, weakness of will or lack of self-mastery, was caused by ignorance and false belief or by passions inherent in human nature (Stowers 1994:279).

The relationship of Sin and the law (Rm 7:7–13)

Paul's tone changes in Romans 7:7–13. He clarifies the relationship between Sin and the law. Even though Paul urges to uphold the law in Romans 3:31b and describes a time before the law was given in Romans 5:13. Hitherto in the argument, the law has been associated with provocative imagery.[508] However, in Romans 5:20, νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν [the law slipped in]; Romans 6:14, 15 establishes that believers are not ὑπὸ νόμον [under the law] and Romans 7:1–6 posits believers are free from the law, with Paul's avant-garde acumen in Romans 7:5 τὰ παθήματα τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν τὰ διὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐνηργεῖτο [the sinful passions that were working through the law] still fresh in the audience's mind. Accordingly, the budding question on the audience's lips is addressed in Romans 7:7–13, namely, but is the law sin? As whether Mosaic Law or the law

508. Paul's portrayal of the law hinges on blasphemy from a Jewish perspective (Wilckens 1993:75).

in general is intended, the law would have been seen as something good either as a system to govern order or as a way to enter a relationship with God.

Unsurprisingly, Paul's premise in Romans 7: 7–13 is that the law is good. The ring composition highlights this hypothesis as both Romans 7:7 and 7:13 refute any negative notions of the law as μὴ γένοιτο marks. In Romans 7:13, the law even becomes synonymous with the good (ὁ ἀγαθός). However, if the foundation of the law is good, what went awry? In Romans 7:7, Paul discloses that the law functioned as an instrument through which Sin and the parallel structured desires became known. The law specifically warns against the 10th commandment, 'you shall not covet' (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις) (Rm 7:7f). In Romans 7:8, this command becomes the point of contention. Sin takes an opportunity through the commandment (ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς). Sin is successful in benefitting from this action as it accomplishes all desired things. Romans 7:8c–10 sheds light on the impact of Sin using the law on believers. Apart from the law, Sin is dead. However, 'I' was once alive apart from the law, but when the commandment came, Sin sprang to life and 'I' died, and the very commandment proved to be a cause of death to me instead of resulting in life. In Romans 7:11, Paul again describes Sin as taking an opportunity through the commandment but adds that Sin also deceives and kills. Paul concludes in Romans 7:12 confirming the law is holy, righteous and good.

This confirmation of the law continues in Romans 7:13 as the particle μέν refers to the whole passage and correlates with ἀλλά in Romans 7:13. Romans 7:13 is nonsensical without Romans 7:12 in two ways. Firstly, the initial question is repeated by stating whether has that was is good for 'me', that is, the law become (the cause of) death? Secondly, it is seen in Romans 7:7 that it is through the law that knowledge of Sin is obtained. Again, in Romans 7:13, the same idea is communicated as Sin is shown to be sin through the law, but it might become sinful beyond measure when the law functions as an instrument of Sin.

Detail analysis of Romans 7:7–13

In typical Pauline argumentative fashion, Romans 7:7a commences with the inferential question: τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν [what shall we say then?],[509] ensued with the elliptical nominal question ὁ νόμος ἁμαρτία [is the law sin?] (Rm 7:7b), which introduces the main argument.[510] The definite article in conjunction with

509. The verse is reminiscent of Romans 6:1 with the repetition of the question: what shall we say then? This phrase is well-known in Greek literature, but it is only used by Paul and in his letter to the Romans in the New Testament, for example, in Romans 4:1; 6:1; 7:7; 8:31; 9:14; 9:30 (Kruse 2012:299; Michel 1966:225; Wilckens 1993:75).

510. The verb εἰμί is left out in order to make the question more urgent (Greijdanus 1933:324).

the noun (ὁ νόμος) is applied, which signifies the law as an entity. This is reminiscent of the personification ὁ νόμος κυριεύει (Rm 7:1c), but in Romans 7:7b, the law is not personified. Rather the law is still treated in a general manner as a force whose impact needs to be defined as either positive or negative. Similarly, ἁμαρτία [sin] is not personified but refers to the whole of sinful actions, that is, anything that could be an obstacle in the relationship with God. Paul immediately clarifies that the law is a positive force refuting the notion that the law is a sin with μὴ γένοιτο [by no means!] (Rm 7:7c).[511]

The adversative particle ἀλλά (Cranfield 1975:347; Greijdanus 1933:324; Käsemann 1978:184; Wilckens 1993:76)[512] in Romans 7:7d launches the dynamics between Sin and the law, namely, the law provides knowledge of Sin (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων). Sin as a power is implied. The verb γινώσκω is utilised in a manner similar to that in 2 Corinthians 5:21, indicating a concrete experience rather than theoretical knowledge (Michel 1966:226; Zeller 1985:139).[513] This is amplified in the parallel negative unreal contrary-to-fact conditional sentences (οὐκ … εἰ μή) (Blass et al. 1961:§360[1])[514] 'not … if not' constructions indicating exclusively that the 'I' (Cranfield 1975:349)[515] would have not known sin if not through the law (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἔγνων εἰ μὴ διὰ νόμου) and not have known[516] desire if not the law had said: 'you shall not desire' (τήν τε γὰρ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐκ ᾔδειν εἰ μὴ ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν·οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). The preposition διά is used in an instrumental manner, indicating the Mosaic Law as the vehicle that sheds light on Sin, but the law itself is not indicated as an accomplice of Sin (Greijdanus 1933:326; Wolter 2014:428). Sin (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) is elaborated on (γάρ) with desires (τήν ἐπιθυμίαν) and the parallel construction as well as τε γάρ also underscores the close relationship between Sin and desires.[517] However, desires do not equate Sin.

511. Paul's use of the diatribe has similarities with Epictetus as both employ it in the beginning of the argument. In the case of Paul, μὴ γένοιτο has developed as a consistent device to emphatically deny preposterous conclusions (Malherbe 2014:108–109).

512. Contra Michel (1966:226) who views it as '*einschränkend*'.

513. Contra Greijdanus (1933:326).

514. The negative μή is used with the unreal indicative in the subordinate clause (Blass et al. 1961:§428[2]).

515. Wolter (2014:431) argues that 'I' in this verse identifies with every Jewish person who has come across the Torah. The audience would have consisted of gentiles too. Perhaps it is prudent to rather indicate 'I' as exemplifying all because the knowledge of correct and wrong is a basic human notion. I would argue that 'I' is functioning as a rhetoric device to engage with the audience.

516. The pluperfect of οἶδα is used implying the action is continuing, thus 'I' should continue to not know is in effect (Wolter 2014:429).

517. Τε indicates rather a close connection and relationship between the clauses, which in Romans 7:7 is the relationship with sin (ἁμαρτία) (Blass et al. 1961:§443[3]).

The Law is personified again (ὁ νόμος ἔλεγεν)[518] as the human quality of speaking is attributed to it.[519] This personification is not uncommon to the 1st century.[520] The Law tells believers not to desire (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). The phrase οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις refers to the 10th commandment[521] and in Jewish traditions the 10th commandment was considered to be 'the essence and origin of all sin' as it was 'the sin from which all others flow'.[522] This is incumbent, as all the other commandments deal with outward actions, but the 10th commandment deals with an inner disposition (Hultgren 2011:277). The translation of the ἐπιθυμέαν as 'covet' obscures Paul's Hellenistic conceptualities (Stowers 1994:278). Worldviews from Judaism and Greek thought overlap with the use of ἐπιθυμία [desires].[523] Gerard Lavery (1980:148) surmises that for Seneca a single crucial battle has to be fought within the soul between reason and passion with a victory on either side as total.

Paul argues that the law is not sin and the 'I' would not know Sin unless the law had exposed it (Kruse 2012:300). Unfortunately, the problem persists although the law discourages to desire, the 'I' desires. Romans 7:8a illustrates how this persistence is possible. Sin has taken an opportunity through the commandment (ἀφορμὴν δὲ λαβοῦσα ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς). Paul draws on the common Hellenistic expression[524] ἀφορμὴν λαμβάνειν [to take an opportunity] to illustrate how Sin takes a chance through the commandment (Wilckens 1993:79). Jewett and Beverly Gaventa argue that the source domain

518. Cf. Romans 3:19.

519. Usually citations from the Torah are introduced with the formula 'it is written' (Dodson 2010:419). The only other biblical occurrence where the law speaks, apart from Paul, is 4 Maccabees 2:5–6. Dodson (2010:425) notes the difference: in 4 Maccabees 2:5–6, the voice gives the listener the ability to obey, whereas in Romans 7:7, the listener is rendered powerless to control his or her desire.

520. Philo, a contemporary of Paul, describes in Contempl. 78 the law from the vantage point of the Therapeutae, where the law resembles a living creature with literal ordinances for its body and invisible mind.

521. There is broad consensus (Jewett 2007:447; Kruse 2012:300; Michel 1966:226; Wilckens 1993:78; Wolter 2014:430; Zahn 1925:341; Zeller 1985:139) that οὐκ ἐπιθυμίαν reflects the 10th commandment, that is, Exodus 20:17; Deuteronomy 5:21. The quotations from Exodus 20:17 and Deuteronomy 5:21 are radicalised as these are used without an object (Hübner 1978:71). Philo cites the *Decalogue* in the same way. See Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4.78. In Romans 13:9, Paul also uses οὐκ ἐπιθυμίαν, but in contrast to this verse, it is clear that it refers to the *Decalogue*. Here, the Attic formulation τε γάρ draws 7:7e–f in connection with 7:7d prompting the notion that it is probably a generalisation from the commandment as also seen in 4 Maccabees 2:6 and Philo, *Decal*., 142, Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4:78. Other examples in support are: Philo, *Spec. Leg.* 4, 93; All. 2.8. Vit cont. 74; Jos. Bel. 7. 261, *Ant.* 4, 143.

522. Cf. Philo, *Vitae Adam et Evae* 19, *Decal*, 173 (Hultgren 2011:277; Kruse 2012:300; Wilckens 1993:78; Ziesler 1989:185).

523. In 4 Maccabees, it is claimed that Jewish law agreed with Greek moral psychology because of its emphasis on the passions as the source of evil impulses as the LXX's translation of ἐπιθυμία allows (Stowers 1994:278). Wilckens (1993:80) and Zeller (1985:140) mention the pervasiveness of desires with an example of Ovid, 3,4,17 (*Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata*).

524. Cf. Polyb. III 7,5; 32,7; IV 58,8; Isocr. Paneg. 61.

of the idiom is 'war', but this meaning cannot be attributed to the use of the active voice of the idiom. Jewett (2007:449) uses an example of the idiom used with the same verb κατεργάζομαι in Andocides (Pac 37.4) and another example found in Philo, Flacc. 35.7, which describes an Alexandrian prefect Flaccus, encouraging mob violence against the Jews: ὅ τι δ᾽ ἂν ὄχλος ἀσύντακτος ἀφορμὴν λάβῃ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων [but whenever an ungoverned multitude begins a course of evil doing]. Gaventa (2004:272) argues that ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα draws on military contexts with the pretext to make war as seen in Polybius, 3.69; Philo, *Flaccus* 47, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus 5.5.3; 6.25.3. However, these examples from both exponents are not convincing enough to coherently argue the origins of the idiom from a source domain of war. The idiom is used in an active manner. The passive voice is usually attributed to military situations, for example, Thuc I 90; Polyb I 41,6 (Wilckens 1993:81). Sin is personified again with the use of the definite article and the noun (ἡ ἁμαρτία) highlighting Sin as an entity. Paul states that the law is not the culprit, as the preposition διά is used instrumentally with ἐντολή, which usually denotes 'an order authorizing a specific mandate or ordinance' (Bauer et al. 2000:340),[525] but in Romans 7:8a, Paul redefines ἐντολή as a synonym of law referring to a legal system (Bauer et al. 2000:340). Accordingly, Sin has taken an opportunity through the law.

In Romans 7:8b (κατειργάσατο ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν), the personification is further explicated as Sin also accomplished all things coveted (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν) within a specific space, namely in the 'I' (ἐν ἐμοί [in me]).[526] The verb κατεργάζομαι with the accusative has the meaning 'to prepare for battle' in Ephesians 6:13 (Bertram 1966:634–635), but in Romans 7:8b, κατεργάζομαι with the accusative renders the meaning 'accomplish'. This is coherent with the imagery of Sin taking an opportunity and working as an active force. However, dominion is implicit as it encompasses an overlord with a specific place that is dominated. Sin forged an opportunity to be in control of the 'I'. The phrase ἐν ἐμοί invites a spatial understanding as the preposition ἐν is used in a locative manner. The body can be inferred as the container for the self, where all desired things (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν)[527] describe a state of fullness of desires. In Romans 6:12b, the negative connection between Sin and ἐπιθυμία as a state is associated with the

525. It especially means mandate in Koine, for example, P. Oxy. 2771, 4,6,10 (mandate given by a woman to her husband). Ἐντολή was widely used in public law concerning laws, decrees, constitutions, rules of public administration and royal and imperial orders (Spicq 1994k:11). Describing a command of a king, an official or a general, for example, in Xenophon Cyrop. II 4,30: ἐντολὴ τοῦ Κύρου (Schrenk 1964:545).

526. The preposition ἐν is used in a locative manner.

527. This is also found in Sirach 36:22; 4 Maccabees 2:4: καὶ οὐ μόνον δὲ τὴν τῆς ἡδυπαθείας οἰστρηλασίαν ὁ λογισμὸς ἐπικρατεῖν φαίνεται ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ἐπιθυμίας [Not only is reason proved to rule over the frenzied urge of sexual desire, but also over every desire]. Cf. Aristoteles, Top. 140b28, Diodorus Siculus 1.70.6.; Dionysius Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. 5.48.2; Dio Chrysostomos 4:24; 4:99; Plutarch, Mor. 101a. These desires not only derive from the interpretation domain of sexual desires, which would have underlined Paul's use of σάρξ [flesh], but rather it encompasses wanting what is not yours.

reign of Sin. The image of all desired things (πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν) conjures an image of the total takeover of Sin. Consequently, the commandment urging cautiousness concerning 'to desire' provides sin with a base of operations (Hultgren 2011:277).

Romans 7:8c (χωρὶς γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία νεκρά) elaborates on Romans 7:8b (γάρ) with a description being apart from law (χωρὶς … νόμου). Sin cannot take an opportunity within the 'I' if the law does not exist (Hultgren 2011:277).[528] In Romans 5:13, Paul described a time before the law, but to be apart from the law is a unique appearance in Paul.[529] The metaphor draws on a figurative state of being dead or 'lifeless/without power' with the image Sin is dead (ἁμαρτία νεκρά).[530] Romans 7:8c–10a forms a chiastic pattern with A ἁμαρτία νεκρά [sin dead] (Rm 7:8c); B ἐγὼ ἔζων [living I] (Rm 7:9a); B ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν [sin coming to life] (Rm 7:9c) and A the ἐγὼ ἀπέθανον [I died] (Rm 7:10a) (Moo 1996:437). How the relationship between the law and Sin affects the 'I' is explored. Romans 7:9a is closely knit together with Romans 7:8 as χωρὶς … νόμου repeats. Furthermore, temporal clause Romans 7:9a (ἐγὼ δὲ ἔζων χωρὶς νόμου ποτέ) describes a time in the past when the ἐγώ [I][531] was alive.[532] Again, Paul contrasts the imperfect ἔζων (Rm 7:9a), which enhances the understanding of living, with νεκρός [death] (Rm 7:8c). This period without the law changed with the coming of the commandment (ἐλθούσης … τῆς ἐντολῆς) (Rm 7:9b).[533]

Paul interchanges between ἐντολή and νόμος and moves from ζάω to ἀναζάω. In Romans 7:9b, ἐντολή is an example of a metonymy referring to the law as a whole and not just the one commandment, as in Romans 7:7 (Michel 1966:228). Romans 7:9c continues the personification of Sin. Sin sprang to life (ἡ ἁμαρτία ἀνέζησεν). It is again emphasised as an entity with the definite article employed with the noun (ἡ ἁμαρτία). Sin has been allotted human qualities to be able to emerge from a dormant state as the verb ἀναζάω is used here in the sense of

528. Michel (1966:227) notes that Paul thinks forensic, as there where the law is, brings sin to be liable.

529. Paul only uses the expression apart from law (χωρὶς … νόμου) three times (Rm 3:21; 7:8, 9). The expression does not appear in the LXX or any other works of Hellenistic Jewish writers of antiquity. The 116 instances this phrase occurs in the Thesaurus Lingua Graeca are from authors who cite Paul or echo his words. The same is true when the article is added. There are only nine instances in early Christian literature, but post-Paul.

530. The noun νεκρός [death] indicates a state of not functioning or without power. It was often used to refer to those killed in battle, for example, Th. 4.44: τοὺς νεκροὺς ὑποσπόνδους ἀνείλοντο (Liddell et al. 1996:1165). Michel (1966:227) and Wolter (2014:435) describe νεκρός succinctly as '*wirkungslos*'.

531. Romans 7:9 marks the first appearance of ἐγώ in Romans.

532. Bauer et al. (2000:425) suggest that ζάω should be understood illustrating the perils of a follower of Jesus who thinks moral action is incumbent on the law instead of the 'Spirit of life in Jesus Christ' (τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), as seen in Romans 8:2.

533. Wolter (2014:436) comments on the possible time limit inferred from Romans 5:12–13 with sin entering the world after the misstep of Adam. The problematic moment is rather found in Genesis 3:6, where awareness of the law slipped in. Wolter (2014:436) continues that Paul does not want to limit the time frame to the time between Adam and Moses.

'to awake after being dormant'. This is contrasted to the 'I' who was living. The twist in Paul's use of this imagery is that Sin has sprung to life. Life and to come to life again are associated with living in Christ Jesus.[534] The Jesus-following audience would have been aware of this association. Unexpectedly, the active agent Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) has sprung to life through the law.

Nonetheless, in Romans 7:10a, the 'I' died (ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπέθανον).[535] The emphasis is placed on the 'I' with ἐγὼ δέ in the beginning of the sentence and creates a contrast with the 'I' who was living then in Romans 7:9a. The very commandment that was supposed to bring life proved to be for the 'I' to cause his or her death.[536] The clause Romans 7:10b (καὶ εὑρέθη) illustrates the result of the process (καὶ ὡρέθη) with the dative (μοι) signifying that it affects at a personal level (Michel 1966:228). The preposition εἰς is used in this case to indicate a goal (Oepke 1964b:429).[537] The assumption is that the law leads to life, but this does not transpire according to Romans 7:10c. The commandment that should lead to life is the very commandment that leads to death (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον). The demonstrative pronoun (αὕτη) refers back to the commandment (ἡ ἐντολή) in Romans 7:8 and 9, emphasising the disillusionment. It is important that the law itself is not the problem, but Sin manipulating it (Zeller 1985:140). The 'I' wants to live. The law was intended for life, but through the law, Sin is able to take an opportunity causing the opposite to happen, namely, death (Hultgren 2011:280). In Romans 7:10, εἰς emphasises the result of the law manipulated by Sin, namely, death. Death is interpreted in contrast to a living relationship with God (Bauer et al. 2000:443).[538]

534. For example, Romans 6:11, 13; 14:9: εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν, ἵνα καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ ζώντων κυριεύσῃ [for to this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of the living].

535. Wolter (2014:437) mentions that this death is relevant to the eschatological '*Heilsverlust*' and taking Romans 1:32 and 6:21, 23 into account, refers to a person losing his '*Heil*' because of his or her missteps of the law. In 11 Q5 19:9–10, '*Dem Tod verfallen war ich in meiner Sünde, und meine Verschuldungen lieferten mich an Scheol aus*'. Jewett (2007:451) argues that sin has emerged to turn the commandment into an instrument for gaining honour. His view relies on the assumption that Paul is addressing house churches competing against one another. I do not think Paul is addressing the house churches nor that the main concern exhibited here is honour.

536. In Romans 7:10, the clause καὶ εὑρέθη μοι ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν, αὕτη εἰς θάνατον is an aorist passive followed by a dative with an indirect object μοι. A form of the verb 'to be' is required in the translation (Bauer et al. 2000:412).

537. The εἰς reflects the seriousness of Paul's imagery. It is reminiscent of Romans 6:17 proving that being obedient to the wrong master leads to death in contrast to being obedient to Christ which leads to life. Cf. Romans 6:16, 18, and 21.

538. Wasserman (2008a:405–406) argues that 'killing' and 'dying' in Romans 7:7–13 function as metaphors for domination and control. 'I died', 'sin deceived me' and 'killed me' and 'worked death in me' are equivalents to the irrational passions that overpowered the mind as seen in the Platonic tradition. It is normal in the Platonic tradition to personify irrational passions as malevolent, devious and deceptive beings that overrun the soul and rise to rule in place of its natural master.

Romans 7:11a (ἡ γὰρ ἁμαρτία ἀφορμὴν λαβοῦσα διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς) repeats the metaphor of opportunity as Sin taking an opportunity through the commandment, highlighting the true root of the problem, namely, Sin. In Romans 7:8b, the result of Sin taking an opportunity culminates in the total control of the 'I'. In Romans 7:11b–c, however, there is a significant progression in Paul's use of the personification of Sin. Sin is a manipulator and killer. The argument indicated that Sin is not a good lord to be obedient to and that being for Sin leads to death, but the identification of Sin as the death-giver is novel. Sin has caused the death of the 'I' through this manipulation of the law, and has also managed to deceive (ἐξαπατάω) the 'I' and kill (ἀποκτείνω) the 'I'.

The use of 'deception' (ἐξαπατάω) has been pointed out as reminiscent of the serpent's deception in Genesis 3:13 (Cranfield 1975:352; Jewett 2007:452; Michel 1966:228; Zeller 1985:140),[539] which Paul also uses in 2 Corinthians 11:3 (cf. 1 Tm 2:14). It is possible that Paul has the original tale of the fall of man in sight (Wolter 2014:438). However, Wasserman (2008a:405) succinctly argues that the fact that the verb for deception found in Romans 7:11 shares the root verb of the LXX Genesis 3:13 is insufficient evidence that Romans 7 alludes to Eve.[540]

Accordingly, Paul concludes (ὥστε) his argument that the law is not the problem, but Sin in Romans 7:12a (ὥστε ὁ μὲν νόμος ἅγιος), reminding the audience the law is indeed holy. Paul underscores the value of the law with the threefold expression ἡ ἐντολὴ ἁγία καὶ δικαία καὶ ἀγαθή [the law is holy and righteous and good] (Rm 7:12b).[541] Paul picks up the motif of ἀγαθός in Romans 7:13, and instead of employing νόμος or ἐντολή, Paul uses ἀγαθός to describe the law.[542] In Romans 7:13a (Τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος), Paul revisits the original question in Romans 7:7, namely is the law sin? In Romans 7:13, he asks whether the good has become the cause of death for 'me'? (τὸ οὖν ἀγαθὸν ἐμοὶ ἐγένετο θάνατος). This brings the death of the 'I' as a result of Sin taking an opportunity through the law into focus. Once more, as seen in Romans 7:7, the notion of the law being sin is emphatically refuted in Romans 7:13b. It is not the law that is the problem. The adversative particle ἀλλά in Romans 7:13c sheds light on the true problem, that is, ἡ ἁμαρτία. In an essentially repetitive

539. The verb ἐξαπατάω which has the same connotation as ἀπατάω of deceiving and appears in the original account of Adam's alibi.

540. Contra Dunn (1988:384).

541. Paul's view of the law stands within mainstream Judaism (Hultgren 2011:280). The adjectives ἅγιος, δίκαιος and ἀγαθός are often found in Deuteronomy 4:8; 2 Maccabees 6:23, 6:28; 2 Ezra 19:13; Nehemiah 9:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 4.295 and Spr. 4:2 to describe the law (Michel 1966:229; Wolter 2014:439). The adjective ἀγαθός describes ἐντολή as a characterisation of things that have social significance and worth (Bauer et al. 2000:4). δίκαιος also situates the law as righteous. Partaking in the holiness of God is worthy of respect, reverence and awe as was the conventional view also reflected in 2 Maccabees 6:23, 28, 'holy law', 4 Ezra 9:37.

542. Cf. Epictetus Diss. 4.3.11–12. Cf. Romans 7:16; 1 Timothy 1:8.

manner, Paul elaborates on the actions of Sin in two final clauses, in Romans 7:13d–f. In the first final clause (ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία, διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μοι κατεργαζομένη θάνατον), the rare expression ἵνα φανῇ ἁμαρτία [that sin might be shown][543] appears, duplicating that Sin misconstrues through the good (διὰ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ), suggesting the law to engender death.[544] In the second final clause (ἵνα γένηται καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς ἡ ἁμαρτία διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς), 'in order that the sin might become' connotes that Sin might become sinful beyond measure (καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν ἁμαρτωλὸς)[545] through the commandment (διὰ τῆς ἐντολῆς) (Cranfield 1975:354). Bauer et al. (2000:199) list γίνομαι to imply something results in something for someone. This is not the first time that Paul draws on an image of excess. This image recalls Romans 5:20. In a similar final clause construction, it is indicated that where Sin increased, righteousness was abundant (ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία, ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις). It can be deduced that favour (χάρις) supersedes Sin (ἁμαρτία). However, it should also be noted that χάρις is associated with Christ. In Romans 5:21, it becomes clear as χάρις might reign through righteousness in eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord (ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). The law itself is good, but when manipulated by Sin, it becomes exceedingly sinful.

Persuasion in Romans 7:7–13

The *inclusio* encircles the premise that the law is good. The imagery of Sin being portrayed as a power that takes a chance is repeated. On the one hand, the imagery underscores the law becomes problematic when Sin takes an opportunity through the commandment exempting the law from any suspicion. The repetition highlights the ensuing relationship of dominion between believers and Sin.

The hegemony of Sin is depicted as a force that deceives and kills (Rm 7:11). Sin takes a chance and accomplishes all desired things, specifically ἐν ἐμοί [in me]. The space of destruction is clear, namely, the body of the believer.

543. This is the only occurrence of the verb φαίνομαι in Romans and the verb denotes 'to be recognised' (Bauer et al. 2000:1047). The only other pre-Pauline occurrences are found in LXX Psalms 2:17: ἵνα φανῇ τὸ κρίμα σου [in order that your judgement might appear] and Herodotus Hist. 3.137.22 reporting that Democedes acted 'in order to seem worthy in Darius' eyes' (ἵνα φανῇ πρὸς Δαρίου ἐών … δοκιμός) (Jewett 2007:459).

544. According to Wolter (2014:443), the same '*Unheilstod*', as found in Romans 7:10–11, features in this verse.

545. The expression καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν [beyond measure] evokes an image of a scale with the point of the scale at extent (Bauer et al. 2000:1032). The expression is popular with Attic orators. Paul also employs it in 1 Corinthians 12:31; 2 Corinthians 1:8; 4:17, and Galatians 1:13. Jewett (2007:459) interprets this idiom to illustrate the strife for honour, which in itself was not necessarily viewed as sin's law bending, but as competition between members of house churches. For Jewett (2007:460), Paul's use of sin as twisting the commandment into a method of gaining honour is unique. In my view, it can rather be inferred from the text that sin is trying to seize (as started in Rm 7:8 and repeated in Rm 7:11) the self (ἐμοί). The strife is currently located in the self and not between persons, although the Roman audience would have been well-acquainted with the notion of honour.

The self becomes the dominated space with all desired things signalling a general state of decay in Romans 7:8. Sin is a destructive power, not only is Sin a ruler that brings its own subjects into decay but also ultimately Sin kills its subjects.

However, the audience knows that they have been freed and separated from Sin. The audience cannot be dominated by Sin because they are not under the Law, but under Favour, as seen in Romans 6:14. The only way that Sin can have this hegemonic power in the self is if believers succumb to their desires. If they heed to the manipulation of Sin, Sin will take an opportunity in the believer. When believers are not obedient to Christ, as seen in Romans 6:15, 19, they provide Sin a chance to grab hold of their bodies as instruments for Sin. Paul illustrates the assumption of a time without the law in which Sin is deemed as dead, rendered as lifeless and without any effect, but Sin sprang to life. Sin as a hegemonic force is coherently portrayed with the metaphor of opportunity in Romans 7:7–13. Believers should be slaves of God, blocking any foothold of Sin. The body that is a slave to God becomes a space that is protected from calamity, orientated towards life and results in eternal life (cf. Rm 6:22).

The Spirit versus the flesh (Rm 7:14–20)

In Romans 7:7–13, Paul ascertains that the law is good. This premise is in Romans 7:14–20, but the relationship between law and Sin is unpacked again from a new standpoint, namely the contrast between Spirit and flesh. Throughout Romans 7:14–25, a conflict situation is evident within the 'I' as a result of being under the Sin (ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) and implicitly under its authority.[546] The argument in Romans 7:14–20 follows two similar lines of thinking that can be traced in Romans 7:14–16 and Romans 7:17–20. Paul assumes the audience already knows that the law is spiritual, but the 'I' is of the flesh. The argument in Romans 7:14–16 describes the situation of the 'I' as having been sold under Sin. This predicament causes the 'I' to not do what the 'I' wants, but to do what the 'I' hates even though the 'I' agrees that the law is good.

In Romans 7:17–20, the 'I' is no longer in control, but Sin dwells within the 'I'. Again, the argument mirrors Romans 7:14–16, confirming it is in the flesh of the 'I' where that which is good does not dwell. Even if the 'I' wants to do good, it cannot do good. The same predicament in Romans 7:19, as in Romans 7:15, is seen as the 'I' cannot do the good the 'I' wants to do, but only does the evil which the 'I' does not want to do. Romans 7:20 repeats Romans 7:17

546. It is significant that Paul uses ὑπό and the definite article – the sin (τὴν ἁμαρτίαν). The sense of ὑπό is 'under the power or authority of'. As can also be inferred from Matthew 8:9 and Luke 7:8 (Cranfield 1975:357).

accentuating that the 'I' is no longer in control, but is overtaken by the Sin dwelling in the 'I'.

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 7:14–16

The second line of the argument affirms the law is good ushered in Romans 7:14 with the phrase 'for we know' (οἴδαμεν γάρ).[547] The audience is already familiar with this notion.[548] Romans 7:14b (ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστιν) builds on the argument with the novel concept that the law is spiritual.[549] The word πνευματικός describes having to do with the (divine) Spirit.[550] Romans 7:10 (ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ εἰς ζωήν) already encapsulates πνευματικός (Zahn 1925:349). Although Paul established this link between the law and the spiritual realm, which is usually associated with God, he juxtaposes πνευματικός [spiritual] with σάρκινος [fleshly]. This contrast establishes a pattern of recurrence with Romans 7:5 where the contrast is initiated (Wilckens 1993:86). The 'we who know' (οἴδαμεν)[551] the law is spiritual is set against the 'I' (ἐγώ) in Romans 7:14c (ἐγὼ δὲ σάρκινός εἰμι) placed in the emphatic position associated with σάρκινος [of the fleshly].[552] The 'I' is clearly in a negative disposition as σάρκινος means 'carnal or worldly orientation closed off to the spirit' (Bauer et al. 2000:914; Cranfield 1975:357; Jewett 2007:461)[553] The use of σάρκινος also picks Romans 7:5 up on the description of what the flesh domain (ἐν τῇ σαρκί) is. Hegemony is prevalent with the position of the ἐγώ [I] as the situation becomes clearer in

547. The phrase οἴδαμεν γάρ seems nonsensical when it is considered that this pericope is mostly in the first person. Zahn (1925:349) interprets οἴδαμεν as οἶδα μεν. Wilckens (1993:85) rightly notes that the use of the plural cannot be convincingly explained. Syntactically, the rest of the verse is not dependent on this phrase.

548. This style is typically used by Paul as seen in Romans 2:2; 3:19; 8:22, 28; 1 Corinthians 8:1, 4; and 2 Corinthians 5:1 and functions as an introduction formula drawing the addressees into the argument (Cranfield 1975:355; Greijdanus 1933:342; Michel 1966:229; Wilckens 1993:85; Wolter 2014:444).

549. Paul is not personifying the law again in Romans 7:14 as was the case in Romans 7:1. The definite article is used in a general sense to refer to the law.

550. For example, Philo in Abraham 113: ἢ προφητῶν ἢ ἀγγέλων μεταβαλόντων ἀπὸ πνευματικῆς καὶ ψυχοειδοῦς οὐσίας [prophets or of the angels who had changed their spiritual and soul-like essence] (Bauer et al. 2000:837).

551. Paul could be drawing from the notion in Judaism that the law derives from divine origin affirming its authority. Early Jesus followers made similar claims concerning their sacred writings as seen in Matthew 22:43; Mark 12:36; Acts 1:16; 4:25; 28:25; and 2 Peter 1:21, but in different terms (Cranfield 1975:355; Jewett 2007:460).

552. Paul has already indicated in Romans 7:5 that σάρξ is associated with being under the control of sin. Wolter (2014:445) argues that the antithesis of the Torah as spiritual against the self-characterisation of the 'I' as being of the flesh functions as a metonymy of the relationship between humans and God.

553. Michel (1966:230) remarks that the notion 'flesh' derives from a Semitic–Hellenistic pre-tradition. In secular terms, σάρκινος refers to obesity (e.g., Eupolis Comic Frag. 387 'a corpulent woman'), to human limitation (e.g., Aristophanes Inc. Fab. 26.1., 'not as another man of the flesh'; Sib. Or., Frag. 1.1.; Aristotle Eth. Nic. 1117b 3; Polybius Hist. 38.8.6) and susceptibility to corruption (e.g., Epicurus Dep. 16.1., 'what is flesh is capable of corruption'). These images of excessiveness in terms of obesity and corruption seem to fit like a glove after the excessive illustration of sin in becoming sinful beyond measure and using the law to deceive, as seen in Romans 7:13.

Romans 7:14d (πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν) as the 'I' finds itself having been sold under Sin (Michel 1966:231; Wolter 2014:446).[554] This image underscores a loss of control for the 'I'. In Romans 6:15, 19, the image of being a slave to Sin was already seen, but a believer had an active role to play in the decision to which master to be obedient to or to present himself or herself to.

The phrase πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν [having been sold under sin] is *sui generis* to Paul (Jewett 2007:461) and a solecism.[555] Sin is personified as the preposition ὑπό with the noun ἁμαρτία indicating subjection. The 'I' is literally under Sin, but what is more, Sin is further depicted as a slave dealer as Paul draws on the source domain of πιπράσκω [sell]. The verb πιπράσκω [sell] occurs in various commercial contexts including slavery, for example, LXX Leviticus 25:39 and LXX Isaiah 50:1, where being sold into slavery and captivity is associated with Israel's sin (Jewett 2007:461; Stowers 1994:281).[556] Writers frequently use πιπράσκω as a metaphor for betrayal and disloyalty, for example, 1 Maccabees 1:15: 'they (Jewish Hellenizers) joined with the gentiles and were sold to do evil' (Stowers 1994:280). It is frequently used in the handing over of a captive or prisoner (Stowers 1994:281). A Hellenistic parallel occurs in an inscription from Asia Minor in which a slave Antigone is to be 'sold from among her fellow slaves' and given over to the power of Demeter an infernal deity who will 'not be propitious to her' (Newton 1863:725–727). In Ps. Demosth. 17, 13, τοῖς πεπρακὸσιν ἑαυτους εἰς τἀναντία [to those who have sold themselves to what is opposed (to their country's interests)] (Bauer et al. 2000:815). These ample examples illuminate that πιπράσκω [sell] also draws on the source domain of slaves being sold. The imagery enhances the fleshly existence of the 'I' as the 'I' is powerless under the power of Sin (Zahn 1925:351).

In Romans 7:14, the distinction between πνευματικός [spiritual] and σάρκινος [fleshly] is evident with the latter situation associated with the dominion of Sin. Up until this point, Paul has used the image of slavery, but the believer always had a choice as the believer could choose to be obedient. However, the situation becomes dire in Romans 7 as the 'I' is of the flesh and, accordingly, already within the space of Sin's dominion. Slaves are obliged to do what the master wants (Wolter 2014:446), but in Romans 7:14, the 'I' becomes more entangled in this hegemony.

554. Wolter (2014:446) mentions that Paul illustrates the hegemonic relationship as the loss of the 'I's' ethnic autonomy as he or she is under Sin.

555. The faulty grammar is seen that πιπράσκω refers to the ones who sell being in the *dativ casus* and not being ὑπό with an accusative, as is also seen in Diodorus Siculus 16,83,1; Plutarch. Eum. 8,5; Lv 25,39; Bar 4,6; JosAs 24,9 (Wolter 2014:446).

556. Goodrich (2013:495) argues that πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν is a complex allusion to Isaiah 50:1, echoing the Isaiah 49–50 evoking images of the Babylonian exile. Goodrich's argument is built on the work done by Philonenko tracing 11 QPs 19:11 as an echo of Isaiah 50:1 as well as Romans 7:14 (Goodrich 2013:476–495). However, Philonenko's methodology is not sound.

However, having been sold under Sin, the 'I' is engaged in a conflict within the self.[557] The extent of this conflict comes to the fore in Romans 7:15a as γάρ also marks an elaboration (Wilckens 1993:86). The verb κατεργάζομαι of the relative clause (ὃ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι) in Romans 7:15 means 'to accomplish' and the sentence expresses: 'what I am accomplishing I really do not know'.[558] The utterance in Romans 7:15b sheds further light (γάρ) on this. That which the 'I' want, the 'I' do not do (οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω τοῦτο πράσσω). Romans 7:15c (ἀλλ᾽ ὃ μισῶ τοῦτο ποιῶ) underscores the contrast (ἀλλά) of what the 'I' does, the 'I' do that which the 'I' hates.[559] The conflict is intensified with the only appearance of the verb μισέω [hate] in the Pauline letters.[560] In what seems as an essentially repetitive manner, Romans 7:16 reflects this conflict within the self between what the 'I' wants,[561] that is, the good which also implies the law, and what the 'I' does reflected in the verbs ποιέω and πράσσω [to do] which functions as synonyms,[562] with the demonstrative pronoun οὗτος repeated three times (Rm 7:15b,c and 7:16a) accentuating 'this' that which the 'I' does not want to do. Not only does the 'I' find the law good but also the 'I' agrees that the law is good in Romans 7:16b–c (σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ ὅτι καλός).[563] The noun καλός reminds of ἀγαθός used for the law in Romans 7:12 (Wilckens 1993:86). The effect of the metaphor of having been sold to Sin is seen as the 'I' has been doing these things that he or she does not want to do, because as a slave he or she had to obey his or her master.[564]

557. See 'The 'I' debate' for more detail.

558. The verb κατεργάζομαι has the same meaning as Romans 7:13 (Wilckens 1993:86).

559. In classical parallels, Epictetus describes the contradiction of a person lacking reason and thus acting in ignorance against his better interest: 'what he wants he does not do, and what he does not want he does' Diss. 2.26.4 or in the case of Ovid where a weak-willed person says 'I perceive what is better and approve of it, but I pursue what is worse' Metam. 7.20–21, Ovid, metam. 7,19 (Michel 1966:231).

560. The verb μισέω means in this context detest and not disfavour (Bauer et al. 2000:652).

561. The notion of 'to want' (θέλω) occurs seven times. The meaning of the verb θέλω is nuanced as to have something in mind for oneself, such as a purpose or resolve to do something (Bauer et al. 2000:448).

562. Paul's use of the verbs πράσσω and ποιέω both resonate with earlier occurrences of the law in Romans. The former in Romans 2:25 'practice the law' and the latter in Romans 2:13 'doers of the law'. That what the 'I' wants to do is the good or as the good also implies is to follow the law. It is possible that the verbs πράσσω and ποιέω are used as synonyms, or more likely that a distinction is intended between κατεργάζομαι and ποιέω, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, πράσσω. The verb πράσσω is less definite as it is never used with reference to an action of God and predominantly used when an activity is disapproved (Cranfield 1975:358).

563. Cf. Romans 7:22. The verb συνήδομαι is used to express rejoicing with others as can be seen in Philo Conf. 7 συνήδετο καὶ συναηδίζετο [community of languages led them to impart to each other their pleasures and discomforts], Xenophon Symp. 8.18 refers to friends συνήδεσθαι δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς κάλαις πράξεσι [sharing a common joy in life's pleasures] and Plato's explanation in Resp. 462e of the ideal state in which all will ἢ ξυνησθήσεται ἅπασα ἑαυτῆς εἶναι τὸ πάσχον [share the pleasure or pain].

564. Wolter (2014:453) also argues that Paul illustrates a '*Herrschaftsverhältnis*' continuing the metaphor of being slaves from Romans 7:14 under sin.

The self becomes the conflicted space where Sin and what the 'I' truly wants to do struggle for power. Having been sold to Sin envelops the self under the hegemony of Sin. The self and per implication the body of the believers becomes the space dominated by Sin, as the 'I' cannot do what the 'I' wants to do. The hegemonic power Sin compels the 'I' to do what the 'I' hates. The 'I' cannot escape the dominance of Sin.

Romans 7:15 and 19 ubiquitously are Greek sayings central to the Greco-Roman ethic of self-mastery (Stowers 1994:260). Paul's argument bears similarities specifically with Euripides' account of Medea 1077b–80. Both Euripides' Medea and Paul describe conflict utilising the phrase οὐ γινώσκω [not knowing]. Paul's 'I' does not know what he or she brings about (ὃ γὰρ κατεργάζομαι οὐ γινώσκω [Rm 7:15]). However, Paul's use of not knowing is framed with two occurrences of the perfect οἶδα occurring in the plural in Romans 7:14 and in the singular in Romans 7:18. These parallel occurrences highlight the progression of the argument as the 'I' is at first not able to do (cf. Rm 7:15–16) and as the argument continues, not capable of doing (cf. Rm 17:20) what the 'I' deems as good, which refers to the law.

The turning point between Medea and Paul lies in the fact that Paul's 'I' does actually know what he does.[565] Paul's 'I' knows about the good and what the 'I' is supposed to do, namely, follow the law.

☐ Excursus: Medea

The tale of Medea would be well-known to the audience and was even used in schools (Marrou 1956:163). It is the story in Greek circles of a woman scorned seeking revenge. Medea's husband, Jason, used her in his efforts to attain the Golden Fleece. He then wishes to marry princess Glauce in Corinth. Medea is filled with jealousy. She sends Glauce a dress and a golden crown covered in poison, resulting not only in the death of the princess but also her father Creon. Medea is aware of Jason's desire to have a new family and so kills their two sons, Mermerus and Pherus, and then flees to Athens. Some sources mention that the death of her two sons was by accident, while others blame the death of the two sons on the citizens of Corinth.

The figure of Medea gained continued popularity as she was connected with purity of citizenship and ethnicity. Medea stood for foreigners who corrupted the purity of the citizen's body and her saying about ἀκρασία (bad mixture, ill temperature and lack of self-mastery) connoted the moral degeneracy that mixing with foreigners would supposedly bring. The figure of

565. Wolter (2014:451) asserts that it is not possible to determine whether Paul was aware of the Medea discussion even if some of the language uses overlaps. Furthermore, Wolter finds the ἀκρασία discussion in Medea not to really contend with what a person wants to do and what a person does, as Medea does what she wants. In contrast, it is clear that Paul has to do what he does not want to.

Medea and other passion-bound barbarian women from Greek tragedy became important in imperial Rome as early as Cicero. The type becomes a prominent oratorical slander.[566] The theme especially peaked between the struggle of Anthony and Octavian. Propagandists likened Medea to Cleopatra, Omphale and Semiramis. Niobe was recommended as a model for prosopopoeia and paralleled Medea as a type of degenerate foreign woman. On the doors of the temple of Apollo in Rome, erected as a votive for the victory at Actium, stood the scene of Niobe slaying her children. The not so subtle defeat of Anthony and Cleopatra used Niobe as a paradigm of God's wrath against barbarian *hybris* (Stowers 1994:271).

Phaedra's monologue in Euripides' Hippolytus is also linked with the failure of self-mastery (377–83): 'I do not think people do evil by nature, for many are good. But one must consider that though we know and understand what is good we do not act on what we know – some through laziness, others through preferring pleasure more than goodness' (Quoted by Stowers 1994:261). Socrates as well as Plato opposed this popular view of ἀκρασία, deeming it to be impossible for a person to act against what a person knows is right and impossible, and Plato also opposed the larger tragic perspective (Stowers 1994:261). In Medea, passion functions as a foreign power, which wrestles the dominion of the mind (Stowers 1994:262).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 7:17–20

However, the situation for Paul's 'I' changes from being a slave to the imagery of possession. Sin has been a destructive force deceiving humans through the law, but as the adverbial phrase νυνὶ δέ [now surely][567] in Romans 7:17a marks the second argument within the pericope Romans 7:14–25, it becomes evident that Sin dwells within humans. In Romans 7:17a (οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτὸ), the 'I' is no longer responsible for his or her actions as the 'I' no longer the self brings about, but the Sin dwelling in the 'I' (ἀλλὰ ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία [Rm 7:17b]) (Wolter 2014:453). In Romans 7:8, ἐν ἐμοί was already used as a place where Sin works all desired things. The 'I' is of flesh and therefore no good dwells in the 'I'. In Romans 7:17b, the spatiality is prevalent in Paul's metaphor of possession. Sin is personified again with the definite article and the noun underscoring that it is an entity. The source domain οἰκέω means 'to live or dwell' (Bauer et al. 2000:694). Usually, οἰκέω is associated with the Spirit of God that dwells in people (Weindt 2011:1210). Paul reverses the image, shocking the audience with Sin dwelling in the 'I' instead of God's Spirit. It is evident

566. Cf. Pro Cael. 7.18; Leg. Man. 8.21.

567. The phrase νυνὶ δὲ οὐκέτι [now surely it is not ...] is employed in a inferential manner and should not be interpreted from a temporal sense (Bauer et al. 2000:546, 592; Cranfield 1975:360; Jewett 2007:467; Wilckens 1993:87; Zahn 1925:353).

that the 'I', having been sold to Sin, rather results in the indwelling of Sin.[568] The metaphor ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία [sin's dwelling in me] has a distant parallel in Philo Leg. 1.78.5 (Jewett 2007)[569]:

> Now the overall intelligence that indwells the wisdom of God (ἡ οἰκοῦσα τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ σοφιάν) and his house is beautiful for it is imperishable and abides in an imperishable house. (p. 469)

Romans 7:18a (οἶδα γὰρ) is parallel with Romans 7:14, although the verb οἶδα in Romans 7:14 is in the plural, whereas the singular is used in Romans 7:18. In Romans 7:14, Paul established that the law is spiritual, but the 'I' is of the flesh and has been sold under the lordship of Sin. In Romans 7:18, Paul underscores this difference between the law and the 'I'. The clause Romans 7:18b (ὅτι οὐκ οἰκεῖ ἐν ἐμοί) repeats the metaphor of indwelling, but in a dramatic fashion, Paul elaborates on the space ἐν ἐμοί (Zahn 1925:356) with Romans 7:18c (τοῦτ᾽ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου) underscoring that the 'I' is of flesh and in the flesh (ἐν τῇ σαρκί).[570] The latter is associated with the dominion of Sin. For Paul, σάρξ is an instrument constituted by all the various body parts forming a whole, which is dominated by Sin (Bauer et al. 2000:915). Σάρξ 'flesh' functions as a metonymic description of the body. It has become the home of Sin and now describes the *conditio humana* (Cranfield 1975:361; Wilckens 1993:88; Wolter 2014:454).

The image succinctly illustrates the dire situation of the 'I' in an environment totally controlled by Sin.[571] The imagery of the flesh magnifies the improbability of the good (ἀγαθόν), namely, the law (Rm 7:13) to be at the helm of the 'I'. Sin creates such an inhabitable environment that no good can live in such conditions (Bauer et al. 2000:915).

The tragedy of the 'I' situation is elaborated on (γάρ) in Romans 7:18d (τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι), illustrating the will is at hand for the 'I' to do good. The expression τὸ θέλειν indicates the possibility to do good (Wilckens 1993:88). This is present and lives (παράκειται) in 'me'. But as the adversative clause in Romans 7:18e illustrates, accomplishing the good (τὸ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλόν) is not present in the 'I' (οὔ [παράκειταί μοι]), thus the 'I' does not bring

568. However, demonic possession does not seem to be an appropriate model for Paul's argument, according to Cranfield (1975:360). In contrast, Wolter (2014:453) and Zeller (1985:141) understand that the dominion of sin over the 'I' is being described as a demonic possession as sin dwells in a person impeding his or her autonomy, resulting in being lost to himself or herself. Wolter (2014:453) and Zeller (1985:141) use Test. Naph. 8:6 to circumscribe this argument and view it as a metaphor. Although the example dates later than Paul's letter, it offers insight into how indwelling could be understood. A similar example can be seen in Josephus *Ant.* 6, 211.

569. Schottroff (1979:501–502) argues that sin is a demonic power that exercises a reign of terror.

570. The flesh is seen here as destructive. This association is also seen in Philo Gig. 1:29: αἴτιον δὲ τῆς ἀνεπιστημοσύνης μέγιστον ἡ σὰρξ καὶ ἡ πρὸς σάρκα οἰκείωσις [and the greatest cause of our ignorance is the flesh, and our inseparable connection with the flesh]. In Sextus 317, ἀγαθὸν ἐν σαρκὶ μὴ ἐπιζήτει [do not seek goodness in the flesh]. In Epicurus, σάρξ is the bearer of sinful feelings and desires as well as the means of sensual enjoyment (Bauer et al. 2000:915). See Ep. In Plut., Mor. 135c; 1087; 1089; 1096 αἱ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐπιθυμίαι.

571. The causal coordinating conjunction γάρ indicates that the verse is supportive of Romans 7:17.

about the good (Blass et al. 1961:§399[1]). The state of human forsakenness is highlighted, as the human is not inherently evil, but extradited to the dominion of Sin (Michel 1966:232).

The substance of Romans 7:15b is repeated in Romans 7:19 (Cranfield 1975:361; Michel 1966:233; Wolter 2014:455). Again, the conflict within the self is evident. For the good, which I want (οὐ γὰρ ὃ θέλω ποιῶ ἀγαθόν [Rm 7:19a]), I do not do. But evil which I do not want (ἀλλὰ ὃ οὐ θέλω κακὸν [Rm 7:19b]), this I do (τοῦτο πράσσω [Rm 7:19c]). This refers back to the ancient ʼΑκρασία debate concerning Medea's classic dilemma between reason and passion (Wolter 2014:447–451).

In Romans 7:20a, the clause (εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ θέλω [ἐγὼ] τοῦτο ποιῶ) illustrates the dire situation of the 'I' being encroached by Sin to such a limit that the 'I' cannot be held accountable for its actions.[572] In Romans 7:20b (οὐκέτι ἐγὼ κατεργάζομαι αὐτό), the 'I' is no longer autonomous. Romans 7:20b–c repeats Romans 7:17a–b. A new vantage point on the conflict of the 'I' occurs with the repetition of the metaphor of indwelling Sin (ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία). The repetition emphasises, firstly, that the 'I' is not an instrument of Sin, but sin occupies the self and dominates to such an extent that the 'I' fails to do the good it wants to. Secondly, Paul marks a distinction between the will of the 'I' and the power of Sin within the 'I' that opposes that will. Sin is the ruling power (Michel 1966:233).

Paul's use of the metaphor of possession in Romans 7:17–20 is noteworthy as the 'I' is no longer struggling to do what the 'I' does not want to do and hates, but now the 'I' has been stripped of all autonomy. It is the Sin that lives in the 'I' that is performing the actions. A slave could still rebel against his or her lord, although there would be consequences, perhaps even death. But in Romans 7:17–20, the 'I' cannot even be disobedient like a slave could, but does not even have the autonomy to rebel. The 'I' is tragic, not only because of ἀκρασία but also because the relationship with Sin forces the 'I' to do evil.[573]

☐ Persuasion in Romans 7:14–20

Again, Paul employs sharp contrasts. In Romans 7:14, we are reminded that the law is good. Paul adds a new attribute to the law describing it as spiritual. However, the 'I' finds itself in the fleshly realm and is even put in a further disposition having been sold under Sin. Again, the preposition ὑπό [under]

572. The conditional Romans 7:20 seems to reverberate Romans 7:17–18. Rhetorically, the repetition serves as *redditio* in order to emphasise the point (Wolter 2014:455).

573. Pitta (2015:316) deems it appropriate to view Romans 7:7–25 in sapiential terms as the 'I' does not have a choice as a result of the coercion that Sin exercises with regard to the 'I' and the Mosaic Law.

marks position with Sin being in the dominating position and the 'I' literally under it.

The metaphor of being sold under Sin is developed with the ἀκρασία debate. This slavery metaphor cogently indicates the predicament of the 'I' not being able to do what the 'I' wants to do, but doing what the 'I' does not want to do. This type of discourse was well-known in Rome and shares a connection with the tale of Medea.

Medea was an important figure especially for Roman propagandists illustrating the effects of a degenerate foreign woman. Paul's audience would have picked up on the subtleties. The figure of a woman is portrayed as a bonded figure, which is also reflected in Romans 7:1–6 in the marriage analogy. Paul fiercely illustrates with his metaphor that being under Sin is a situation of subjugation and bondedness.

Nonetheless, there is a slight difference between Paul's 'I' and Medea concerning knowing. Medea acted the way she acted as she did not know any better. The same cannot be said of the 'I'. The 'I' knows better and does not have to suffer the situation of not being able to do what the 'I' wants to as the 'I' should be obedient to Christ. This idea has been established in Romans 6:17. Paul rather illustrates in detail the result of being obedient to the wrong lord, which is Sin.

However, Paul uses the slavery image again to illustrate the confinements of being under Sin in Romans 7:14–16. In Romans 7:17–20, Paul shifts to a metaphor of possession intensifying the depiction of being under Sin. As can be inferred from the slave metaphor, the 'I' had to do things he or she did not want to do. However, a slave could still disobey his or her master. There are ample examples of Roman slaves being disobedient to their masters. The consequences of disobedience are harsh ranging from being flogged to even death.

However, in Romans 7:17–20, the 'I' does not even have the autonomy to disobey his or her master. The possession metaphors in Romans 7:17 and 7:20 sketch a picture of total subjugation.

The conflict between mind and body (Rm 7:21–25)

Romans 7:21–25 marks the final section of the argument, shedding light on the relationship between law and Sin. The discontinuity between doing what the 'I' wants and that what the 'I' does continues. The premise that the law is good is prevalent. In a logical determination, the 'I' finds the law good, with the will to do the good, but the evil is at hand for the 'I'. Romans 7:22 reiterates that the inner man of the 'I' agrees with the law of God. However,

in Romans 7:23, the 'I' observes in its members another law waging war against the law of the 'I' mind and the law of Sin taking the 'I' captive in its members. The state of captivity yields the 'I' in Romans 7:24 to assert that it is a wretched human in need of someone who will save the 'I' from the body of death. In Romans 7:25, the 'I' gives thanks to God through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord as the 'I' is in its mind a slave to the law of God, but the flesh of the 'I' is a slave to the law of Sin.

Detail analysis of Romans 7:21–25

The final section of the argument of the relationship between Sin and law is seen in Romans 7:21–25 as the inferential particle ἄρα [thus] (Rm 7:21a) signals (Wilckens 1993:88). The logical formulation εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον of 7:21a conveys that the 'I' finds the law, but what is referred to by τὸν νόμον is not certain.[574] In Romans 7:21a, the verb εὑρίσκω is used in the active voice applied to the law (εὑρίσκω ἄρα τὸν νόμον), most likely signalling the law that has been manipulated by Sin as it only causes the 'I' to do the evil at hand instead of the good that it wants to do (Wilckens 1993:88). The frustration of the 'I' continues while the good the 'I' wants for itself to do (τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν [Rm 7:21b])[575] is not being done as is elucidated in the phrase of Romans 7:21c (ὅτι ἐμοὶ τὸ κακὸν παράκειται) that the evil is present with 'me'. The dative *commodi* in Romans 7:21a (τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ) is mirrored in Romans 7:21b with ἐμοί. The phrase 'the bad lies within my reach'[576] reverberates Romans 7:18d (τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι). This imagery echoes a state of possession.[577] This law that the 'I' finds is crippling the 'I' as the 'I' is still not capable to do what the 'I' truly wants to do.

Romans 7:22 ensues elaborating on (γάρ) the dichotomy of the 'I' wanting to do good, but only managing the evil at hand. Underneath the dominion of Sin, the inner being still deems the law good with the premise of the argument surfacing again, namely, the law is good. However, in Romans 7:22a, νόμος

574. It is not certain what is exactly intended with the law as the Torah or law in general. Wolter (2014:256–257) argues that νόμος is not being used in the same way as in Romans 7:14–20, but is used here metaphorically as an expression for something like a rule or a lawfulness (cf. Hultgren 2011:291; Wilckens 1993:89). However, the phrase τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ refers to the Torah in Romans 7:22.

575. The object of θέλω is νόμος and the object of ποιέω is καλός being an infinitive of purpose 'in order to do good'. The object of εὑρίσκω is τὸν νόμον and the dative τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ is not dependent on εὑρίσκω. It is possible to understand τῷ θέλοντι ἐμοὶ ποιεῖν τὸ καλόν as a dative of disadvantage with εὑρίσκω, but it is better to interpret it with the ὅτι clause. The placement is probably to emphasise (Wilckens 1993:88–89). Contra Zahn (1925:357).

576. The expression παράκειταί μοι [lies ready at hand for me] appears nowhere else in Christian literature. In Sirach 31:16, it is used as an admonition 'eat like a human being what is set before you' which fit the basic meaning, lie ready at disposal (Jewett 2007:468).

577. In effect, Romans 7:21–23 functions as a summary of Romans 7:14–20 (Wolter 2014:455).

signifies Mosaic Law (Wilckens 1993:90). The phrase συνήδομαι τῷ νόμῳ (Rm 7:22) is an augmentation of σύμφημι τῷ νόμῳ (Rm 7:16b) signalling the contrast between 'want' and 'do' and is propelled in a war between the law of the 'I's' mind and the law of Sin (Wilckens 1993:94).

This is not the first instance in which Paul uses the concept of the inner man. It is also in 2 Corinthians 4:16, where Paul refers to our outer self (ὁ ἔξω ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος) as having been destroyed (διαφθείρεται) and our inner self (ὁ ἔσω ἡμῶν) as being renewed day by day (ἀνακαινοῦται ἡμέρᾳ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ).[578] For Paul, there is an inner man and an outer man (Cranfield 1975:363). Paul separates what the 'I' wants and what the 'I' does. This separation seems to also function at an intellectual as well as bodily level as Paul refers to the inner[579] man (ἔσω ἄνθρωπον [Rm 7:22a]) (Wolter 2014:452).[580] It is this inner man that wants to do good, follow the law and consequently function in an intellectual capacity. This intellectual capacity can be inferred from the connection between the phrase τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον (Rm 7:23) and νοός μου (Rm 7:23). It is the mind that recognises the law of God (νόμῳ θεοῦ [Rm 7:25, 23]). The law of God is different than the other law (of Sin), which entails an element of forcing a person to do something they do not want to do (Michel 1966:233). A wordplay concerning law forms in Romans 7:22–23: τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ [the law of God], ἕτερον νόμον [another law], τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου [the law of my mind] and τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας [the law of sin].[581] There is an ongoing struggle between the 'inner being' and 'my members' (Michel 1966:233). The former associates with 'mind' affirming the goodness of the law, and the latter associates with 'Sin' (Hultgren 2011:291).

Paul continues with bodily imagery in Romans 7:23a with the phrase βλέπω δέ [but I see] enlisting the sense of eyesight. In Romans 7:23b–c, the body becomes a clear space of contention with another law waging war against the law of the mind. The body has been subjected to the dominion of Sin (Rm 7:5) in the argument, but in Romans 7:23b, the body is presented as a place of war. The phrase ἐν τοῖς μέλεσιν already seen in Romans 6:13; 6:19; 7:5 is employed again, but in Romans 7:23b, instead of the personal pronoun in the plural, the

578. Cf. Ephesians 3:16; 1 Peter 3:4 (Michel 1966:234; Wilckens 1993:93). Cf. CorpHerm 115 ὁ οὐσιώδης ἄνθρωπος; 118.21 ὁ ἔννους ἄνθρωπος; XIII7 ὁ ἐνδιάθετος ἄνθρωπος.

579. The adverb ἔσω denotes inside/within, as there is no verb of motion (Bauer et al. 2000:398).

580. Paul coins middle Platonist ideas with his use of 'inner/outer man' and although he draws on Platonist ideas his anthropology is not dualistic (Jewett 2007:470). However, Wolter (2014:459), in contrast, does not find the linguistical overlaps between Paul and Plato as well as middle Platonism convincing as the ideas within their contexts are used vastly different. He rather suggests that Paul is drawing on 2 Corinthians 4:16 and reuses it here with a new meaning.

581. Wasserman (2008a:407) contends that the law of sin is a play of words that expresses the incorrigible desires of the passions and appetites to pursue evil ends. Something similar can be spotted in Philo's description of Cain as a city 'whose laws are lawlessness' Post. 52.

'I' singular (μου) is used. The body has been depicted as a tool for slave owners, but in Romans 7:23b it becomes a place where a war is waged. Paul uses μέλος as a metonymy because it refers to the whole body as the sum of its parts. The phrase ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου [in my members] is repeated twice stressing the fact that the members are in contention for either the law of the mind or the other law.

In Romans 7:23a, the personal pronoun emphasises that the specific location for the activity of the forces is in the body of the self. The preposition ἐν is used in a locative (Wilckens 1993:92) manner illustrating that the members are the specific space in which there is a different law (ἕτερον νόμον) waging war against the law of the mind (ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου).[582]

Paul characterises this other law (ἕτερος νόμος), which is the law of Sin, with two participial terms interpreting the conflict between wanting and doing as a war (Wolter 2014:460).[583] It seems that 'another law in my members' (ἕτερον νόμον ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου) and 'the law of sin being in my members' (τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας τῷ ὄντι ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου) function as synonyms.[584] The ἕτερος νόμος [other law][585] is not only the aggressor but also the victor in this war (Wolter 2014:460). It is Sin that takes the 'me' captive. The law of sin (αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας) makes the 'I' a prisoner to the law (Bauer et al. 2000:31).[586] Hegemony can be traced as Sin is in the position of power and the 'I' is in a disposition of being a captive prisoner of war.[587]

In Romans 7:23b, the metaphor of dominion draws on the source domain of war. Paul draws on the military verbs ἀντιστρατεύομαι [to be at war with an enemy][588] and αἰχμαλωτίζομαι [to be captured in war]. The source domain αἰχμαλωτίζομαι means 'caught by the spear and denotes a prisoner of war' (Link & Tuente 1978:590–591). In both the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament,

582. Similar cases: Aeschylus, Sept. 622; Euripides, El. 387; Empedocles, frag. 126; Plutarch, De esu carn. 4; Philo, Heir 268, Alleg. Interpr. 2. 49 σάρξ is contrasted with νοός (Spicq 1994r:232).

583. The phrase ἀντιστρατευόμενον τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου means 'to be at war with the law of my mind' (Bauer et al. 2000:90).

584. Cranfield (1975:364) and Jewett (2007:470) suggest that it is quite natural to associate τοῦ νοός μου [which my mind acknowledges] with νόμος τοῦ θεοῦ in Romans 7:22. The noun νοῦς is contrasted with the side of life that is physical and refers to the higher mental part of a human (Bauer et al. 2000:680).

585. Cranfield (1975:364) mentions that Paul uses law in this verse metaphorically to denote the exercise of power, authority and control exercised by sin.

586. In the Roman Empire being defeated also meant being subjected to slavery, death in an imperial theatre or, if a prisoner was particularly attractive or important, he or she would be executed in honour of Jupiter at the end of the victory parade (Jewett 2007:471).

587. This is also not the first time that Paul draws on this type of language as in 2 Corinthians 10:5; it is not sin, but Christ who is in the position of power: αἰχμαλωτίζοντες πᾶν νόημα εἰς τὴν ὑπακοὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ [we take every thought captive and make it obey Christ].

588. Cf. Xenophon Cyr. 8.8.26; Dio Chrysostom Orat. 32.90.

a 'prisoner of war' is a miserable person who stands in special need of God's help.[589] In the Hebrew Bible, the thought of imprisonment is always linked with prayer and liberation (Kittel 1964:196). However, the thought of imprisonment in war is carried over into the inner moral and religious struggle of man (Kittel 1964:196). The use of αἰχμαλωτίζομαι is unique to Paul in the New Testament (Kittel 1964:196). In Romans 7:23, it illustrates subjection to Sin. In 2 Corinthians 10:5, Paul also uses αἰχμαλωτίζομαι to indicate subjection, but the subjection of our thoughts to Christ (Kittel 1964:196).

Romans 7:24 depicts the dire situation of the 'I' subjected to Sin in the body of death. It is from a place of being captured as a prisoner of war that the cry 'how wretched a person am I' (ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος [Rm 7:24a]) originates.[590] The famous parallel to Paul's words in Romans 7:24 is Ovid's Met. 7.17–21 (quoted by Stowers 1994), where Medea is dialoguing with herself:

> Oh wretched one, drive out these flames that you feel from your maiden breast if you can, If I could, I would be more reasonable. But some strange power holds me back against my will. Desire impedes me one-way, my mind another. I see what is better and approve it, but I follow the worse. Why do you, a royal maiden, burn for a stranger, and think about marriage in a foreign world? (p. 263)

The 'I' is torn between his or her will to follow the law of God and the life of flesh and cries out for a saviour (Stowers 1994:280). In Romans 7:24b, this becomes prevalent in the rhetorical question, 'who will save me?' (τίς με ῥύσεται ...).[591]

The verb ῥύομαι [to be rescued] is in the future. It is from out of this of a body of death (ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου)[592] that the 'I' needs to be rescued from as the question 'who will save me' (τίς με ῥύσεται) indicates.[593] Being rescued from this body of death means to be rescued from the power

589. Cf. Psalms 79:11 (Kittel 1964:195–197, 195).

590. Cf. LXX Samuel 4:8; LXX 6 Ezra 16:17. The phrase Ταλαίπωρος ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος [how wretched a person am I] has parallels in early Attic, Hermetic, Stoic, Cynic, Hellenistic Jewish sources as the adjective ταλαίπωρος [wretched] occurs.

591. Wolter (2014:461) postulates that this emphasises that help can only come from outside – a person needs God to save him or her.

592. It is not clear whether τούτου should be interpreted with τοῦ σώματος or τοῦ θανάτου. Jewett (2007:472) opts for 'the body of this death' following the word sequence and mentions that the death in view here is probably Paul's violent persecutions prior to his conversion. This argument does not hold, as the 'I' is not autobiographic. Cranfield (1975:367) deems τούτου to fit better with σώματος as the 'I' is saved from the condition of the body under the occupation of sin and if it was not so, the 'I' would have succumbed to death. The phrase τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου refers to the human nature of the 'I' in its condition when it is under the occupation of the 'other law' which is the usurping authority of sin (Cranfield 1975:366). Wolter (2014:462) suggests that τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου refers metonymically to Romans 6:6 expressing a determinative existence of the earlier person. The dualism of body and soul is seen here, as Paul does not identify the 'I' with the soul but with the body. The death referred to is the death found in Romans 7:10–11:13, thus being the '*Unheilstod*' (Wolter 2014:462).

593. Wolter (2014:462) deems the question not to be rhetorical as it illustrates the despair of the 'I'.

of death (Bauer et al. 2000:907). The body of death describes being under the power of Sin, as Death accompanies Sin. A person is still susceptible to death, but those who belong to the Resurrected Christ will be saved from the mortal body's qualm. A similar occurrence can be seen in AcPl Ha 3,7: ἐκ δεσμῶν ἐρύσατο τὸν κόσμον ὅλον [(God who) rescued the entire world from its chains] (Bauer et al. 2000:907). This is also seen in 2 Corinthians 1:10, where he has saved us from a great death and will save (ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύσεται).

Romans 7:25 does not answer the question in Romans 7:24. God is thanked as believers are situated under God's Favour. They have been protected from the horrible scenario sketched with the body of death. Believers and Paul have undergone a status change, accordingly gratitude χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ [but thanks be to God],[594] reminiscent of Romans 6:17, where Paul thanks God for his righteousness (Cranfield 1975:367; Jewett 2007:472).

Romans 7:25 is best understood as a parenthetic interjection of the authorial voice within the speech of the imaginary persona (Stowers 1994:281).[595] The adversative particle δέ in Romans 7:25a indicates the distinct difference between the 'body of death' in contrast with the power of Christ. Paul now also uses the plural ἡμῶν [us] instead of the first person, which has been dominant in this pericope. It is through the agency of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν) that it is possible to be out of the power of Sin. Believers are under the dominion of Jesus Christ. This refers back to Romans 7:6, where the audience already knows that they have been saved from the body of death. It also connects to Romans 8:1, as believers are exempt from condemnation, as they are located in Christ.

However, the body remains a contested space, as the flesh is continually associated with Sin and inherently death. Paul states in Romans 7:25b that the 'I' is in his or her mind a slave to the law of God, but in the 'I's' sinful nature a slave to the law of Sin (ἐγὼ τῷ μὲν νοῖ δουλεύω νόμῳ θεοῦ τῇ δὲ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας [Rm 7:25b]). The use of the verb δουλεύω recalls Romans 6:15–23, where being a slave of Jesus Christ has been illustrated as positive. The 'I' would rather be a slave to the law of God in contrast to the alternative lordship of Sin. The dichotomy between the law of God and the law of Sin persists as will unfold again in Romans 8:2. For Paul, sin is a continual problem. Even if the believer is under the lordship of Christ, there is always a possibility of the believer falling back into the lordship of Sin. Sin is a defeated power and should play

594. For example, gratitude is the proper response to a deity for benefits conferred as seen in Jos. *Ant.* 7, 208.

595. Both Romans 7:25 and Romans 8:2 are indicative of the first- and second-person singular used to represent the third person (Blass et al. 1961:§281). In the light of ancient prosopopoeia, the 'you' fits well (Stowers 1994:281–282).

no role. However, the believer could give Sin power if he or she is obedient to the wrong lord, as seen especially in Romans 6.

Persuasion in Romans 7:21–25

In Romans 7:21–25, the final segment of Paul's argument concerning the relationship between the law and Sin unfolds. In Romans 7:21, we become aware the 'I' is still immersed in a conflict. The law that has been manipulated by Sin causes the conflict. The 'I' continues not to be able to do what the 'I' wants to do.

The conflict takes place not only at a bodily level but also at an intellectual level, as seen in Romans 7:22 (τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον) and Romans 7:23 (τοῦ νοός μου). The intellectual side of the 'I' wants to joyfully agree with the law, specifically the law of God. The will of the body is to do good, but the evil lies at hand. Accordingly, the domination for space in believers' bodies encompasses all of the human's faculties.

Paul employs military metaphors to indicate the direness of the struggle with Sin. The 'I' is 'waging war' (ἀντιστρατεύομαι) with Sin in its members and another law 'takes captive' (αἰχμαλωτίζω) the 'I'. The ultimate low point of this continuing battle throughout Romans 7:7–25 culminates in Romans 7:24 when the 'I' asks, 'who will save me from this body of death?' Paul has made it continuously clear that when a person is subjugated to Sin, death is the result. The 'I' is overpowered, and the space, namely, the believer's body is deemed 'this body of death' (τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου [Rm 7:24]). However, in Romans 7:25, it becomes clear that not only will God rescue the 'I' through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord but also believers will be saved. The verb ῥύομαι denotes 'to be rescued' and Christ proves to be able to save the 'I' from the power of death. Believers are under the lordship of Jesus Christ and no longer captives of Sin.

The slavery metaphor is used again. A divide is still present as the intellectual part of the 'I' serves the law of God in contrast to the flesh that remains to be a servant of the law of Sin. For Paul, the contest of powers vying to dominate the body is ongoing. However, obedience is vital. A person may choose to be obedient to either Sin or Jesus Christ. The flesh remains drawn to Sin, even though the body wants to do good. The mind, in contrast, does not have the same disposition as the flesh but seeks to submit to Jesus Christ.

The Spirit (Rm 8)

Romans 5–7 vividly describes the dominion of forces, such as Sin, Death and law, within their respective relational position to believers. Notwithstanding, in Romans 8, Paul veers the argument in a positive light with fastidious attention

to πνεῦμα [Spirit].[596] Romans 8 consists of sections that are logically connected to, but often independent of, each other, contingent to the content (Harrisville 1980:117). The sections of the argument can be traced as Romans 8:1–11,[597] 12–17; 18–30; 31–39.

Being in Christ (Rm 8:1–11)

Believers in Christ (Rm 8:1–4)

Romans 8:1–4 throws light on believers' current position as 'in Christ'. Romans 8:1 commences with the statement that there is therefore now no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus (οὐδὲν ἄρα νῦν κατάκριμα τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 8:1a]) based on the argument of Romans 7:25. The statement is elaborated on with the elucidation that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set believers free from the law of Sin and Death (ὁ γὰρ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ ἠλευθέρωσέν σε ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου [Rm 8:2]). However, the notion of the law of life and the law of Sin needs further explication. Romans 8:3 attempts to clarify the contrast expounding for what the law was powerless to do because it was weak through the flesh (τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός [Rm 8:3a]), God (did by) sending his own Son in the likeness of the sinful flesh (ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 8:3b]) and for sin (καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας [Rm 8:3c]), condemned sin in the flesh (κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί [Rm 8:3c]). The reason for sin's condemnation becomes clear in Romans 8:4: that the righteous requirement of the law might be fulfilled in believers (ἵνα τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν [Rm 8:4a]). Believers walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit (τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα [Rm 8:4b]).

Detail analysis of Romans 8:1–4

The placement of the indefinite personal pronoun οὐδέν at the beginning of the sentence and the temporal use of the adverb νῦν[598] sheds light on the current position of believers, namely, those who are in Jesus Christ (τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). This position delimits believers' exoneration. The forensic

596. Throughout the scope of Romans 1–7, πνεῦμα only occurs five times; in Romans 9–16, eight times, but in Romans 8, πνεῦμα occurs 21 times, more than in any other single chapter of the entire New Testament (Cranfield 1975:371; Moo 1996:468; Schlier 1977:236).

597. Most commentators gauge the break after Romans 8:11 (Cranfield 1975:372; Haacker 1999:149; Käsemann 1978:204; Lohse 2003:228; Schlier 1977:236), but others consider Romans 8:13 more suitable as the antithesis between the flesh and the Spirit, as seen in Romans 8:4b–9a, becoming an application of exhortation in Romans 8:12–13 (Byrne 1996:234; Fitzmyer 1993:479; Harrisville 1980:117; Légasse 2002:481; Moo 1996:472).

598. Hultgren (2011:296) describes νῦν as an eschatological νῦν of the new age that has arrived with the resurrection of Jesus from the dead (cf. Dunn 1988:415; Moo 1996:472). Cf. Romans 3:21; 5:9; 6:19, 22; 7:6. This is true, but Peterson (2017:226) describes νῦν more precisely as 'life in the Spirit'.

image κατάκριμα underscores the result of God's saving action seen in Romans 7:25a (Haacker 1999:151; Kruse 2012:322; Schlier 1977:236; Zeller 1985:152).[599] The resurfacing of κατάκριμα also establishes a link with Romans 5:16,18 resounding the judicial pronouncement that under the lordship of Christ a believer is free from the lordship of Sin, which leads to death.[600] The same theme of being free from Sin is also reverberated in the connection the inferential particle ἄρα determines with Romans 7:6.[601] The forensic image is coherent with the legal jargon, emphasising that believers are freed from Sin (Du Toit 2003:54). The question lingers whether Roman or Jewish legal jargon is intended? Similar to Romans 7:1–6, it is of no consequence whether Roman or Jewish legal systems are used, as Paul's audience would have understood. Even if the audience resembles the lower strata of society representing Jewish and Greek backgrounds, they would have also been conversant with the main features of Roman law (Du Toit 2003:54). This image deters any remnant notion of following the law to the letter as a means to gain access to God (Barrett 1957:154; Michel 1966:249).[602]

Again, Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor may be used as a tool for illumination. Throughout Paul's argument, the believer's body may be inferred as the container. Within the phrase τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, the preposition ἐν signifies spatiality, while Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ constitutes a specific location.[603]

599. Bauer et al. (2000:518) suggests that the context described in Romans 7:24 qualifies the nature of the judicial sentence as a death sentence. Contra Fitzmyer (1993:481) who interprets κατάκριμα as having the same meaning as in Galatians 3:10, 'the curse'. However, Paul's use of the law in Romans is different from that in Galatians, and the context does not support 'cursed'.

600. Jewett (2007:480) interprets the letter to the Romans to address the situation of Roman churches, which he argues is the reason for the continued perception of powers and principalities derived from Adam's fall, as seen in Romans 8:12, 35–39. In contention, Bornkamm (1969:90) succinctly indicates that using rhetoric as a delineation of Judaisers or groups and individuals is an error in the letter to the Romans. Jewett's argument is not feasible as there is simply not enough evidence.

601. Bultmann (1947:197–202) contends that Romans 8:1 is a gloss. However, Romans 8:1 is sensible when understood with Romans 7:6. Van Leeuwen and Jacobs (1974:353) add that Romans 8:1 is an expression of the result of Romans 7:25b.

602. In Romans 7, it is copious that the law, when manipulated by Sin, becomes a hindrance in a relationship with God. Harrisville (1980:118) remarks that for Paul, Sin occurs in the pursuit of the Torah. Furthermore, Harrisville (1980:118) sheds light on the Qumran community, who, similar to Paul, regards humans as fallen and can only be saved by the initiative of God. This view is reflected in the multitude of thanksgiving hymns. The key difference between Paul and the Qumran community originates from the Qumran community's vantage point that Sin does not occur alongside obedience to the Torah and, accordingly, justification from Sin frees them from the way of the Torah.

603. It is clearly locally in Romans 8:1 (Jewett 2007:480; Wright 2002:576). Deissmann's seminal study '*Die Neutestamentliche Formel "in Christo Jesu"*' (1892) launched the understanding of the formula as both local and mystical. Mystical connotes to Christ as a universal Spirit forming the atmosphere believers live in. Following Deissmann, Fitzmyer (1993:482) and Käsemann (1978:212–215) draw on a mystical understanding. Contra Schlier (1977:237) and Peterson (2017:226) who rightly note ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ refers to a new way of being derived from baptism and faith. Accordingly, with regard to Paul's argument in Romans 5–8, interpreting the phrase mystically is not appropriate. Hultgren (2011:296) deems ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ to be more than a means

The container metaphor does not need to specifically indicate believers' bodies, as Romans 7:25 is still fresh in the minds of the audience. The metaphor signifies that Christ rules in believers' bodies, highlighting the saving action of Christ, as κύριος is not utilised.

The close connection between the ἐν-term and its referent indicates the controlling influence (Bauer et al. 2000:327).[604] The controlling influence is metonymically expressed with Christ Jesus (Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). The concept domain 'controller for controlled' is applicable in Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ as believers do not just have to think of who Christ is but also consider their relation to him (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:38–39).

Needless to say, the interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ remains a contentious debate. Amongst the anatomisations, prevails the debate whether ἐν Χριστῷ should be regarded as a metaphor or not.[605] It is not the aim of this study to solve the ἐν Χριστῷ debate. Certainly, there is a possibility that Paul understood this as an ontological reality. As a modern exegete, ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [in Jesus Christ] in Romans 8:1, 2, is in my view a metaphor that forms part of the recurrent pattern of the dominion.

This container metaphor entails bodies of believers where Jesus Christ rules, in which believers are transposed after they have been saved, as seen in Romans 7:25. The result of being dominated by Jesus Christ encompasses a person to be free from Sin and condemnation. The believer's position of being ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is repeated in Romans 8:2 and further elucidated as γάρ signals (Greijdanus 1933:354; Käsemann 1978:207).[606] However, the elaboration unfolds in an abstract manner complicating the current metaphor of dominion with another metaphor of dominion. This metaphor hinges on two abstract descriptions of the law industrious for both sides of the forces at play, namely, Sin or Christ (Byrne 1996:235; Lohse 2003:229; Moo 1996:473; Mounce

of identification, but a boundary marker in society. The problem with such a view is that it assumes early believers of Jesus regarded themselves as an individual group.

604. Parallels of ἐν with a name can be found in astrological statements. Cf. Vettius Valens, Anthol. Passim; Seneca, Nat. Quaest. VII 27,3: *in leone* and *in aquario* (Haacker 1999:151). Haacker (1999:151) convincingly argues that the phrase concerns the experience of power (Machterfahrung) and a lifestyle (Fitzmyer 1993:482). Haacker (1999:151) mentions that it was especially prevalent in Rome, during the early time of the Caesars, that astrology dictated the fate and talent of a person according to one's star sign.

605. For more detail, see Engberg-Pedersen's *Cosmology* (2010). Engberg-Pedersen (2010:1) argues that 'being in Christ' should not be merely viewed as metaphorical, but understood in cognitive terms as a group of people marked in a specific way by their relationship with Christ. For Pedersen, a person is literally part of the body of Christ, who himself is πνεῦμα [Spirit].

606. Schlier (1977:237) notes that this verse elaborates the whole Romans 5–7. Contra Morris (1988:300) who interprets γάρ as 'because' giving a reason. Contra Zahn (1925:373) who interprets Romans 8:1 as a question and accordingly understands Romans 8:2 as 'ja, doch'.

1995:174; Schlier 1977:238).[607] Paul's use of νόμος [law] is intricate. There exists debate whether νόμος should be interpreted as the Torah or in a metaphorical way as Paul's use of νόμος in Romans 7:22–8:2 forms part of a wordplay chain (Räisänen 1980:101–117). The difference in the effect of the dominion of Christ and Sin is pertinent in νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς [the law of the Spirit of life] pitted against νόμου τῆς ἁμαρτίας καὶ τοῦ θανάτου [the law of sin and death], with the former functioning as the protagonist and the latter as the antagonist. The question is whether νόμος should be interpreted with a genitive construction and, accordingly, refer to the Torah, or whether νόμος is meant in the general sense, referring to 'norm, system or principle' (Bauer et al. 2000:677). In light of the wordplay chain, Paul constructs with νόμος, and the use of νόμος in a metaphorical way, evidently the Torah is not intended (Cranfield 1975:374–377; Greijdanus 1933:355; Haacker 1999:151; Hultgren 2011:297; Kuss 1957:490; Wolter 2014:473).[608] The same source domain 'νόμος' is used, but with different expressions creating a pattern of recurrence (Semino 2008:23). The dominion of Christ entails that the νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς [the law of the Spirit of life] accomplishes freedom from (ἐλευθερόω ἀπό) Sin and Death (Schlier 1977:239). The genitive τοῦ πνεύματος is a *genitivus auctoris* describing the freeing force from the law that stems from the Spirit and τῆς ζωῆς (Greijdanus 1933:355).[609] The phrase evidently refers to being under the lordship of Jesus Christ as a 'new law' or 'system' of conduct (Bauer et al. 2000:677).[610] Freedom is particularly applicable to the audience as the personal pronoun σύ [you] indicates, along with the use of ἠλευθέρωσεν in the third-person plural, which has a more general sense (Blass et al. 1961:§281).

Christ is portrayed as the better ruler. In effect, the collocation of law, sin (ἁμαρτία) and death (θάνατος) in Romans 8:2 is a summary of the powers seen in Romans 6:1–7:6 (Fitzmyer 1993:483). Coinciding the target domain entails freedom from sinning and death applicable to the audience, but also to anyone through and under control of the law of the Spirit of life in Christ.[611]

607. Πνεῦμα [Spirit] is associated with God and per implication Christ. Fee, 35; contra Paige (1993:404–413) notes that 1st-century believers understood the Spirit to be manifested as a power to such a degree that 'Spirit' and 'power' are at times interchangeable.

608. Contra Wright (2002:576–577); Lohse (2003:229) argues that the Torah is clearly intended, as it is the subject of the sentence. Räisänen (1980:117) remarks that the Torah and the assumption that the Old Testament law has various interpretation possibilities should not be applied to Romans 8:2. Moo (1996:474) suggests a translation of νόμος as 'power' is suitable because in both contexts νόμος has a figurative meaning as a power in this verse.

609. Paul also links νόμος with πνεῦμα in Romans 7:14 (Lohse 2003:230). Paul applies νόμος to the Spirit (Fitzmyer 1993:482). The intent of the law was to bring life (Lv 18:5), but it does not occur (Hultgren 2011:297).

610. Fitzmyer (1993:483) argues that νόμος is intended as a 'principle'. The law of the Spirit is nothing other than the 'Spirit of God' (Rm 8:9a, 14) or the 'Spirit of Christ' (Rm 8:9b) in this ruling function in the sphere of Christ.

611. In Romans 7:23, the reference is also made that the law is held captive by sin (αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας). According to Jewett (2007:482), freedom can be compared to Cicero's formulation in Parad. 34, where freedom is when one who submits not to the law because he or she fears it, but because he or she believes it is

Romans 8:3 continues in support of Romans 8:2 as the coordinating conjunction γάρ beckons. The main clause comprises a conjunction, subject, verb and object, γὰρ … ὁ θεὸς κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν [for God condemned sin] (Rm 8:3), sustaining being set free from Sin (Venter 2014a:2). Again, the law features, but in Romans 8:3, νόμος implies the Torah (Haacker 1999:151).[612] The audience is reminded that it is God's saving action that enables a person to be free from Sin. The substantiated ἀδύνατον is an accusative of respect describing νόμος, preceding the appositional element it defines (Porter 1992:91), and should be interpreted in an active sense rendering the meaning 'powerless'.[613] The phrase ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός depends on ἀδύνατον making it clear that, the error was not the law, but the law in the dominion of the flesh, which is controlled by Sin. Within the phrase ἐν ᾧ, the preposition ἐν functions instrumentally, rendering the translation 'while/because' in Romans 8:3 (Blass et al. 1961:§219[2]; Porter 1992:91).[614] It refers to weakness and Paul develops the understanding of weakness further as it is now brought in connection with the law (Link 1978:994). The verb ἀσθενέω draws on the notion of suffering a debilitating illness and to experience some personal incapacity (Bauer et al. 2000:142),[615] with the imperfect indicating the continued state of being under the control of Sin as which is depicted by διὰ τῆς σαρκός (Greijdanus 1933:357). The phrase διὰ τῆς σαρκός is a metaphor of dominion. The preposition διά with the genitive indicates agency (Smyth 1956:375). The Torah is rendered powerless when it is not used to fulfil its true purpose (Wolter 2014:475). Paul's use of τῆς σαρκός may signify that he draws on a tradition that also emerges in Galatians 4:4 and in the Johannine tradition.[616] The emphasis is on the main clause ὁ θεός … κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί (Rm 8:3c) as God judged sin in the incarnate Son and the verb signals legal imagery (Breytenbach 2010a:69), but we follow the flow of the text and treat Romans 8:3b first.

advantageous. As we have seen throughout the argument in Romans 7, the law itself is not problematic and Paul's view is in harmony with the ancient view of freedom that underscores to persist in being subjected to the law. However, the law, when manipulated by sin as an active force, leads to death. Especially seen in light of Romans 7:7–25, where the dominance of sin has prohibited Paul's possibility to do what he deems to be good. In this regard, Käsemann's (1978:216) observation that it really is a question of which Lord shall be dominant, is helpful.

612. Moo (1996:478) argues that νόμος in Romans 8:3 refers without a doubt to the Mosaic Law.

613. The phrase τὸ γὰρ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is an example of a reverse order of an ellipse of the formulaic type (ὅ τῷ νόμῳ ἀδύνατον ἦν) (Blass et al. 1961:§480(6)). But what is more, τὸ … ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου is in apposition with κατέκρινεν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἐν τῇ σαρκί as an accusative in apposition to it (Cranfield 1975:378; Wolter 2014:475). The use of ἀδύνατον in the New Testament is closely associated with the response of Jesus to the problem of salvation of the rich and with everyone because 'with humans this is impossible, but with God all things are possible' (Friedrich 2011:80–82; Spicq 1994b:36). Cf. Matthew 19:26; Mark 10:27; Luke 18:27.

614. It has a connective function.

615. Usually the formula of ἐν ᾧ ἠσθένει expresses 'becoming ill' as seen in Xenophon Anab. 1.1.1 and 6.2.19. According to Jewett (2007:483), the argument of Romans 7 is reverberated as human arrogance denies and twists a person's ability to do good.

616. Cf. John 3:16; 1 John 4:9 (Breytenbach 2005:69).

Romans 8:3 states that, for what the law was powerless to do because it was weak through the flesh, God did by sending his own Son in the likeness of the sinful flesh and for sin condemned sin in the flesh.

A pattern of metaphorical mixing occurs, as Paul draws on a sending metaphor in Romans 8:3b in close proximity with metaphors from other source domains.[617] The participial clause τὸν ἑαυτοῦ υἱὸν πέμψας indicates the manner in which God deals with sin in humanity (Greijdanus 1933:357; Wolter 2014:477).[618] The source domain of πέμπω entails to dispatch someone whether human or transcendent being, usually for purposes of communication as seen in Romans 8:3 with God the Father who sends the Son (Bauer et al. 2000:794). The sending metaphor is no anomaly to the Roman audience as many sources, for example, an inscription from Halicarnassus declares 'the immortal nature of the universe has sent us Caesar'.[619] The mapping focuses on God who sends his Son to break the power of sin.

This sending metaphor is further elucidated with ὁμοίωμα. In CMT, words such as 'like' indicate signalling (Semino 2008:27–28). However, the interpretation of ὁμοίωμα in Romans 8:3 is quite difficult as there is no consensus in what way Paul uses ὁμοίωμα to refer to Christ's earthly life.[620] The term ὁμοίωμα is ambiguous and vacillates in Paul's language between full identity and similarity (Gillmann 1987:597–604).[621] The bone of contention derives from whether the Lord in his earthly ministry possessed a completely human form and that his physical body was capable of sinning as human bodies are, or that he had the form of a human being and was looked upon as such, but without losing his identity as a divine being (Bauer et al. 2000:707).

617. The Christological claim, that is, God having sent his own son, is in support of Romans 8:2 with regard to being set free from sin and death (Hendriksen 1980:246; Kruse 2012:325; Schlier 1977:240).

618. Byrne (1996:236) interestingly describes the death of the Son upon the cross as the culmination of the divine 'invasion'. In 1 QS 11,9; 1 QM 4,3; 12,12, the sending of the son in the flesh is expressly used in the formula 'Fleisch des Frevels' (Käsemann 1978:208).

619. Cf. B. Mus. In 4.1. Nr. 894.4–6. There are ample Hellenistic Greek parallels of gods sending messengers or heralds on certain missions, for example, Epictetus, *Dissertationes* 3.23; Plutarch, *De Alexandri Magni fortuna* 1.6 §329c.

620. Moo (1996:479) mentions that Paul treads lightly using ὁμοίωμα, probably wanting to indicate that Jesus had fully become human and yet not exactly, thus having to face the in-flesh realm. Barrett (1957:156) suggests that Paul distinguished between flesh under the dominion of sin and flesh that was created by God. Although, Barrett (1957:156) deems the suggestion unlikely, he notes that ὁμοίωμα does not mean 'imitation' in Paul. Thus, Christ did not have sinful flesh, but overcame the proclivity to sin. In Romans 5:14 and 6:5, the use of ὁμοίωμα is probably a way of emphasising that Jesus, although human, remained in the sphere of the Spirit and never had sinful flesh (Cranfield 1975:379–382). Jewett (2007:484) postulates that the argumentative context needs to be considered, thus resulting 'in Christ knowingly stepping into a social arena with all its evil consequences, at the cost of his own life'.

621. Greijdanus (1933:357) argues that ὁμοίωμα is a concrete image and not an abstract likeness. In contrast, Moo (1996:479) reasons that ὁμοίωμα implies a nuance of 'form' instead of 'likeness' or 'copy'.

The preposition ἐν describes a state or condition (Bauer et al. 2000:327) within the phrase ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας [in the likeness of the sinful flesh]. The genitive ἁμαρτίας is a *genitivus qualitatis* portentous that there is no flesh that is not sinful. The flesh becomes a container metaphor with the preposition signifying the flesh as a place that is imbued with the rule of Sin.

A spatial aspect comes to the fore in Romans 8:3c in the phrase περὶ ἁμαρτίας.[622] It is possible to argue the conflation of imagery from the realm of expiation of sins and legal terminology occurs with the περί phrase referring to the abolition of sin's consequences (Breytenbach 2010a:69). But what is more, the verb κατακρίνω denotes a sentence after guilt has been determined and God has pronounced a sentence on Sin in the flesh (Bauer et al. 2000:519). However, God sends his Son to contest the sinful flesh of the believer's body. The phrase ἐν τῇ σαρκί also functions as a container metaphor. It is closely linked with ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας. However, it reflects the contaminated container, that is, when the believer's body is ruled by Sin. The preposition ἐν signals a specific location with σάρξ as the space where Sin rules.[623] The flesh is a 'power' but also a reality (Peterson 2017:235; Schlier 1977:240; Venter 2014a:4). The target domain purports that Christ's mission was to overcome Sin. For the incapability of the law, in which it was powerless through the flesh, God, by sending his own son in the likeness of the sinful flesh and concerning Sin, condemned sin in the flesh (Venter 2014a:3).

The purpose clause (ἵνα) in Romans 8:4a is subordinate to κατέκρινεν in Romans 8:3 and illustrates what is remarkable about being set free (ἠλευθέρωσέν σε [Rm 8:2]) (Cranfield 1975:383; Wolter 2014:479). Paul's variation of νόμος is evidently functioning different from Romans 8:2 (Räisänen 1980:117). The formula δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου expresses a fixed form of righteousness,[624] which is a prerequisite of the Mosaic Law, conceived in its unity (Bauer et al. 2000:678; Cranfield 1975:384; Fitzmyer 1993:487; Jewett 2007:485; Wolter 2014:479).[625] The singular of δικαίωμα is employed to compliment the -μα endings[626] and should be interpreted to mean 'requirement, righteous requirement' as also

622. The expression περὶ ἁμαρτίας is often found in the LXX describing a sin offering, for example, Leviticus 14:31 or Psalms 40:6 (Barrett 1957:156; Michel 1966:251). Contra Breytenbach (2010a:75) who indicates that περὶ ἁμαρτίας does not fixedly refer to a sin offering in Greek pseudepigrapha.

623. Schlier (1977:240) notes that it is a place where sin rules. Σάρξ is a power.

624. The noun δικαίωμα denotes a regulation relating to just or right action (Bauer et al. 2000:249).

625. Paul also speaks about the law being fulfilled in Galatians 6:2; Romans 13:8, 10 and Galatians 5:14 (Wolter 2014:480). Peterson (2017:235) rightly objects to connoting the phrase to the resurrection with the result that Christ is understood as 'in us' interpreted as a mere ethical sphere. Dunn (1988:423) notes that the fulfilment of the law's requirement is the result of Jesus' mission and death and God's purpose for sending him. McFadden (2009:483–497) argues that the phrase must be understood as referring to obedience.

626. It is peculiar as the plural is usually used. The singular use is scarce in literature. The -μα endings signify the result of an action (Schrenk 1964:219).

seen in Romans 2:26 (Cranfield 1975:384; Wolter 2014:479). Πληρόω functions in Romans 8:4 as a prayer (Bauer et al. 2000:829), as Paul does not speak of merely fulfilling the law, but it being fulfilled 'in us' (ἐν ἡμῖν) (Cranfield 1975:385; Jewett 2007:485).[627]

The phrase ἐν ἡμῖν is a container metaphor. The container metaphor is elucidated in Romans 8:4b with the conceptual metaphor 'life is a journey', as expressed by περιπατοῦσιν. As is the case in Romans 6:4, περιπατέω is used in a moral sense and expresses a way of conduct (Haacker 1999:152). The phrase τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ also structurally reverberates τοῖς μὴ κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦσιν, enforcing the space of believers' bodies being free from the dominion of Sin (Zahn 1925:373). The negation μή underscores the believers' body is not a place ruled by Sin. The preposition κατά with an accusative signals conformity (Smyth 1956:380). The use of κατὰ σάρκα should be understood in a similar manner as in Romans 7:5a and 8:8 as σάρξ is antagonistically opposed to God being in the control of Sin. For Paul, there are two ways of life fundamentally opposed to one another in either precipitating κατὰ πνεῦμα [according to the Spirit] or walking κατὰ σάρκα [according to the flesh] (Bauer et al. 2000:803; Ebel 1978:943–945). For Paul, the life and death contrast is still applicable with his use of κατὰ σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα, with the former illustrative of death and the latter with life (Zimmermann 2009:517). This use of περιπατέω is unparalleled in classical Greek (Jewett 2007:486).[628] Paul draws on the Hellenistic Jewish tradition[629] and does not use περιπατέω in the precepts of the Torah. The expressions make it clear that Christian living is not something that flows automatically from faith and baptism as cooperation with God's Spirit is required (Fitzmyer 1993:488). Romans 6:4 has already made it clear that believers walk according to the newness of life. However, the use of the verb περιπατέω designates intentionality on the part of the believer. This intentionality is explicated in Romans 8:5–8.

Mindset of the flesh versus mindset of the Spirit (Rm 8:5–8)

The intentionality of walking in conformity with the Sprit is explicated in Romans 8:5–8. The contrast between the two dominions embodied with κατὰ

627. According to Cranfield (1975:384), the argument of Romans 7 should be kept in mind in order to fulfil the law; a real faith in God is necessary in order to sincerely desire to obey. In Romans 13:8, Paul picks up this idea again as 'the love' between Jesus following communities evoked by the Spirit 'is laws fulfilment' (Jewett 2007:485; Wolter 2014:480).

628. According to Jewett (2007:486), Paul employs a metaphor of walking stemming from the Qumran community who taught that God 'created man to rule the world and placed within him two spirits so that he would walk with them until the moment of his visitation: they are the spirits of truth and of deceit' as seen in 1 QS 3:17–19; see also 1 QS 4:6; 12, 24.

629. Cf. 2 Kings 20:3; Proverbs 8:20; Ecclesiastes 11:9.

σάρκα and κατὰ πνεῦμα continues. For those who conform to the flesh, they set their minds on the things of the flesh (οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν [Rm 8:5a–b]). In contrast, those who conform to the Spirit set their minds on the things of the Spirit (οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος [Rm 8:5c]). Romans 8:6 elaborates on what the dominion of flesh in contrast to that of the Spirit entails. The mindset of the flesh is death (τὸ γὰρ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς θάνατος [Rm 8:6a]) in contrast to the mindset of the Spirit being life and peace (τὸ δὲ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος ζωὴ καὶ εἰρήνη [Rm 8:6b]). The reason why believers should not conform to the mindset of the flesh protrudes in Romans 8:7–8. The mindset of the flesh is enmity towards God (διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν [Rm 8:7a]), for it is not subject to God's law (τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται [Rm 8:7b]) and it cannot (οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται [Rm 8:7c]). Those who are in the flesh (οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες [Rm 8:8a]) cannot please God (θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται [Rm 8:8b]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:5–8

Paul describes in Romans 8:5–8 what living according to the Spirit and living according to the flesh entail, embroiling on Romans 8:4 as γάρ designates. Paul elucidates the different dominions of the flesh in contrast to the Spirit. However, the phrases τοῖς μή (Rm 8:4), οἱ γάρ (Rm 8:5) and οἱ δέ (Rm 8:5) highlight believers not being for the flesh, but in the Spirit (Greijdanus 1933:359).

To recourse to Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor, Paul illustrates two types of containers, namely, the contaminated container and the container ruled by Christ. In Romans 8:5a, the first container is described with οἱ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες [who are according to the flesh], and the second οἱ κατὰ πνεῦμα ὄντες [who are according to the Spirit]. The former represents the contaminated container and the latter the container under the lordship of Christ. In each case, οἱ … ὄντες acts as the agent of the container. The present participle of εἰμί rather conveys 'those who exist' than referring to behaviour (Cranfield 1975:385; Greijdanus 1933:360; Jewett 2007:486; Wolter 2014:482). The state of a group of people is ascribed. The flesh functions as the controlling influence because a person's existence is determined by κατὰ σάρκα. In contrast, the second state of being is associated as κατὰ πνεῦμα, where the Spirit is in a person who is serving God.

The control of both containers' hinges on φρονέω [set one's mind on, be intent on] is significant, drawing on φρονέω τά τινος, which means 'to take sides in a conflict' (Bauer et al. 2000:1066; Liddell et al. 1996:1956).[630] The two sides are φρονέω κατὰ σάρξ and φρονέω κατὰ πνεῦμα, which are explained as two

630. Cf. Diod. S. 13, 48, 4 & 7; Jos. *Ant.* 14, 450; Polyaenus 8, 14, 3; Appian, Liby. 70 § 316, Bell. Civ. 3, 85, § 351; Herodian 8, 6, 6; 1 Maccabees 10:20.

distinct mindsets functioning as realms where the dominion occurs within the human body dependent on the specific dominator a believer sides with.[631] The qualitative genitives τῆς σαρκός and τοῦ πνεύματος describe the goal of each mindset culminating in death or life.[632] Accordingly, believers have a significant choice in determining what controlling influence will establish their dominant state of being. The mindset is conducive to either foster a situation of κατὰ σάρκα or κατὰ πνεῦμα. It draws on the ontological metaphor 'the mind is an entity' (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:27).

Jewett (1971:206) understands σάρξ [flesh] as the antithesis of σῶμα [body]. Σάρξ is not coherently used for the domain of Sin, nor is σῶμα continually ascribed to Christ.[633] It depends on the incumbent power having dominion over the body that classifies whether it is a 'dead' body or an 'alive' body. Both σάρξ [flesh] and σῶμα [body] are always controlled spaces, as a dominator is inherently prevalent within Romans 5–8.

Jörg Frey (1999:45–77) postulates that, based on Romans 8:5–8, Paul's comprehension of flesh and body exhibits the influence of 4QInstruction. He argues that Paul harbours a dualistic understanding of 'people of the Spirit' and 'people of the flesh'. 4QInstruction is known as a wisdom text and accordingly the binary language is not unaccustomed. 4QInstruction frequently features לישמה meaning 'to give dominion', and at key points,[634] the verb describes that God has given the addressee an elect form of status (Goff 2013:9). Benjamin Wold (2015:279) revisits 4QInstruction and the relationship with Paul delineating that Paul, like the 4QInstruction community, had to contend with ongoing evil and the flesh. Both Paul and 4QInstruction relate to victory in overcoming the flesh to access God's revelation (Wold 2015:279).

631. Paul's use of φρονέω also attests that those who are in the realm of σάρξ are shaped by it and vice versa concerning πνεῦμα, as in earlier Pauline letters it was used to describe a basic orientation or mindset. For example, in Philippians 2:5, Christ's self-emptying love is in contrast to those who are earthly minded. The language of φρονοῦσιν with τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς/τοῦ πνεύματος is also used in a political sphere, for example, Dionysius Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. 5.13.5: μηκέτι τά τῶν τυράννων, ἀλλά τά τῆς πόλεως φρονεῖν [no more the matters of tyrants, without supporting the city]. See also Dionysius Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. 11.39.7, Diodorus Siculus 13.104.6; 1 Maccabees 10:20; Josephus, *Ant.* 7.286; Bell.4.209; Plutarch, Flam. 6.1; Polyaenus 2.13.1 (Cranfield 1975:386; Wolter 2014:482).

632. Contra Cranfield (1975:386) who deems the genitives to be subjective (cf. Fitzmyer 1993:488; Haacker 1999:153; Wolter 2014:483). According to Byrne (1996:238), the consequences of death and life are illustrated in the idea of 'mindset'. The phrase φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς [the mind of the flesh] echoes Aeschylus's description of 'the presumptuous pride and impious thoughts' (κἀθέων φρονημάτων) of Persian invaders who suffered disaster because they ravaged temples. In contrast, φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος [the mind of the Spirit] echoes Euripides El. 1201–1204, whose chorus tells Electra that she has 'changed her mind' (φρόνημα … μεταστάθη) and is 'now thinking holy thoughts' (φρονεῖς γὰρ ὅσια νῦν) (Jewett 2007:487).

633. Cf. Colossians 1:22; 2:11; 1 Corinthians 10:16–17; 15:44 (Dunn 1975:52).

634. 4Q423 1 2, for example, employs the term to claim that he has been entrusted with the garden of Eden. In 4Q416 2 iii 11–12, the term helps convey that the deity has bequeathed to the *mebin* an 'inheritance of glory' (Goff 2013:9).

In contrast, Emma Wasserman (2008a:409–410) deems the Platonic premises as the most helpful in understanding Romans 8:5–11, interpreting the 'things of the flesh' as desires or appetites and setting 'the mind to the Spirit' as a new state of self-control that derives from the mastery of the body. The passions do not have a 'mind', but with personifications and in the context of some metaphors, these qualities are attributed to them. However, in Romans 5:5–8, it is οἱ … ὄντες (Rm 8:5) that determines the agent of dominion. Control of the body is determined by which side is taken in the conflict situation (cf. φρονέω).

Paul elucidates the difference between the two states of being in Romans 8:6 as γάρ signposts (Cranfield 1975:386; Jewett 2007:487; Wolter 2014:483). The mindset of the flesh is death in contrast to the φρόνημα [mindset] of the Spirit, which is life and peace. The repetitive use of the noun φρόνημα[635] in Romans 8:6–8 establishes a metaphorical pattern, which serves as a baseline for the comparison between the contrasting dominions. It becomes clear that κατὰ σάρξ goes along with death and κατὰ πνεῦμα with life and peace. Again, the qualitative genitives τῆς σαρκός and τοῦ πνεύματος describe the goal of each mindset culminating in death or life. Paul frequently draws on the contrast of death (θάνατος) and life (ζωή),[636] but for the first time in the argument since Romans 5:1, 9, 11, Paul utilises εἰρήνη/καταλλαγή. The metaphor of εἰρήνη reminds of Romans 5:1: 'to have peace with God'. The placement of εἰρήνη at the end of Romans 8:6b draws attention to another contrasted mindset found in Romans 5:10 and 8:7a, namely, ἔχθρα.[637] The clause διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν (Rm 8:7a) contains the oppositional phrase of εἰρήνη that is ἔχθρα. The genitive τῆς σαρκός is not a genitive of the subject, but similar to Romans 8:6, a *genitivus qualitatis* expressing goal. The causal conjunction διότι should be translated as 'for' (Blass et al. 1961:§456). The metaphor of being an enemy of God also originates from the source domain of diplomacy.[638] Flesh-orientated humanity is in direct hostility and estrangement from God and accordingly opposed to his life (Fitzmyer 1993:489).

635. The noun φρόνημα designates the faculty of fixing one's mind on something with a focus on strong intention (Bauer et al. 2000:1066). Wolter (2014:483) mentions that the use of φρόνημα is in a metonymic manner referring to φρονέω in Romans 8:5, encompassing the results of being in the realm of flesh or the realm of the Spirit. This is the first time in Paul's letters that the nominal form of φρονέω is used and can be interpreted to mean, 'to be minded' (Jewett 2007:487).

636. Θάνατος in Romans 7:10, 11, 13, 24; 8:2; ζωή in 7:10; 8:2, 10, 11. Death (θάνατος) is viewed transcendently in contrast to a living relationship with God (Bauer et al. 2000:443). Thus, there is no article because death is used in its full sense here and not just as a force (Greijdanus 1933:361).

637. Bauer et al. (2000:288) notes that the noun εἰρήνη entails the notion that peace is an essential characteristic of the messianic kingdom and in Christian view almost synonymous with messianic salvation. The combination of ζωή with εἰρήνη refers to coming of life that proceeds from Christ and God (Bauer et al. 2000:430).

638. Josephus *B.J.* 1.211, 242; Appian *Mithridatic Wars* 17.114; *Punic Wars* 20.134 (Venter 2015:2).

This enmity towards God is elaborated on (γάρ) in Romans 8:7b with a metaphor of submission, ὑποτάσσω (Spicq 1994v:424).[639] Not only are flesh-orientated persons enemies of God, but the mindset of flesh does not submit to the law of God and in fact, cannot. The source domain ὑποτάσσω designates 'to cause to be in a submissive relationship' and denotes to subject oneself (Bauer et al. 2000:1042). In the middle voice, ὑποτάσσω emphasises the voluntary character of the submission and alleviates whatever may be humiliating about subordination, or whatever suggests inferiority.[640] However, the mindset of the flesh is a metaphor of dominion that entails the believer's body being dominated by Sin. The mindset of the flesh cannot willingly submit to God, his law and his training (Greijdanus 1933:361; Spicq 1994v:424) or voluntarily submit to God who is the superior power.[641] The hostility of the mindset of the flesh towards God becomes open transgression of the law's commands (Fitzmyer 1993:489).

Paul continues that being in the realm of Sin under its dominion, instead of God, renders one incapable of (οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται [Rm 8:7c]) submitting to God.[642] The elliptical formulation of οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται refers back to Romans 8:3 (τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου) and Romans 7:13–25 as being in the flesh is a domain ruled by Sin (Wolter 2014:484).[643] This state of being under Sin is a state of powerlessness and hostility. However, in Romans 8:7, the situation of the mindset of the flesh being focused on Sin causes a regression, which previously in the argument being described as weak to being without power.

Romans 8:8 reverberates Romans 8:5 mimicking the metaphor of dominion (κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες) with ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες. Unlike Romans 8:5, the preposition is not κατά indicating actions that lead to the situation; it is now ἐν used locally evoking the state in which a person who sets his or her mind on Sin finds himself or herself in.[644] The slight change has to do with the verb ἀρέσκω

639. In Christian pastoral writings, submission is not to be confused with obedience and is a major virtue, especially expressed in light of cosmic and religious order. In Josephus *War* 2.361, 433; Polybius 3.13.8, ὑποτάσσω denotes political submission of the people to one king or one God. Cf. 1 Chronicles 22:18; 24:24; Psalms 18:47; Wisdom 8:14; 18:22; 2 Maccabees 8:9; 13:23; Romans 8:7; 10:3; Hebrews 12:9; James 4:7. Cf. Epictetus 3.24.65 τῷ θεῷ ὑποτεταγμένος; 4.12.11: I have someone whom I must please; to whom I must submit, whom I must obey: God, and after God myself.

640. Cf. 1 Corinthians 14:34; Philo *Decalogue*, 168, Josephus, *Ag. Apion* 2.201 (Spicq 1994v:425).

641. For example, Josephus, *Ant.* 13.88 refers to the lack of submission to the king (οὐχ ὑποτασσόμενον τῷ βασιλεῖ). Cf. Onasander Strat, 1.17, and Plutarch *Pomp*. 64.5.

642. The *absolutus* δύναμαι denotes 'can easily be supplied' (Bauer et al. 2000:262; Lohse 2003:234).

643. In Romans 8:7, οὐδὲ γάρ exhibits the causal coordinating conjunction used in a question, which would often not be translated in English with the corresponding negative form rendering the translation 'for it cannot either' (Blass et al. 1961:§452[3]).

644. Greijdanus (1933:359) mentions that ἐν σαρκί functions as a sphere, being an all-encompassing force.

meaning to give pleasure/satisfaction.[645] The goal of human life is to please God.[646] Paul sums Romans 8:7 up with Romans 8:8 (Cranfield 1975:387; Wolter 2014:485). The verb δύναμαι is repeated underscoring the consequence of setting the mind to Sin (Bauer et al. 2000:262).[647] This illustrates that being in the flesh renders a person powerless, unable to please God and inherently in a state of being against God (Wolter 2014:484).

In Romans 8:5–8, Paul draws on the contrast between the two dominions embodied in those who conform to the flesh, set their minds on the things of the flesh (οἱ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ὄντες τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς φρονοῦσιν), and those who set their minds on the things of the Spirit (οἱ δὲ κατὰ πνεῦμα τὰ τοῦ πνεύματος [Rm 8:5]). The mindset of the flesh is in stark contrast to the mindset of the Spirit. However, the audience does not live according to the mindset of the flesh.

☐ No really, in believers Christ dwells (Rm 8:9–11)

Three conditional clauses in Romans 8:9c–11 illustrate what can be expected with the Spirit being ἐν [in] a believer. In Romans 8:9, Paul reminds the audience of their changed status and current position in Christ as the personal pronoun plural (ὑμεῖς) signifies. Because of this status change, believers are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit (οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ἀλλ᾽ ἐν πνεύματι [Rm 8:9a]). Believers' position is substantiated by the fact that God's Spirit dwells in them (εἴπερ πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:9b]). However, the contrary fact is also stated. If someone does not have Christ's Spirit (εἰ δέ τις πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ οὐκ ἔχει [Rm 8:9c]), then that person does not belong to Christ: that one is not of him (οὗτος οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ [Rm 8:9d]). Again, Paul reinforces that believers are in Christ, but revisits the notion from a new angle. If Christ is in believers (εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:10a]), then on the one hand, the body is dead 'to' Sin (τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν [Rm 8:10b]) and, on the other hand, believers are in the Spirit of life 'through' righteousness (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην [Rm 8:10c]). A third 'but if' conditional clause is employed in Romans 8:11 building on the emphasis of believers' current position. In Romans 8:11a, the

645. Refers to the reciprocity-conscious Mediterranean world in the interest of accommodating others' needs (Bauer et al. 2000:129).

646. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:9 (Fitzmyer 1993:489–490). Being in the flesh (ἐν σαρκὶ) entails the problem of not being able to please God. The importance of pleasing God is seen in 1 Thessalonians 4:1, where a converted congregation is described as pleasing God, and in 1 Corinthians 7:32–34, it is the basic criterion of pleasing God. Theopompus *Hist. Frag*. 2b115 describes a view widely held by Greco-Romans, 'the wish to please the Gods' (τό βούλεσθαι τοῖς θεοῖς ἀρέσκειν). The LXX frequently uses 'well-pleasing' to describe successful piety because the idea existed that pleasing God would result in good fortune. Paul succinctly puts that being in the flesh renders a person incapable of achieving the most basic goal of ancient religion, that is, to please God (Jewett 2007:489).

647. Cf. Οἱ δὲ ἐν σαρκὶ ὄντες θεῷ ἀρέσαι οὐ δύνανται is litotes (Greijdanus 1933:359).

condition is stated, if the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in the addressees (εἰ δὲ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:11a]). The one who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to their mortal bodies through his Spirit that dwells in them (ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῳοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:11b–c]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:9–11

Paul's use of the emphatic address form ὑμεῖς δέ (Cranfield 1975:387; Greijdanus 1933:361; Jewett 2007:489) brings the focus back to audience's current situation as it underscores that they are not in the flesh (οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐν σαρκί) but in the Spirit (ἐν πνεύματι) (Cranfield 1975:38; Fitzmyer 1993:490; Jewett 2007:489; Peterson 2017:237). Paul's use of the preposition ἐν vacillates between a local and instrumental use, but in Romans 8:9, the local sense is utilised (Blass et al. 1961:§219(4)). Both ἐν σαρκί and ἐν πνεύματι are container metaphors illustrating dominion.[648] To be ἐν σάρκί describes a metaphorical state of death, while the believer is alive, drawing on the metaphor 'living from the dead' (Zimmermann 2009:517). However, when a person allows the Spirit to be the controlling influence, then they experience the life-giving power of God (Zimmermann 2009:517). The negative indicates ἐν σαρκί is not applicable to the audience.

The reason for their state of being, that is, being in the Spirit, emanates from the Spirit of God that dwells in them (cf. πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν). The cause (εἴπερ)[649] for the dominion of the Spirit in believers is the indwelling of the Spirit of God (πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν) in Romans 8:9b. The source domain draws on the verb οἰκέω denoting 'to reside in a place, live or dwell' (Bauer et al. 2000:694). The metaphor of indwelling has already featured in Romans 7:17, 20, but functioned as an indicator of the lordship of Sin. The place of the Spirit's residence is mapped as ἐν ὑμῖν [in you], designating the believers' bodies as the place of the Spirit's indwelling.[650] This is not a strange metaphor

648. Peterson (2017:237) notes that being in the flesh means to be in sin, constituting Adams's sinful body, whereas in the Spirit means to be in the resurrection of Christ. For Dunn (1988:428), it is locative.

649. The conjunction εἴπερ has a causal meaning similar to Romans 3:30 and 8:17, indicating an assurance. It can be translated as 'if indeed, if after all' (Bauer et al. 2000:279). There is debate concerning how εἴπερ should be interpreted, whether the reading thereof should be considered as a warning or as an indicative. I understand it to be an assurance and thus the use of the indicative poses no problem. Εἰ δέ τις (Rm 8:9) functions conditionally; thus, it is perhaps best not to understand εἴπερ also as conditional (Greijdanus 1933:363). Käsemann (1978:215) states that the meaning is not conditional but affirmative.

650. It does not have an ecclesiological interpretation in mind as is the case in 1 Corinthians 3:16; 14:25; and 2 Corinthians 13:5 (Wolter 2014:486). Barrett (1957:158) remarks that believers are directed from a source outside of themselves.

in the 1st century.[651] Paul is referring to believers as both dwelling within the Spirit as well as being possessed by its power (Hultgren 2011:301). The metaphor of indwelling also functions as an implicit metaphor of dominion as the notion of indwelling facilitates the understanding of the Spirit as a force (Wolter 2014:486).[652]

In Romans 8:9c, the simple present conditional clause illustrates that if a person does not have the Spirit of Christ dwelling in him or her, then this person does not belong to Christ. Paul does not elucidate how one can determine whether a person has the Spirit of Christ or not (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:3), but is rather interested in identifying the possessor spirit Christ (πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ) (Cranfield 1975:388; Wolter 2014:487).[653]

In both Romans 8:10 and 8:11, εἰ is employed with the indicative of reality emphasising the current state of the believers (Blass et al. 1961:§372(2b)). In Romans 8:10, Paul uses Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν [Christ in you], which is a referential synonym with πνεῦμα θεοῦ … ἐν ὑμῖν [Spirit of God in you] (Rm 8:9) (Barrett 1957:158; Cranfield 1975:388–389; Jewett 2007:491; Lohse 2003:234; Wolter 2014:488).

A contrast illustrates the result of the two main contenders' lordship with σῶμα νεκρόν[654] through Sin (διὰ ἁμαρτίαν [Rm 8:10b]) and πνεῦμα ζωή through righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνην [Rm 8:10c]).[655] The body is dead through Sin in contrast to the Spirit that brings life through righteousness. This echoes Romans 5:12–21 as the indwelling of Christ allows believers to live within tensions between body and Spirit, sin and righteousness, and death and life as seen in the parataxis (Cranfield 1975:389; Jewett 2007:492; Wolter 2014:488–489).

651. In Seneca Ep. 41.1–2, he assures a friend that: 'God is near you, he is with you, he is within you. This is what I mean, Lucilius: a Spirit indwells us, who marks our good and bad deeds, and is our guardian'. This idea is also prominent in Judaism, for example, Exodus 29:45–46; T. Levi 5.2. and T. Zeboul 8:2. Later Judaism even develops the notion of Shekinah originating from the Hebrew root 'to dwell' to refer to God's presence (Dunn 1988:429; Jewett 2007:490; Zeller 1985:158).

652. There is a reciprocity between Christ and Jesus' followers because they are in Christ, as seen in Romans 8:1; 16:7, 11; 1 Corinthians 1:30; 2 Corinthians 5:17; 12:2 and Philippians 3:9, and the Spirit is in them as seen in Romans 8:10; 2 Corinthians 13:5, and Galatians 2:20 (Wolter 2014:486). According to Jewett (2007:490), the Spirit of Christ seizes power in us, just as we are incorporated into Christ.

653. Paul also uses this type of language in 2 Corinthians 5:17 (τις ἐν Χριστῷ), persons in Christ, and in 2 Corinthians 13:5 (Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν), Christ in persons. 2 Corinthians 12:2 (ἄνθρωπον ἐν Χριστῷ); Galatians 2:20 (ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός) (Fitzmyer 1993:490; Hultgren 2011:301).

654. It is possible that σῶμα νεκρόν alludes to Romans 6:6–11, but this creates the impression with διὰ ἁμαρτίαν that it was sin rather Christ who overcame the body of death (Cranfield 1975:389; Jewett 2007:491; Wolter 2014:488). Paul draws on his Hellenistic context using σῶμα νεκρόν, with the body being dead, although the person is still alive. This can be seen in Philo Leg. All. 3.69; Dionysius Halicarnassus, Demosth. 54.

655. Interpreters do not have consensus over the use of πνεῦμα in Romans 8:10 concerning whether it means 'the Spirit' or 'the spirit' (Hultgren 2011:303).

The preposition διά with the accusative denotes 'on account of/owing to' (Smyth 1956:375) The phrase διὰ ἁμαρτίαν functions as a metaphor of dominion because the Sin is the controlling influence that causes the body to be dead. In contrast to διὰ ἁμαρτίαν, διὰ δικαιοσύνην signifies the power of righteousness.[656] In contrast to Sin leading to death, δικαιοσύνη, which can be translated as righteousness in this instance, leads to life. However, being in the Spirit is life through righteousness (διὰ δικαιοσύνην) means being able to be resurrected (Cranfield 1975:390). Paul attaches the Spirit with life explicating life as a power. In Romans 8:9–10, Paul clearly interprets his and other Christians' pneumatic experience of the risen Lord as experiences of the divine (Fatehi 2000:332). Pauline Christians believed themselves to experience the risen Christ as present and active amongst themselves (Fatehi 2000:331).

The conditional markers εἰ δὲ in Romans 8:11 should be understood in the sense of 'since' (Hultgren 2011:303). Paul takes the metaphor of indwelling to the next level. The Spirit that dwells in believers is the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead (cf. τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:11a]). Paul repeats this notion but adds that the same Spirit gives life to the mortal bodies of the addressees (cf. ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῳοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν [Rm 8:11b]).

Paul refers to the indwelling of the Spirit, but in connection with the image 'from death to life' in Romans 8:11, that is, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἐγείραντος τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐκ νεκρῶν (Cranfield 1975:390). The 'from death to life' image is derived from the early Christian proclamation and belief tradition (Zimmermann 2007:609). Paul draws on the metaphor 'from death to life' as especially seen in Romans 6:1–14. Romans 6:12–13 prepared believers that Sin no longer has power over the mortal body (Zimmermann 2009:514). Zimmermann (2009:512) explicates that being κατὰ σαρκά implies to live, but the person is metaphorically dead. Through the life-giving power of Christ, the mortal body is delivered from the metaphorical death to live (Zimmermann 2009:515). Paul sheds light on the connection between the resurrection and Christ.[657] The future of ζωοποιέω 'to cause to live/make alive' indicates an enlivening activity (Bauer et al. 2000:431)[658] that the mortal bodies of believers will undergo. Paul's use of 'to cause to live/make alive' refers to a few early Jewish *Vorlagen* with the notion that God is a 'power creating life' (Zimmermann 2007:608). Accordingly, the mortal body becomes a place

656. According to Bauer et al. (2000:247), the noun δικαιοσύνη refers to the quality or state of juridical correctness with focus on redemptive action.

657. He has also done this in other letters, such as 1 Corinthians 6:14; 15:20, 23; 2 Corinthians 4:14; Philippians 3:21, and 1 Thessalonians 4:14 (Cranfield 1975:390).

658. The broad idea of God being the source of life seems prevalent in the use of this verb, as in Corp. Herm. 11.4, the divine soul ζωοποιοῦσα τὸ πᾶν [surrounds the universe and brings it to life], and numerous examples in the LXX reflect this.

where the Spirit can live (Zimmermann 2009:515), as the same life-giving power that worked in Christ, works in believers. Paul interprets the concept of God's power in the light of the primary metaphor of Christ's crucifixion (in weakness) and his resurrection in power (Gräbe 2000:267).

The preposition διά is used instrumentally in the clause διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν [through his Spirit that dwells in you]. Paul draws on the source domain ἐνοικέω denoting 'non-physical entities making their home among people' (Bauer et al. 2000:338). Consequently, the target domain conveys that not only will the Spirit dwell in a person, but it will also make a home in such a person, thus indicating longevity.

The Holy Spirit dwells in the believers' bodies, transforming their bodies from places of death (ruled by Sin) to spaces of life (ruled by Jesus Christ 'our' Lord).

☐ Persuasion in Romans 8:1–11

Metaphors systematically shape worldviews (Semino 2008:10). Paul carves a new worldview for believers that they are no longer subjected to multiple powers or forces, but securely located in Christ. Paul has actively convinced the audience that they are liberated from Sin in Romans 5–7. Concomitantly, they are situated under the lordship of Christ Jesus, expressed with ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [in Jesus Christ]. Paul establishes Christ is the controlling influence in believers in Romans 8:1, 2, and in Romans 8:9, 11, the zenith of hegemonic relationship crystallises with the metaphor of indwelling, inadvertently also a metaphor of dominion, as it is the Spirit that takes up residence within believers (διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν). The continual in–out orientation of believers with regard to their relationship with πνεῦμα [Spirit] establishes a pattern of hegemony.

Believers are *au courant* that being under the dominion of Jesus Christ entails being in a space where there is no condemnation (οὐδὲν … κατάκριμα [Rm 8:1a]) and free from Sin and Death (cf. Rm 8:2, 3). A person does not have the ability to enter into the space of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [in Jesus Christ] on his or her own. The law is rendered powerless when Sin dominates it, and the flesh becomes the agent through which Sin manages this control (διὰ τῆς σαρκός). Access is made possible through Jesus Christ as the sending metaphor stemming from the source domain of diplomacy (cf. Rm 8:3) illustrates. Jesus Christ has taken the consequences of Sin away. The purpose of God's saving action comes to the fore in Romans 8:4, entailing the embodied space ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [in Jesus Christ] explicitly as ἐν ἡμῖν [in us]. Believers have the ability to fulfil the requirement of the Torah, as the embodied space of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [in Jesus Christ] is synonymous with Christ or the Spirit in their bodies.

Romans 8:5–8 explicates Romans 8:4. For Paul, the reality of being under the lordship of Sin is ever present. The body is a contested space. Even if Christ is the superior ruler and the Lord to submit to, a believer runs the risk to yield to the flesh. In Romans 8:5–8, the metaphor of dominion gleans on the source domain of cognitive faculties (φρονέω). The container metaphor can be delineated by οἱ … ὄντες. The container metaphor expounds ἐν ἡμῖν. Again, it is the power that is pursued that will fill the container. The mindset of the flesh will be dominated by the flesh. The contrary is also true, namely, if the mind is set on the Spirit, it will be dominated by the Spirit. The difference between the dominions of the flesh and the Spirit are decoded in Romans 8:6. The antithesis of life in the Spirit leads to peace and life, whereas life in the flesh leads to death.

Chiastically curtailed to Romans 8:5–6, Romans 8:7–8 illustrates the mindset of the flesh is hostile to God. The detriment of being under the dominion of the flesh becomes pertinent, as a person with a mindset dominated by the flesh cannot submit to the law of God (τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται) and is not even able to do so (οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται). A person in the grip of the flesh cannot please God. This highlights again the need for God's saving action as well as believers actively submitting to Jesus Christ.

Romans 8:9–11 concludes with the assurance that hope in Christ derives from God resurrecting Christ in the resurrection event (Stuhlmacher 1998:108). The importance of being positioned in Christ is ubiquitous, as an out status means not being under the lordship of Christ.

Children of God (Rm 8:12–17)

After determining believers' status in Christ (Rm 8:1–11), the inference follows that believers, who Paul now addresses as brothers, are not obligated to the flesh to live according to the flesh (ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν [Rm 8:12a–b]). Paul elaborates on the negative notion of living according to the flesh. He involves the audience with the second-person plural and curtails the imagery to the audience's situation. Paul states the condition that if the audience lives according to the flesh (εἰ γὰρ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆτε [Rm 8:13a]), the consequence is that they will die (μέλλετε ἀποθνήσκειν [Rm 8:13b]). In contrast, if the audience puts the disgraceful deeds of the body to death (εἰ δὲ πνεύματι τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε [Rm 8:13c]), they will live (ζήσεσθε [Rm 8:13d]). Paul sheds new light on living in Romans 8:14 as he explicates all those who are led by God's Spirit, these are the sons of God (ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται, οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν [Rm 8:14a–b]). Paul illuminates sonship in Romans 8:15 stating that the audience did not receive a spirit of slavery leading again into fear, but received a spirit of adoption as sons (οὐ γὰρ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα δουλείας πάλιν εἰς φόβον ἀλλ᾽ ἐλάβετε πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας [Rm 8:15a–b]). This brings believers to cry out: 'Abba, the Father!' (ἐν ᾧ κράζομεν αββα ὁ πατήρ [Rm 8:15c–d]).

The Spirit itself bears witness with the spirit of believers that they are God's children (αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα συμμαρτυρεῖ τῷ πνεύματι ἡμῶν ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ [Rm 8:16a–b]). The implication for associates of God is made clear in Romans 8:17. The conditional clause states that if children, also heirs, on the one hand, God's heirs, and Christ's joint-heirs, if indeed 'we' suffer with him, 'we' also might be glorified with him (εἰ δὲ τέκνα, καὶ κληρονόμοι κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ, συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ, εἴπερ συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν [Rm 8:17a–e]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:12–17

Paul unabatedly continues his argument that believers are free from the law of Sin and Death. The formula ἄρα οὖν in Romans 8:12a marks a conclusion drawn on the established status of believers as 'in Christ' (Rm 8:1–11) but also marks a transition shedding light on what this status encompasses.[659] The audience's current position as those in whom the Spirit lives is revisited, but also a new emphasis is added to their position with Paul's climactic use of the familial metaphors.

The address in Romans 8:12a ἀδελφοί [brothers] also functions at a metaphorical level. The source domain ἀδελφός draws on the meaning of 'brothers' as relatives (Bauer et al. 2000:18; Von Soden 1964:144–146). The familial bond is mapped onto the target domain of those who share similar beliefs and positions.[660] The expression ὀφειλέτης + εἰμί + dat/gen articulates to whom/what a person is obligated to do something (Bauer et al. 2000:742).[661] Paul draws on this image of debt to reiterate believers' position under the lordship of Christ as not obligated to the flesh (τῇ σαρκί). The dative of reference (τῇ σαρκί) recalls the ruling power of the flesh by allowing the

659. The inference is seen with ἄρα and οὖν linking the rhetorical segments together (Fitzmyer 1993:492; Käsemann 1978:217; Porter 1992:305; Schlier 1977:249).

660. Jesus especially uses ἀδελφός when he refers to people who are devoted to him, for example, the disciples. Cf. Matthew 12:50; 28:10; Mark 3:35; John 20:17 (Bauer et al. 2000:18). Hultgren (2011:312) describes it as a 'spiritual kinship that is stronger than that of natural relationships'. Fitzmyer (1993:492) expresses that brothers convey a personal urgency. The general use of ἀδελφός is also seen at Qumran and in Josephus, *Bell.*, 2,122 (Von Soden 1964:146).

661. In Romans 8:13, ὀφειλέτης εἰμί τινι is an example of εἰμί with the dative and predicate nouns with the predicate supplement as a substantive (Blass et al. 1961:§190[1]). The expression ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν [we are obligated ones] is also used in Romans 1:14, where Paul describes the reversal of social obligations to the Greco-Roman world. According to Jewett (2007:493), Paul always uses this term with εἰμί reflecting the social status of having received patronage and thus being required to render a reciprocal service. The combination of ὀφειλέτης and a dative can also be seen in Sophocles, Ajax 589 Θεοῖς … οὐδέν ἁρκεῖν εἶμ᾽ὀφειλέτης ἔτι [to be obligated to the gods]; Plutarch Demeter. 5.5, where Demetrius prays to the gods to no longer be in Ptolemaeus a debtor in thanks (μή πολὺν χρόνον ὀφειλέτην Πτολεμαίῳ γενέσθαι χάριτος) (Byrne 1996:241; Dunn 1988:448). Contra Bornkamm (1969:156) who argues that it is clearly an imperative. Romans 8:12 resonates with the exhortation in Galatians 5:16–17. Cf. Hultgren (2011:312); Wright (2002:217); Zeller (1985:159).

dominion of Sin.[662] Accordingly, the metaphor of debt maps the idea of owing a person something onto the target domain of not owing the flesh and per implication Sin, anything. The subordinate clause in Romans 8:12b (τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν) underscores the target domain, as believers are not obligated to live according to the flesh.

The genitive of the articular infinitive ὀφειλέται … τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν illustrates the focus on what not to do, that is, not to live according to the flesh (Blass et al. 1961:§400[2]; Porter 1992:198). The preposition κατά with the accusative of σάρξ indicates conformity (see Smyth 1956:380[c]). In a nuanced fashion, τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν is a metaphor of dominion, as a person who is obligated to the flesh would have to live according to the controlling force of σάρξ. Bultmann (1968:209) succinctly describes that life comprises intentionality or purpose for Paul. To live according to the flesh entails being subjected to the power and consequences of σάρξ [flesh].[663] In Romans 8:1, metaphorical mixing is prevalent as Paul vacillates from a familial metaphor to a debt metaphor to a metaphor of dominion.

In contrast to Paul's positive focus in Romans 8:1–11, Paul is again arguing from the perspective of what is not to be done (Lohse 2003:238; Schlier 1977:250; Zeller 1985:159). Although the audience is not obligated to the flesh, as seen in Romans 8:12, Paul paints a picture in Romans 8:13 of what would happen if the audience were living according to the flesh.[664] The phrase κατὰ σάρκα is repeated in Romans 8:13a. Similar to Romans 8:12, κατὰ σάρκα functions as an echo of the container metaphor 'in the flesh' conveying the dominion of the flesh. If a person lives according to the flesh, the consequence is that the container is filled with the controlling influence of the flesh. The apodosis Romans 8:13b is expressed with the periphrastic future μέλλω with ἀποθνήσκω emphasising death as the inevitable consequence of being controlled by the flesh, but also that this death is a death without the hope of life with God (Byrne 1996:246; Cranfield 1975:394; Fitzmyer 1993:492–493; Lohse 2003:238; Schlier 1977:250; Smyth 1956:436). The verb ἀποθνήσκω functions at a

662. The container metaphor ἐν τῇ σαρκί seen in Romans 8:3, 8, 11 is ever-present in Paul's argument with the flesh continuing to function as a hostile force. Käsemann (1978:217) translates τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν as '*unter der Macht des Fleisches zu leben*'. Zeller (1985:159) remarks that Paul continually uses the body to express his view of the crucifixion and resurrection. Traces of Plato's idea of the body can be seen in Plato, Phaidon 67a, as taken up by Philo, Gig, 14, but for Paul, it is not about the freedom of the soul but the impulse of the Spirit of God to be in the bodies of believers (Zeller 1985:159).

663. The infinitive is finally expressing the goal (Käsemann 1978:217).

664. The audience has already been prepared for the consequences of living according to the flesh as it is already seen in Romans 1:32; 6:16, 21, 23; 7:5, 10, 24; 8:6. Furthermore, the same is true of life as it now also refers to life past death, as similar cases have already been seen in Romans 2:7; 5:17, 18, 21; 6:8, 22, 23; 8:2, 6, 10 (Wolter 2014:492). Byrne (1996:241) mentions that Paul brings the ethical sequence (Rm 6:1–8:13) to a close, offering his audience with a stark choice between 'death' and 'life'. This verse is reminiscent of the structure in Romans 6 as the argument in Romans 6:12 follows Romans 6:1–11 with the ethical implications thereof.

transcendent level implicating losing eternal life (Bauer et al. 2000:111).[665] Someone who is conforming to the flesh will not obtain eternal life.[666]

In Romans 8:13c–d, the contrast between the life in the Spirit and the life in the flesh is revisited. This is apparent with the instrumental dative of πνεῦμα that functions as the means by which the evil deeds of the body (τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος) (Bauer et al. 2000:860; Cranfield 1975:394; Dunn 1988:449; Lohse 2003:238)[667] is put to death (θανατοῦτε) in the protasis, implying that the Spirit of God is the way to destroy the flesh and its activities.[668] It is, however, not clear why Paul substitutes σάρξ with σῶμα. Most commentators interpret σῶμα to be used in the sense of σάρξ.[669] I agree with Wolter (2014:493) that πράξεις τοῦ σώματος draws on Romans 6:12 (ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι). If you live under Sin or are controlled by the flesh, ultimately death will follow. [670] However, the audience would have recalled Romans 5:8 as the love of God is demonstrated for humans (inferred from εἰς ἡμᾶς [Rm 5:8]) in Christ's death even for humans who are in a state of animosity towards God. Christ has died for sinners in order to enable a status change saving humans from God's wrath. Accordingly, believers' life or death possibilities are determined by the power they choose to fill their container with and accordingly live by. The evil deeds of the body are put to death if a person lives for the Spirit that enables him or her to obtain eternal life. Again, death is contrasted with life as seen in the apodosis Romans 8:13d.

The conjunction γάρ adduces an explanation of the latter conditional clause in Romans 8:14.[671] Another metaphor of dominion highlights believers'

665. The idea that evil deeds result in death was already stated in Romans 7:9–10, but is also an idea widely assumed in the Jewish and Greco-Roman materials, for example, T. Abr. 8:25–30 and LXX Bar 4:1–2 (Jewett 2007:494). Paul draws on the widely known traditional formula 'you (pl.) are about/bound to die', which appears as an individual reminder in Orphic gold tablets directed to someone on the verge of dying, being buried and becoming divine in the afterlife: 'this is the tomb of Memory when one is about to die' (ἐπεί ἂν μέλλησι θανεῖσθαι).

666. Dunn (1988:449) refers to an 'eschatological life'.

667. Contra Käsemann (1978:217) who notes that the word πράξεις is often used in a political sphere by Polybius to indicate intrigues and treacheries.

668. A false understanding of the Spirit being an instrument to wield by Jesus' followers is avoided by πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται in Romans 8:14 (Cranfield 1975:394). Jewett (2007:495) contends that a cosmic struggle to the death is envisioned here within the community between the community and the world. This is a repeated and continuous action (Cranfield 1975:395). The conditional sentence describes life in the Spirit as the present reality. Hultgren (2011:312) states that there is no doubt that a believer will be capable of engaging in the struggle against sinful deeds (Hultgren 2011:312).

669. For example, Cranfield (1975:395) and Jewett (2007:495).

670. Hultgren (2011:312) aptly states that Paul associates σῶμα with human weakness, and although it is not inherently sinful, it is a place where sin seeks to have dominion. Schlier (1977:250) notes the dominion of sin.

671. Dunn (1988:449) notes that the connection of thought between Romans 8:13 and Romans 14 is only unclear when one forgets the fulfilment of the promises to Abraham and Israel and the hidden current that carries Paul's thought.

position[672] as those who are led by the Spirit of God.[673] The phrase πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται [who are being led by God's Spirit] is distinctively Pauline.[674] This is a metaphor of dominion. The dative indicates a relationship by which an entity or person enters into an action with respect to something else, in this case, the Spirit of God with those who are being led by it (Porter 1992:99).[675] The source domain of ἄγω meaning 'to lead' is mapped onto human beings with the Spirit of God indicated as the force that leads them.[676]

The apex of Paul's argument is seen in the familial metaphor υἱοὶ θεοῦ [sons of God] employed in Romans 8:14b, with οὗτοι emphasising the image of those being led by the Spirit of God. Paul develops an extraordinary metaphor with the use of υἱοὶ θεοῦ [sons of God] as this expression was renowned in both Greco-Roman and Jewish environments as it was usually rulers and heroes who were adhered as individual sons of God.[677] After the death of Caesar in 44 BCE and he had been declared divine, Octavian let it be known on the basis of his adoption in 45 BCE he was *divi filius* [son of the divine] (Michel 1978:635). The first two emperors and Nero proclaimed themselves *divi filii* (Hekster et al. 2014:10).[678] It was a message that was especially broadcasted for the elite and the army who were more likely to handle gold and silver coinage (Hekster et al. 2014:10).

This mythical descent from the deity did not mean that the Roman emperor was a god, but the Hellenistic formula merely established the emperor as intelligible and acceptable (Michel 1978:635). This source domain in Romans

672. The correlative ὅσος usually indicates a comparative quantity or number of objects or events, but in Romans 8:14, it is used in a restrictive sense rendering 'all who … these in' (Bauer et al. 2000:729). According to Hultgren (2011:312), it implies an inclusive summary statement.

673. The verb 'being led', also seen in Galatians 5:18, is synonymous with 'walk according to the Spirit' (Fitzmyer 1993:499; Schlier 1977:252). This vocabulary is also used in 1 Corinthians 12:2 (Lohse 2003:239).

674. There is a clear parallel in Galatians 5:18 (Byrne 1996:252; Schlier 1977:251). According to Jewett (2007:496), the notion of 'being led' is prevalent in magical texts, where ἄγειν is a technical term for gods, spirits or ghosts of the dead who are commanded to supernaturally 'lead' a specific person to act in a way the force desires.

675. It is also traced in Galatians 5:18 describing the 'enthusiastic' understanding of believers being 'carried away'. Paul also uses it in 1 Corinthians 12:2 when he depicts pagans allowing to be carried away by 'dumb idols', shedding light on the Greco-Roman world of spiritual forces overpowering humans (Jewett 2007:496; Käsemann 1978:218). Käsemann (1978:218) translates it as '*vom Geist getrieben werden*'.

676. Bauer et al. (2000:16) interprets ἄγω in a moral or spiritual manner.

677. This was especially prominent in the civic cult. The Pergamon altar celebrated Augustus as the 'son of god' and elsewhere he is called the 'son of Apollo'. Nero was celebrated as the 'son of the greatest of the gods', namely, Tiberius Claudius. In Hebrew scriptures, Israel is referred to as the son of Yahweh, as can be seen in multiple examples, including Deuteronomy 14:1–2; Sirach 4:10; Psalms 17:26–27; Jubilees 1:24–25 and Wisdom 16:10 (Michel 1978:634–648). It is also part of the technical language in Jewish tradition, for example, Exodus 4:22–23; Deuteronomy 14:1; 32:5–6; Isaiah 1:2–4; Wisdom 12:7, 21; Sirach 36:17, to list a few (Byrne 1996:248–249). Zeller (1985:160) also notes that, in Qumran, God is depicted as the father for the 'sons of truth' (1 QH IX 35), who are being led by the Spirit and has contact with the '*Himmelssöhnen*' (1 QS IV 20; Xi 7; 1 QH III 21; XI 10).

678. Gaius used *divi Augusti pronepos*.

8:14 υἱός denotes believers' identity being defined in terms of a relationship with God and, consequently, believers have special status and privilege (Bauer et al. 2000:1024–1025). This metaphor also describes the life to which ζήσεσθε, in Romans 8:13, refers to, as being a son of God entails a life of now as well as hereafter (Cranfield 1975:395–396).

The conjunction γάρ signifies the link between Romans 8:15 with Romans 8:14 as the sons of God (υἱοί θεοῦ) metaphor is further elucidated (Bauer et al. 2000:189; Byrne 1996:249; Cranfield 1975:396; Jewett 2007:497; Wolter 2014:495). This unfolds in the parallelism with the repetition of the verb λαμβάνω[679] emphasising the result of the dominion of God. The slavery metaphor πνεῦμα δουλείας [a spirit of slavery] is in juxtaposition with the adoption metaphor πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας [a spirit of adoption]. The former image, πνεῦμα δουλείας [a spirit of slavery] draws again on the source domain of slavery. The spirit of slavery (πνεῦμα δουλείας) is a genitive of purpose in conjunction with the negative particle οὐ, making it clear that it is not the Spirit that causes slavery (Jewett 2007:497). Paul's argument has continually illustrated the negative effects of being a slave to sin, which the audience would have picked up on. A new element is added to this recurrent message with the phrase πάλιν εἰς φόβον [again in fear]. To be under the lordship of Sin is also to be in a state of fear.[680]

The audience members are being convinced that they are not in a position of having a spirit of slavery as they are believers who have undergone a status change. The metaphor of adoption communicates a change of status (Longenecker 2014:72), which heightens the understanding of believers' status as Paul has been describing it throughout the argument. Another genitive of purpose πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας [spirit of sonship] in Romans 8:15b, in contrast, produces the ability to inherit and to be part of a kinship relationship with all the advantages and privileges (Jewett 2007:498). The source domain derives from the Greco-Roman world but is also known in Jewish circles. Paul draws on the source domain υἱοθεσία, which is a technical term of law in the Greco-Roman context concerning the adoption of a son (Byrne 1996:250; Hultgren 2011:313; Wolter 2014:495).[681] Adoption involves the situation where an adopted son is taken out of a previous situation and placed into a new

679. The use of ἐλάβετε may refer to the tendency in faith in Jesus, for example, Galatians 3:2, 14; 1 Corinthians 2:12; John 7:39, or to baptism as in 1 Corinthians 12:13 (Cranfield 1975:396; Wolter 2014:496). In contrast, Hultgren (2011:313) notes that the aorist indicates the reception of the Spirit, which believers received through baptism.

680. Bauer et al. (2000:1062) also lists the noun φόβος to refer specifically to slavish fear that should not describe believers' relationship to God. Wolter (2014:495) notes that slaves lived in constant fear. Evidence in support of this conclusion can be seen in Diogenes Laertius 6.75: δούλου … τό φοβεῖσθαι. Cf. Plutarch, Dion 40.3, Mor. 251a; Philo, Virt.124; Ps-Zaleucus, Prooem. Leg., ed. H. Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*, Abo 1965, 228,13f; Ephesians 6:5 (Wolter 2014:495).

681. However, adoption was not a common practice amongst the Jews (Byrne 1996:250; Schlier 1977:253).

situation with a new family, free from any obligations of the former situation (Longenecker 2014:71–78).[682] The adopted son is just as important as the biological son and is given a new name in accordance with his new life (Longenecker 2014:72). In Romans 8:15, this is mapped onto those who are orientated in Christ, signifying that God accepts them as God's children and shares in the benefits of being a child of God (Bauer et al. 2000:1024).[683]

The result of the metaphor of sonship, in contrast to the spirit of slavery resulting in fear, is seen in Romans 8:15c–d, namely, a spirit by which the adopted cries 'Abba, Father'. The verb κράζω denotes prayer, rather fervent than loud in Romans 8:15 (Bauer et al. 2000:564). Paul utilises κράζω in Galatians 4:6, 'we cry out' (κράζομεν), in a worship situation associated with charismatic language.[684] Consequently, some interpreters discern 'αββα' to derive from ecstatic speech (Hultgren 2011:315; Jewett 2007:499; Moo 1996:502).[685] However, it is possible that Paul intends κράζομεν as a prayer, which illuminates the phrase ἐν ᾧ to be an indication of the presence of the Spirit (Byrne 1996:250; Jewett 2007:498; Wolter 2014:497).

The adoption metaphor is strengthened with the Aramaic transliteration αββα confirmation of their status as being God's children, a coherent image with 'Father' (Hultgren 2011:317; Lohse 2003:239; Schlier 1977:253)[686] The term αββα meaning 'father' is a term of endearment and rarely used to refer to God, but Greek-speaking Christians took the phrase over as a liturgical formula that became a title (Bauer et al. 2000:1; Byrne 1996:250). Believers referring to the Father of Jesus Christ use πατήρ (Bauer et al. 2000:787–788).[687] The term

682. The word is not found in the LXX and there is practically no evidence in the Hebrew Bible, because adoption was not a normal practice amongst the Jews. Polygamy (Dt 21:15–17) or Levirate marriage (Dt 25:5–10) is the substitute for it in the Hebrew Bible (Byrne 1996:250; Fitzmyer 1993:500).

683. In Romans 9:4, Paul also uses the metaphor of υἱοθεσία where Israel is described as being part of the adoption of sonship and similar terms are used in Hellenistic Judaism (Byrne 1996:250; Hultgren 2011:313; Schlier 1977:253; Wolter 2014:495). The concept is used in a typological sense as God elected Israel as a people of his own (Byrne 1996:250; Hultgren 2011:314).

684. The verb κράζω is often used in the LXX for fervent prayer, for example, LXX Psalms 4:3; 16:6; 21:24; 27:1; 30:22. It is also used for passionate weeping before God, as seen in LXX Psalms 31:3 (Fitzmyer 1993:501; Hultgren 2011:315; Jewett 2007:499). The verb is used for the uncontrolled shrieking of the in-save (Mk 9:26; Lk 9:39), for outcries of mobs (Ac 19:28; 32; 34) and for Jesus' death cry (Mt 27:50). In Lucian of Samosata Men. 9 'and the magician … no longer in a quiet voice but really loudly, such as he was, crying out to all the demons at once began shouting to the Avengers and Furies …' The verb was used as a call to gods of the underworld in a pagan ritual (Jewett 2007:498–499).

685. Barrett (1975:64) identifies the verb as 'violent'. Some interpreters think of Abba, the Father, as an ecstatic 'acclamation' (Käsemann 1978:228; Kuss 1957:603–604; Schlier 1977:253–254)

686. The word αββα is less formal than the Hebrew אַבָּא and was used as a colloquialism at home (Hultgren 2011:314).

687. The definite article with the nominative used as a vocative in Greek language is seen in Homer, Iliad 1.231; Xenophon, Cyropaedeia 6.2.41; Aristophanes, Frogs 521; Acharnians 243; Birds 665–666; also, LXX Psalms 5:11; 36:8; 44:2; 54:3 (Blass et al. 1961:§147.3).

derives from the Jesus tradition.[688] In conjunction with the article, πατήρ supplies emphasis and was usually used for Zeus (Hultgren 2011:315). The combination of the two words is also particularly effective rhetorically (Hultgren 2011:315).

The asyndeton in Romans 8:16 amplifies the use of Spirit (πνεῦμα) while refurbishing the use of αββα ὁ πατήρ in Romans 8:15 (Blass et al. 1961:§463; Cranfield 1975:402; Jewett 2007:500; Wolter 2014:497). The resumptive expression αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα [the Spirit itself] underscores the activity of the Spirit, confirming that believers are [children of God]. The verb συμμαρτυρέω refers to provide supporting evidence by testifying. With the prefix συν- it has the highest degree of strengthening (Bauer et al. 2000:957)[689] and provides rhetorical effect (Hultgren 2011:317).[690]

The final clause (ὅτι ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ) in Romans 8:16b serves as an assurance that being a child of God is an existential reality (Wolter 2014:498). The expression ἐσμὲν τέκνα θεοῦ [we are God's children] is referentially synonymous with [sons of God] seen in Romans 8:14, 19.[691] It refers to those who exhibit characteristics of transcendent entities and, according to those adopted by God, thus the children of God (Bauer et al. 2000:995). It has an inclusive connotation, making room for both women and men.[692] The use of the first-person plural of ἐσμέν also underscores the inclusive meaning of the phrase.

In Romans 8:17a, the less vivid conditional clause the image of τέκνον is repeated shedding light on the situation of believers again. This is expressed in a threefold rhetorical display: (1) κληρονόμοι [heirs] (Rm 8:17a) appears in an absolute sense without qualification, (2) κληρονόμοι μὲν θεοῦ [heirs of God] (Rm 8:17b) indicates the source of patrimony, and (3) συγκληρονόμοι δὲ Χριστοῦ [joint-heirs] (Rm 8:17c) clarifies the spiritual and relational nature of inheritance (Jewett 2007:501). The verb συγκληρονομέω indicates 'inheriting together with' (Bauer et al. 2000:952). This image is the pinnacle of the metaphor of the

688. It precipitated into New Testament Greek through the gospel tradition (Mk 14:36, Lk 11:2) (Hultgren 2011:314).

689. In Romans 8:16–29, nine different συν compounds appear and within the scope of Romans 8:16–17, they are repeated, thus reducing the semantic range of συμμαρτυρέω is not appropriate (Cranfield 1975:403; Jewett 2007:500).

690. The verb συμμαρτυρέω usually depicts co-witnessing, for example, in Plato's assurance in Plato Hipp. Maj. 282b1 συμμαρτυρῆσαι δέ σοι [I am able to testify with you] that you are telling the truth. Plutarch, in Adul. Amic. 64c13, maintains that working together with a friend requires that they 'should witness together, not deceive together' (συμμαρτυρεῖν μὴ συνεξαπατᾶν). See also Isocrates Trapez 41.8; Paneg. 31.8; Dionysius Halicarnassus Antiq. Rom. 3.73.3.1.; Josephus *Ant.* 19.154.

691. This is the first occurrence of τέκνον in Romans.

692. However, Paul's use of 'sons of God' did not exclude women (Wolter 2014:498). This inclusion of women correlates to Paul's commendations in Romans 16 of the remarkable large number of feminine church leaders (Jewett 2007:501).

children of God drawing a sharp distinction with slaves who are not in a position to inherit (Wolter 2014:498). Paul also refers to heirs in Galatians 3–4 and Romans 4. In Romans 4, believers are heirs because of the promise made to Abraham. In Romans 8:17, heirs do not concern a promise but rather elicit divine patrimony (Jewett 2007:501). The noun κληρονόμος denotes inheritance and was common in Christian usage as the possession of transcendent salvation (Bauer et al. 2000:548).

With the argument of Romans 8:14–17 in view, εἴπερ in Romans 8:17d has an explanatory function, thus meaning 'indeed/since' (Blass et al. 1961:§454.2; Jewett 2007:501).[693] The motif of suffering with is employed picking Romans 5 up (Byrne 1996:250). The present tense is used with the verb συμπάσχομεν [we suffer together] as believers suffer with Christ on behalf of Christ.[694] The subjunctive passive of the verb συνδοξάζω in Romans 8:17 designates to 'be glorified with someone' (Bauer et al. 2000:966).[695] This is reminiscent of believers' status change in Romans 6:4, where believers have been buried with Christ in his death through baptism in order to be raised just like Christ from death through the glory of the Father. Suffering precedes the glory that is revealed. The mortal body is subjected to pain and suffering. However, the final ἵνα clause in Romans 8:17e points towards the fulfilment that believers may be glorified with Christ (Jewett 2007:503). This glorification with Christ points to the spiritual body that believers will have devoid of any suffering. Romans 8:29 depicts believers are predestined to be conformed to the image of God's Son. Accordingly, the children and heirs of God, suffer with Christ in their current predicaments, but also will be glorified with him.

☐ Persuasion in Romans 8:12–17

Paul has already sketched a possibility for believers of what the reign of Favour or the lordship of Christ might entail for them. Up until this point of the argument, the audience has gone through the implications of their baptism and heard that their bodies have been liberated from Sin and Death. However, believers' new status and the inherent meaning of life connoted to it unfolds with the adoption metaphor in Romans 8:12–17.

693. Contra Cranfield (1975:407) who argues that εἴπερ to stating a fact confirming what has just been said and thus meaning 'seeing that'.

694. The συν compound is reminiscent of Romans 6:4–8 being baptised in Christ, buried with Christ, crucified with Christ and enabled to live with Christ.

695. The rare verb συνδοξάζω only appears in classical sources in the active voice, denoting joining others in praising or approving something as seen in Aristotle Pol. 1310a.13: νόμων καὶ συνδεδοξασμένων ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν πολιτευμένων [of the most beneficial laws also jointly approved by the citizens].

Paul has continually woven the notion of 'with' in the discourse. The familial imagery ἀδελφός [brother] depicts believers as close-knit with Christ. The status change is reflected in the metaphor of dominion illustrating the Spirit of God leading believers (Rm 8:14), but the boiling point is reached with the depiction of believers as υἱοὶ θεοῦ [sons of God] (Rm 8:14). This image is interchanged with an adoption metaphor πνεῦμα υἱοθεσίας [spirit of adoption]. The adoption imagery also maps the cohesive understanding of family to believers' bond with Christ. Paul pushes the slavery metaphor further as believers are not just slaves anymore, but children, equal heirs and partakers in the glory of God. The status of believers as heirs and children of God is also emphasised with the repetition and solidifies believers' position as participants of glory. This shared experience with Christ comprises that believers are in their current mortal body subjected to suffering, but will have a spiritual body that is eternal. The adoption metaphor underscores believers understanding of the benefits of their new status.

Liberation for the children of God (Rm 8:18–30)

Free from enslavement to ruin (Rm 8:18–21)

Romans 8:18–21 continues the thought of Romans 8:17c, that is, that believers suffer and will be glorified together with Christ. Paul's logical deduction is prevalent for the 'I' considering that the sufferings of the present time are not worth in comparison with the coming glory to be revealed in believers (Λογίζομαι γὰρ ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς [Rm 8:18a–b]). For the expectation of the creation eagerly awaits the revelation of the sons of God (ἡ γὰρ ἀποκαραδοκία τῆς κτίσεως τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀπεκδέχεται [Rm 8:19a–b]) further elucidates the statement of Romans 8:18. The explication continues that the creation was subjected to futility, not voluntarily but rather on account of the one who subjected it – in hope (τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι [Rm 8:20a]). The reason is stated that the creation itself will also be set free from its enslavement to ruin in order to obtain liberation towards the glory for the children of God (ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 8:21a–b]).

Detail analysis of Romans 8:18–21

An elaboration follows on the sufferings and glory referred to in Romans 8:17 as the conjunction γάρ signifies.[696] Paul's use of λογίζομαι marks his analytical

696. According to Porter (1992:305), γάρ also functions as a device of cohesion.

and logical resolve (Cranfield 1975:408; Jewett 2007:508; Käsemann 1978:224; Lohse 2003:244, Michel 1966:265; Wolter 2014:507).[697] Coherent with this resolve, Paul draws on an image of a balancing scale (ἄξιος) in Romans 8:18b to compare the present suffering with the coming glory.[698] Romans 8:18b–c is litotes (Greijdanus 1933:373), accentuating that suffering cannot indeed be compared with[699] the glory that is to be revealed in believers (πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς [Rm 8:18c]) (Barrett 1957:165; Cranfield 1975:408; Greijdanus 1933:373; Moo 1996:511; Schlier 1977:257; Zeller 1985:161).[700]

However, believers remain susceptible to suffering (παθήματα). Although, it is not clear what is intended with suffering.[701] Suffering experienced under the rule of Christ is undoubtedly different from the suffering experienced under the rule of Sin, Law and Death (Lohse 2003:244; Schlier 1977:258). Believers' current position (τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ) connotes with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Jewett 2007:508; Schlier 1977:257).[702] Throughout the argument, Paul envisions two categories of being, namely, being in Christ and thus

697. Contra Lagrange (1950:204) who mentions it is just a transitioning phrase. According to Dunn (1988:468), Paul's use of λογίζομαι instead of the usual οἴδαμεν seen in Romans 8:22, 28 provides gravitas as it draws on the experience in the Spirit. The verb λογίζομαι defines 'to hold a view about something, think, believe, or be of the opinion' (Bauer et al. 2000:598). Eichler (1978:822–826) argues that for Paul λογίζομαι is intricately linked with the facts of the cross, embedded in the personal activity of God in Jesus Christ. Cf. Schlier (1977:257).

698. The logical term ἄξιος means 'weighing as much/price in equal value' (Bauer et al. 2000:93; Käsemann 1978:224; Lohse 2003:245). Zeller (1985:162) and Schlier (1977:257) note that the expression links to rabbinic '*Schulsprache*'. It is also coherent with the typical classical Greek tradition of logical reasoning entailing comparing and contrasting, for example, in Homer, *Il.*, 8.234. Agamemnon berates his Greek warriors: νῦν δ᾽οὐδ᾽ἑνὸς ἄξιοί εἰμεν Ἕκτορος [we together are not worth of one Hector!]. Cranfield (1975:408) aptly states that the expression οὐκ ἄξια … πρός [bear no comparison with] is derived from Hellenistic and Jewish language (cf. Michel 1966:265). Michel (1966:266) also adds that the comparison is reminiscent to Romans 5:15, although there are no direct links. Paul also draws on an image of a balancing scale in 2 Corinthians 4:17 (Käsemann 1978:224 223; Kruse 2012:342; Lagrange 1950:204; Lohse 2003:245; Peterson 2017:253; Schlier 1977:257; Zeller 1985:161). However, in Romans 8:18, the focus is the connection of sufferings with the present time (τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ).

699. The preposition πρός with the accusative in conjunction with the verb μέλλω [to come] renders the meaning 'in comparison with' (Blass et al. 1961:§239[8]).

700. Kruse (2012:341) notes that Paul downplays the severity of the suffering's believers encounter (cf. Peterson 2017:253).

701. Hultgren (2011:321) remarks that Paul knows that not only does suffering exist, but also it will persist. Jewett (2007:509) postulates that the audience's Roman situation of harassment and deportation forms the backdrop for understanding suffering. Similarly, Moo (1996:511) and (Kruse 2012:342) argue that suffering refers to persecution in Rome, but add that suffering encompasses the 'whole gamut of suffering such as bereavement to financial reverses'.

702. Zeller (1985:161) especially notes that Paul's emphasis on the current aeon contains an apocalyptic viewpoint. Käsemann (1978:224) remarks that the phrase does not only refer to the earthly present existence, or the earthly existence as being portrayed as bad, but also to the revealing of the future glory. The phrase is usually interpreted in an eschatological manner (Barrett 1957:165; Greijdanus 1933:373; Wolter 2014:507; Zeller 1985:161). The phrase τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ is also employed in Romans 3:26.

drawing on the power of God or the alternative state of being, namely being subjected to Sin, which inevitably leads to death. The latter state is considered as a past state of being for believers.

Although believers share in suffering in their current position, δόξα in Romans 8:18c also depicts a future state of being referred to radiance and glory that will be revealed within believers (Bauer et al. 2000:257).[703] The phrase εἰς ἡμᾶς functions as a container metaphor as the bodies of believers may be envisioned as a container to be dominated. The preposition εἰς indicates the bodies of believers as the space where the coming glory will manifest.[704]

Romans 8:19a expounds on what is intended with δόξα as the conjunction γάρ indicates. Notwithstanding, the clarification of δόξα becomes murky as Romans 8:19 introduces anthropomorphic imagery requiring further elucidation in itself. The subject of Romans 8:19a, ἀποκαραδοκία [eager expectation] (Bauer et al. 2000:112),[705] is in itself a dead metaphor. It evokes the image of stretching the neck or craning forward, consisting of κάρα [head] and δέκομαι [to itch/to take] (Delling 1964:393).[706] The use of ἀπό intensifies καραδοκία (Cranfield 1975:410; Greijdanus 1933:374). The preposition ἀπό is also used four times in Romans 8:18, 19, highlighting the connection between these verses. The repetition creates a pattern typically found in discourse (Semino 2008:22).

The noun ἀποκαραδοκία is described with the adnominal genitive (τῆς κτίσεως), which raises interpretation questions concerning whether κτίσις is a

703. Black (1973:115) notes that it is the recovery of the divine image of glory originally lost at the fall but restored in Christ. According to Jewett (2007:510), the use of glory derives from a major stream of prophetic and post-exilic expectations, for example, Psalms 8:1, 5–6, where human beings were created to reflect such glory. This was symbolised throughout the Ancient Near East by the royal crown or diadem. The verb ἀποκαλύπτω indicates in this instance the revelation of certain persons and circumstances in the end time, in this case, the glory that is to be revealed (Bauer et al. 2000:112). The participle is often separated from its adjuncts as seen in the word order position of the nouns and adverbs in τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι (Blass et al. 1961:§474(5a)). Michel (1966:266) notes that the verse continues over into an apocalyptic Lehrsatz.

704. Schlier (1977:257–258) notes that Paul does not shed light on what is intended with δόξα, but that it is revealed εἰς ἡμᾶς becoming more than a concept, but the reality of God. Schlier (1977:258) also points out that Romans 5:5 should be kept in mind as the Holy Spirit is poured into the hearts of believers.

705. The noun ἀποκαραδοκία also occurs in Philippians 1:20, where it is associated with ἐλπίς denoting confident expectation. In Romans 8:19, this is used in conjunction with the creation and not Jesus' believers as is the case in Philippians 1:20 (Cranfield 1975:410; Delling 1964:393; Käsemann 1978:227; Lohse 2003:244; Schlier 1977:259; Wolter 2014:509). Only the verb occurs in Hellenistic texts (Schlier 1977:259). The noun ἡ ἀποκαραδοκία appears in Origen. *Cels.* 7,65; 8,15; *Comm. Jo*. 1,26,170.

706. In classical Greek the verb ἀποκαραδοκεῖν is quite common and in itself a metaphor (Cranfield 1975:410; Peterson 2017:254).

personification,[707] and refers to a creature[708] or the whole of creation (Foerster 1964a:1031).[709] Whether it is necessary to differentiate between 'subhuman' or 'nonhuman'[710]; this distinction is not necessary if κτίσις is understood as a metonymy referring to the whole of creation (Wolter 2014:509).[711]

The verb ἀπεκδέχομαι also divulges 'eagerly awaiting' just like ἀποκαραδοκία (Bauer et al. 2000:100).[712] This is an example of metaphorical extension as the metaphorical expressions evoking the same source domain are used in close proximity (Semino 2008:25). The creation expects the revealing of the sons of God as eagerly as a person protruding his or her head in expectancy to see what will happen (Breytenbach 2013c:204). Paul is juxtaposing the whole of creation with the sons of God (Breytenbach 2013c:204).[713] The *genitivus objectivus* (τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ) indicates God manifests in his sons

707. Jewett (2007:511) argues that κτίσις is personified. His argument draws on the idea that the Greco-Roman world was accustomed to the personification of earth as an eternal mother. The personification of earth is also seen in the apocalyptic variant of the flood narrative in 1 Enoch 7:6: τότε ἡ γῆ ἐνέτυχεν κατὰ τῶν ἀνόμων [then the earth made accusation against the outlaws] (Jewett 2007:511). The personification of creation appears often in Jewish literature. Cf. Genesis 3; Isaiah 24; Psalms 65:12; Isaiah 24:4, 7; Jeremiah 1; 4:28; 12:4.

708. Brunner (1947) argues that κτίσις draws on the Hebrew beriyyah meaning 'creature'. Accordingly, the view is held that Paul does not refer to the cosmos, but to man as the creature of God. However, with Romans 8:22 in mind, it seems prevalent that Paul does intend the whole created universe (Black 1973:116). The possibility exists to view Romans 8:20, 21 as referring to the creature and Romans 8:22 referring to the whole of creation (Lampe 1964:449–462).

709. Gaventa (2011:275) also contends that κτίσις is an all-encompassing term including humans and everything God created (cf. Greijdanus 1933:374; Hultgren 2011:321; Kruse 2012:344). Liberation is intended for all of creation (Kruse 2012:344). However, Gaventa (2011:268) adds that Paul's use of cosmology especially emphasises God as creator and how creation longs for God's redemption as seen especially in Romans 8:19–22. Käsemann (1978:225) remarks that Paul's use of κτίσις stems from the Jewish apocalyptic tradition with reference to the fall. Cf. Romans 3:23; 5:2, 12.

710. Some commentators, such as Michel (1966:266), differentiate between 'subhuman' or 'nonhuman'; however, Hultgren (2011:321) notes that there is no reason to limit the term. Delling (1964:393) proposes that Paul is conscious of the anxious waiting of creation under the stress of the inner and reciprocal conflict of creatures and elements or he may be drawing a theological conclusion from the dominion of anti-godly power over this aeon in consequence of the fall. The present age, subject to futility, corruption and suffering, will be released in the coming age with the purpose of God's salvation, which the whole creation will participate through the revelation of the children of God (Painter 1993:979).

711. In poetry, the adnominal genitive is used with κάρα to express majestic or loved persons or object (Smyth 1956:313).

712. The passive is understood to imply the waiting of the whole creation below the human level (animate and inanimate) (Bauer et al. 2000:573; Greijdanus 1933:374; Michel 1966:266; Morris 1988:320). Paul uses ἀπεκδέχομαι more often, for example, 1 Corinthians 1:7; Galatians 5:5; Philippians 3:20 (Schlier 1977:259).

713. Michel (1966:266) notes that the sons of God is in a way a representation of the creation (cf. Käsemann 1978:226). Michel (1966:266) also adds that according to the Jewish representation the 'son', namely, the Messiah, saves creation as seen in 4 Ezra and Genesis 12.

(Wolter 2014:510).[714] Believers are expressed with the metonymy τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ [sons of God] (Schlier 1977:258–259).[715]

The goal of the images employed in Romans 8:19 is to underline the greatness of the future glory outweighing the current sufferings (Kruse 2012:342). Romans 5:2–3 should be brought into remembrance. Paul has established that the audience should take pride based on hope based on the δόξα τοῦ θεοῦ deriving from circumstances causing distress (Breytenbach 2013c:203). In Romans, Paul uses δόξα as a specific attribute of God as imperishable, in contrast to his creatures that are subject to decay (Breytenbach 2013c:203).

Another elaboration follows in Romans 8:20 as γάρ indicates (Cranfield 1975:413; Greijdanus 1933:375; Jewett 2007:513; Lohse 2003:247; Schlier 1977:260; Wolter 2014:510). The effect of humans' behaviour on creation is emphasised with the placing of ματαιότης in the beginning of the explanatory clause (Cranfield 1975:413; Foerster 1964a:1031; Jewett 2007:513; Michel 1966:267).[716] The creation (ἡ κτίσις) is personified in Romans 8:20. The divine passive of ὑποτάσσω unveils a metaphor of submission. Creation has 'become subject'[717] to a state of being disclosed with ματαιότης [futility].[718]

714. Käsemann (1978:225) notes that the emphatic genitive crowns the argument.

715. Greijdanus (1933:374–375) notes that the position of believers is now explicit as Paul uses 'sons' (υἱοί) instead of 'children' (τέκνα), as seen in Romans 8:21. However, the terms are used as synonyms.

716. Käsemann (1978:225) rightly points out that Paul does not intend the dominion of believers over the world. According to Foerster (1964a:1031), to allot a link to Adam is erroneous as it seems odd that the innocent is to be punished. Foerster (1964a:1031) suggests that it is better to refer to a creation that is subjected to corruption rather than a fallen creation. Usually it implies the sum of everything created. The use of κτίσις is a clear indication of Jewish influence as it is a term that is normally restricted to the colonisation of cities. What is interesting is that, the language Paul uses in Romans 8:20 is similar to a magic spell showing Jewish influence as PGM XII.85 (see also XIII.745) reads: ἡ πᾶσα κτίτις ὑπόκειται [I adjure you by the (holy) and honoured name whom all creation is subjugated]. Paul probably had Genesis 3:17–19 in mind (Jewett 2007:513).

717. There are two interpretations. The more likely is linking God is the one who subjected creation (Black 1973:116; Kruse 2012:343; Schlier 1977:260; Tiedtke & Link 1975:552; Zeller 1985:162). The second interpretation notes Adam's fall as the problem (Cranfield 1975:413; Greijdanus 1933:376; Jewett 2007:513; Michel 1966:267). Käsemann (1978:227) notes that the verb ὑποτάσσω is specifically used in the apocalyptic tradition to refer to the fall.

718. Ματαιότης denotes state of being without use or value (Bauer et al. 2000:621). This reflects the language and thought of LXX Ecclesiastes appearing 39 times (Hultgren 2011:323; Kruse 2012:343; Schlier 1977:259). There is some discussion about the interpretation as Barrett (1957:166) suggests that on account of ματαιότης use in the LXX referring to idols and gods and to 'inferior spiritual powers' or what Paul otherwise calls the 'elements of the world' (e.g., Gl 4:9) to which the created order has been enslaved (Comfort 1993:322). In Ephesians 4:17, it is characteristic of the pagan way of thought and life as in ingratitude man forsakes God. This is possible to infer from the use of the verb ματαιόω in Romans 1:21 that the abusers of the creation are identified as Adam and his descendants. Man is given over to vanity because he ungratefully denies God the honour that is justly God's and it destroys his thinking, planning and action (1964:552). According to Jewett (2007:513), it is a powerful reminder that humans trying to play God by not being obedient to God's command (Gn 3:17) also end up ruining the relationship with the natural world. This is in stark contrast to the Roman propaganda promoting the idea that a ruler who plays god has the ability to restore the world with his piety and military dominance (Jewett 2007:513).

The subordinate clause further describes the creation's position as οὐχ ἑκοῦσα [not voluntarily] (Rm 8:20b).[719]

The metaphor of submission repeats in Romans 8:20c (ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα, ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι) with the verb ὑποτάσσω. The preposition διά in connection with the participle ὑποτάξαντα in the accusative renders the meaning 'by force of' (Blass et al. 1961:§222). God has not subjected the creation to suffering without hope, as ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι [in hope] is intended as the object of ὑποτάσσω (Michel 1966:267; Schlier 1977:260). This is also prompted by the contrast between the negative construction (οὐχ ἑκοῦσα) qualifying ὑπετάγη and the positive construction ἀλλὰ … ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι (Breytenbach 2013c:205). The creation was subjected to futility, not voluntarily by God. However, the creation was not left in the position of futility but placed in a position to hope. The audience is reminded of their own position of standing in favour as hope (ἐφ᾽ ἐλπίδι) is reminiscent of Romans 5:2.

The ὅτι clause of Romans 8:21a explains the content of hope (ἐλπίς). The creation will itself also be set free from the slavery of ruin (ὅτι καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς) (Lohse 2003:247; Moo 1996:516; Michel 1966:268; Schlier 1977:262; Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:153).[720] The employment of the future tense of ἐλευθερόω is significant,[721] especially as the subject is God. God is the liberator. The slavery metaphor is picked up again in the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς [from enslavement to ruin].[722] Paul's use of φθορᾶ is linked with θάνατος, accordingly principles and forces Christ defeats do not only comprise the elements of the cosmos (στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου) but also principles like death and dissolution (Van Kooten 2003:102). One can refer to Plutarch (De genio Socratis 591B) who views four things in life: life, motion, generation and dissolution (φθορᾶ). According to Paul, it is the powers and forces that are gradually subdued during Christ's reign (Van Kooten 2013:103).

719. The adjective ἑκών denotes to be favourably disposed to do something without pressure, that is, willingly (Bauer et al. 2000:313).

720. Peterson (2017:255) mentions that freedom and the resurrection of the body are intended as corresponding concepts.

721. The verb ἐλευθερόω ἀπό denotes to cause someone to be freed from domination (Bauer et al. 2000:317). The idea of the hope of being set free resonates with Jewish prophetism and apocalypticism, expecting a king who will come and restore righteousness. Cf. Isaiah 11:4–9; 65:17, 25; 66:22; Jubilees 1:29; 1 Enoch 24–25, 91:16–17; Testament of Leviticus 18:10–11; 4 Ezra 13:26.

722. The phrase τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης is understood in humans regaining a proper dominion by participating in the 'righteousness of God' as seen in Romans 1:17 having a cosmic scope. It is the exact opposite of ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς being in slavery and decay. In 1 Corinthians 15:42, the creation has been freed from slavery (Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:153). The idea that creation is cursed functions according to this (Van Leeuwen & Jacobs 1974:153).

The suffering creation will be freed from the slavery of decay. The phrase εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [towards the freedom of the glory of the children of God] indicates that the creation will be liberated like the children of God.[723] This freedom becomes synonymous with δόξα.[724] Paul draws a parallel between the subjection of the creation under purposelessness and the slavery caused by decay (Breytenbach 2013c:206). In contrast, the future liberation not only is freedom from purposelessness and decay but also instigates future freedom has purpose (Breytenbach 2013c:206). The δόξα of the children who belong to God constitutes their freedom and this freedom liberates them from slavery caused by organic matter (Breytenbach 2013c:206). Children of God may be understood as the bodies of believers, having partaken in the glory of the Father through baptism; it now becomes clear that this glory also implies a body envisioned without decay. Believers are liberated to become spiritual bodies that continue to embody the glory associated with being a child of God.

☐ The personification of creation

Romans 8:18–23 is often used as a mantra for current ecological issues (Bauckham 2011:91–97). However, although such a view may be fruitful for debates in practical theology, caution must be heeded not to read more into Paul's text. The error is often made to assume that the creation is subjected to man derived from Genesis 1:26, 27; 3 (Bauckham 2011:93). This is not a Pauline view, as Paul does not view humans as dominant over the creation. The passives indicate God as the action taker. Humans are not the mediator between God and the nonhuman creation (Bauckham 2011:93). Paul's anthropology has a strong focus on humans filled with the Spirit and reflecting the glory of God. Paul never describes humans as spirits or the soul (Käsemann 1969:14). Instead, Paul identifies humans from their fleshly existence but understands humans to be determined by the spiritual world (Käsemann 1696:14).

☐ Redemption of the body (Rm 8:22–27)

Paul continues with a statement he assumes is common knowledge, that is, that until now the whole creation groans together and pains together (οἴδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν [Rm 8:22a–c]). Not only the creation but even believers who have the first fruits of the Spirit

723. According to Jewett (2007:515), Paul's hope of restoration lies in the children of God, who in contrast to one king, or Caesar, are the rightful rulers shared by all Jesus' followers reflecting God's glory. In the Sibylline Oracles, a similar notion is found, for example, in Sib. Or. 3.744–745, 750–751, where a time after the day of judgement and the arrival of a just empire is predicted.

724. Δόξα is used in same way as in Romans 8:18 (1977:262).

groan (οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες [Rm 8:23a]). Believers' experience is emphasised in Romans 8:23b–c, as even believers groan within themselves as they await the redemption of their body (ἡμεῖς καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στενάζομεν υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι, τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν [Rm 8:23b–c]). Paul continues with an elaboration drawing on a chain emphasising the notion of hope. For it is in this hope believers were saved (τῇ γὰρ ἐλπίδι ἐσώθημεν·[Rm 8:24a]). But a hope seen is not hope (ἐλπὶς δὲ βλεπομένη οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλπίς [Rm 8:24b–c]), for who can hope for what one sees (ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει; [Rm 8:24d])? But if believers hope in what they do not see (εἰ δὲ ὃ οὐ βλέπομεν ἐλπίζομεν [Rm 8:25a]), they wait for it with perseverance (δι᾽ ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα [Rm 8:25b]). In Romans 8:26–27, Paul especially focuses on the role of the Spirit. In a similar way, the Spirit also helps believers in their weakness (Ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα συναντιλαμβάνεται τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν [Rm 8:26a]). For believers do not know what they ought to pray for (τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ [Rm 8:26b]), but they know the Spirit itself intercedes for sighs too deep for words (οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις [Rm 8:26c]). However, the one searching the hearts knows what the intention of the Spirit is (ὁ δὲ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας οἶδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος [Rm 8:27a–b]) that by God it intercedes for the sake of the saints (ὅτι κατὰ θεὸν ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἁγίων [Rm 8:27c]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:22–27

Romans 8:22a begins with οἴδαμεν γάρ assuming the audience is acquainted with nature's corrupt state (Cranfield 1975:416; Dunn 1988:472; Greijdanus 1933:378; Jewett 2007:516; Käsemann 1978:228; Lohse 2003:247; Michel 1966:267; Schlier 1977:263; Wolter 2014:514). In effect, Romans 8:22 provides a summary of Romans 8:20–21 while simultaneously expressing the suffering and the hope of creation seen in the rare metaphors of συστενάζω [groaning together] and συνωδίνω [pain of child birth] (Cranfield 1975:416; Wolter 2014:514; Zeller 1985:162). The ὅτι clause in Romans 8:22b expounds the personification of creation (ἡ κτίσις) and includes animate and inanimate objects as πᾶσα [all] implies. The source domain of συστενάζω draws on the meaning 'groaning together' (Bauer et al. 2000:978–979).[725] The use of the compound σύν, refers to πᾶσα, provides intensification and should be translated as 'together or with one accord' (Cranfield 1975:417; Greijdanus 1933:378; Wolter 2014:515).[726]

In close connection with the groaning metaphor, Paul draws on the metaphor of συνωδίνω [childbirth], communicating 'to suffer agony together'

725. Bauckham (2011:94) suggests that συστενάζω echoes passages such as Jeremiah 4:28; 12:4; Hosea 4:3; Joel 1:10, in which the earth is purported to 'mourn'.

726. Contra Jewett (2007:517).

(Bauer et al. 2000:977) in Romans 8:22c.[727] The compound σύν is also repeated in συνωδίνω. Both verbs συστενάζω and συνωδίνω are in the present tense, but the addition of ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν, introducing a time frame spanning from the submission of creation until its redemption, requires perfect translations (Hultgren 2011:323; Lohse 2003:247; Wolter 2014:515). The current suffering of the creation will however be worthwhile as the childbirth metaphor underscores. The imagery connotes with the adoption imagery of Romans 8:12–17 (Breytenbach 2013c:207). The creation similar to the children of God, who have the first portion of the Spirit, expects the fulfilment of their adoption (Breytenbach 2013c:207).

The meaning of groaning comes under the scope in Romans 8:23–25 (Schlier 1977:264). Believers and the creation have the first fruits of the Spirit. In Romans 8:23a (οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος ἔχοντες), the elliptical phrase οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ [not only, but also] implies believers and the creation (Greijdanus 1933:379; Schlier 1977:264). The participle (ἔχοντες)[728] serves as a demonstrative article linked with αὐτοί (Michel 1966:270; Wolter 2014:516).[729] The repetition of καὶ αὐτοί in Romans 8:23a and 8:23b, as well as the emphatic use of ἡμεῖς in Romans 8:23b, focuses on the audience's position (Cranfield 1975:417; Wolter 2014:515).[730] The image ἀπαρχή [first fruits] derives from the source domain of agriculture but was also developed in the cultic sphere (Kruse 2012:349).[731] Ἀπαρχή technically indicates any natural product or livestock that was sacred to the deity and had to be consecrated before it could be given to the profane (Brown 1978:415).[732] Paul uniquely combines it with the Spirit (τὴν ἀπαρχὴν τοῦ πνεύματος),[733] as believers have the first

727. Michel (1966:269) notes that the childbirth image stems from an apocalyptic concept, familiar to the possible reference to the birth pangs of the Messiah in 1 QH 3.7–10 to signify the suffering that precedes the coming of a redemptive or messianic era (cf. Black 1973:116–117; Hultgren 2011:324; Käsemann 1978:228; Zeller 1985:162). Jewish tradition also draws on this image, for example, Isaiah 13:8; 21:3; 26:17–18; Jeremiah 4:31; 6:24; 22:23; Hosea 13:13; Micah 4:9–10.

728. Can be used causal and concessive (Greijdanus 1933:379).

729. In a similar manner, Jewett (2007:518) connects αὐτοί with ἔχοντες, but in contrast, Wolter argues that ἔχοντες is used in an attributive sense, thus 'already having'. Contra Cranfield (1975:417) who argues that αὐτοί should be read with the indicative στενάζομεν.

730. Contra Jewett (2007:518). Greijdanus (1933:380) remarks that the repetition of καὶ αὐτοί indicates that believers have already been identified as those who have the Spirit in Romans 5:5; 8:4, 9–11, 14–16.

731. Paul often uses this image. In Romans 16:5; 1 Corinthians 16:15; 2 Thessalonians 2:13, it is employed to refer to Christ's resurrection as the 'first fruits'. Ἀπαρχή is derived from the cultic sphere, referring to the hair cut from the forehead and cast into the fire, thus being the beginning of a sacrifice. The sacrifice is intended to influence unseen powers and in certain cases to render the malignant activities innocuous (Brown 1978:415–417).

732. It describes something that is given by God to man as something that also functions as a gift or pledge of a fuller gift to come (Black 1973:117; Cranfield 1975:418). Black (1973:117) remarks that it should be interpreted synonymously with 2 Corinthians 5:5 with ἀρραβών meaning 'first instalment' or 'gift'.

733. The genitive is either a *genitivus epexegeticus* or *appositivus*. The former renders the meaning that 'the first fruits which is the Spirit' and the latter refers to the work of the Spirit in believers. The former is more likely as is also the case in 2 Corinthians 1:22; 5:5 (Greijdanus 1933:379; Kruse 2012:349; Schlier 1977:264; Wolter 2014:517).

instalment of what is to come (Black 1973:117; Hultgren 2011:324). The image of groaning is reverberated in Romans 8:23b with στενάζω, but differentiates between 'we' and 'creation' as the preposition σύν is not repeated (Lohse 2003:248). Even believers groan within themselves as a container metaphor is prevalent in the expression ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (Rm 8:23b). This implies the body as the place where this groaning, but also the fulfilment of adoption, will take place. Believers are already sons of God, but their sonship is yet to manifest (Black 1973:117; Cranfield 1975:419; Jewett 2007:519; Kruse 2012:350).[734]

The subordinate clause υἱοθεσίαν ἀπεκδεχόμενοι [eagerly waiting for sonship] (Rm 8:23c) reiterates the adoption metaphor of Romans 8:15, 19. The phrase τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν explains the advent of υἱοθεσίαν (Rm 8:23 b–c) and explicitly states the body as the place where believers await redemption. Paul draws on a military metaphor with ἀπολύτρωσις. The source domain of ἀπολύτρωσις originates from the concept of 'buying back a slave or prisoner of war being released by either victory or pagan ransom'.[735] In Romans 8:23, the idea of redemption, acquittal, is mapped onto the target domain of believers' bodies being in a state of capture, in need for redemption (Bauer et al. 2000:117; Greijdanus 1933:380). The expectation is that the mortal body is liberated in such a manner that it will be made alive and will no longer be subjected to death and decay as its members are no longer serving Sin (Breytenbach 2013c:207).

Romans 8:24 elaborates on the expected redemption as the conjunction γάρ marks. The repetition and chiastic word order in Romans 8:24–25 particularly emphasises hope. Hope describes the situation in which believers live as liberated people (Lohse 2003:248).[736] Hope defines believers' aspiration that their mortal bodies will be made alive in such a way that they are no longer affected by Sin (Breytenbach 2013c:208). The modal dative τῇ ἐλπίδι qualifies the past tense of σῴζω, indicating Christ has already saved believers (Hultgren 2011:325; Käsemann 1978:230; Lohse 2003:248; Zeller 1985:163),[737] but the bodily experience of this saving action lies in the future as τῇ ἐλπίδι denotes. Paul differentiates between the present and future in Romans 8:24b–25 with the contrast of ἐλπίς [hope] and βλέπω [to see] (Greijdanus 1933:382; Wolter 2014:520).[738]

734. Dunn (1988:474) remarks that believers experience frustration because of the overlap of the ages. The full manifestation of sonship is seen in the Parousia. Believers are already 'children of God' but there is a form of this adoption sonship for which believers still eagerly long (Kruse 2012:350).

735. There are ample examples of this military context, for example, Posidonius Phil. Frag. 213.20 or Diodorus Siculus Hist. 37.5.3.

736. Schlier (1977:266) notes that 'we are saved to hope'.

737. Contra Black (1973:117) who argues it should be viewed as in an instrumental sense rendering 'in hope we attained our salvation'.

738. A similar distinction is seen in 2 Corinthians 5:7, but between ἐλπίς and πίστις.

The simple conditional clause in Romans 8:25a assumes a negative answer on the rhetorical question in Romans 8:24d (ὃ γὰρ βλέπει τίς ἐλπίζει;) as nobody hopes on something they see. However, the protasis Romans 8:25a illustrates that if believers hope for something they do not see, then the logical deduction is that they wait patiently for it.[739] The noun ὑπομονή forms part of a pattern of repetition. This echoes the use of ὑπομονή in Romans 5:3–5, but in Romans 8:25b, ὑπομονή designates 'patience' (Bauer et al. 2000:1040). There is no object mentioned to which a person directs his waiting (Lohse 2003:248). The preposition διά with ὑπομονή functions as an agent through which a goal is achieved (Porter 1992:150). The verb ἀπεκδέχομαι [to wait, expect] is powered by patience (δι᾽ ὑπομονῆς ἀπεκδεχόμεθα) in Romans 8:25. The powerful image sketches an understanding of the need to be patient while the believer eagerly awaits to reap the reward of the redemptive body. A pattern of recurrence forms with ἀπεκδέχομαι (cf. Rm 8:19, 23 and 25). The adoption metaphor sheds light on the future body a believer will obtain.

The next segment of the argument, Romans 8:26–27, focuses on the Spirit (πνεῦμα). The comparison formula ὡσαύτως δὲ καί [in a similar way also] compares the creation (Rm 8:22), the believers (Rm 8:23) and now the Spirit's suggested experience of groaning (Cranfield 1975:420–421). The Spirit aids (συναντιλαμβάνεται) believers who are in a vulnerable state (τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ ἡμῶν). The verb συναντιλαμβάνεται denotes 'to come to the aid, to be of assistance' (Bauer et al. 2000:965). There is some debate concerning the intention of ἀσθένεια.[740] From the viewpoint of Romans 5:6, 8, 10, the mortal bodily needed saving and is protected by Christ, but the forces of Sin and Death continually pose a threat to the dominion of a believer's body. Paul utilises the plural of the personal pronoun ἐγώ, including himself amongst the believers who are torn between the present state of being, which is still susceptible to the powers of Sin and Death, but also part of the state of being that will reflect the glory of God, which befits children of God. However, the mortal body is vulnerable and needs the help of the Spirit.

Romans 8:26b elaborates (γάρ) on the weakness of believers' mortal bodies. The Spirit not only helps believers but also intercedes on behalf of the believers

739. The creation has been waiting and hoping since Genesis 3:17 for restoration in contrast to Jesus' followers who first become aware of the hope that waits when they believe Christ and are baptised in Christ as already seen in Romans 5:5, 8 (Wolter 2014:520).

740. According to Bauer et al. (2000:142), ἀσθένεια in Romans 8:26 indicates a lack of spiritual insight. Greijdanus (1933:384) remarks that the verse must be understood with Romans 8:18 in mind, considering the difficult circumstances in which believers had to function that would have caused their faith to weaken. In turn, Käsemann (1978:231–232) notes that it describes an inner incapacity, but does not have a psychological or moral implication. Link (1978:994) remarks that Paul's use of ἀσθένεια exhibits reflection concerning man's relation to his or her sinful nature. Link (1978:994) and Schlier (1977:268) continue that ἀσθένεια indicates human powerlessness over God, needing the help of the Spirit's power. For Zeller (1985:163), the weakness lies in the inability of the flesh-like state to articulate their prayers.

(Breytenbach 2013c:209) as they cannot express themselves as they ought to, according to the will of God. Romans 8:26c draws the audience in with οὐκ οἴδαμεν [we do not know] and sheds light on the fact that they are dependent on the Spirit's help to pray as the concessive clause Romans 8:26c (ἀλλ᾽ αὐτὸ τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις) illustrates.[741] Paul is the first to state the Spirit as an intercessor so succinctly. Αὐτό [self] serves in this predicate structure of Romans 8:26c as an intensive pronoun (Porter 1992:120). It is not clear what στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις [unspoken groans] communicated to the audience (Jewett 2007:523–524). Prayers in ancient times were said aloud and, traditionally, is interpreted as referring to ecstatic utterances of glossolalia (Cranfield 1975:423; Kruse 2012:352). The most likely interpretation is 'sighs too deep for words',[742] especially with Romans 8:27 in mind. The use of στεναγμός recalls στενάζω in Romans 8:22, 23, echoing the sighing of creation as well as believers.

The adversative particle δέ indicates a contrast between Romans 8:27 and Romans 8:26. Paul draws on a typical Jewish concept of God with ὁ ἐραυνῶν τὰς καρδίας [the one who searches the heart].[743] The heart (καρδία) is the centre of will, emotion and intentionality and is the place where the 'silent groans' of Romans 8:26 occur. The ensuing clause οἶδεν τί τὸ φρόνημα τοῦ πνεύματος [know the mindset of the Spirit] (Rm 8:27b) should be understood in the context of the Spirit's activity in the human heart (Lohse 2003:251). This also forms a pattern of repetition referring to mindset seen in Romans 8:5–8. The causal clause in Romans 8:27c (ὅτι) illustrates that the Spirit intercedes on behalf of the saints. The saints (ἅγιος) refer to the believers' status when under the influence of God and functions accordingly as a metonymy.[744] Believers receive the Spirit's help because they have undergone a status change, and the metaphor of dominion κατὰ θεόν indicates believers' bodies as under the dominion of God. The preposition κατά with θεόν indicates God as the origin of influence to which believers are subjected to. The mortal bodies are under the

741. The verb ὑπερεντυγχάνω indicates 'to intercede in behalf of another, plead' (Bauer et al. 2000:1033). The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα ὑπερεντυγχάνει στεναγμοῖς ἀλαλήτοις is difficult to understand, as there are no other examples in early Christianity. Käsemann (1978:231) rightly remarks that there is not enough evidence to know how early Christians prayed. This verse remains an aporia.

742. The word ἀλάλητος denotes unexpressed, inexpressible from the concept of sighs too deep for words (Bauer et al. 2000:41). The closely associated adjective ἄλαλος used in Plutarch's description of the oracle of Delphi as possessed by ἀλάλου καὶ κακοῦ πνεύματος [an unspeaking and bad spirit]. However, this does not help us to understand what Paul intended here.

743. Cf. Proverbs 20:27; 24:12; 1 Samuel 16:7; 1 Kings 8:39; 1 Chronicles 28:9; 29:17; 2 Chronicles 6:30; Psalms 44:21; 139:23; Jeremiah 12:3; 17:9–10. It is also immensely important in wisdom literature, as the heart is where one decides. A wise person would be someone who follows God (Kruse 2012:353). Schlier (1977:269) and Kruse (2012:353) note '*er kennt sein*' (φρόνημα [Rm 8:6, 7]).

744. The noun ἅγιος refers to the believers, loyal followers being saints of Christians consecrated to God (Bauer et al. 2000:11). Believers are ἅγιος [holy] when they maintain their relationship with God as his children (Jewett 2007:525).

dominion of God but are vulnerable and susceptible to lapse under the control of Sin. Accordingly, the Spirit intercedes on behalf of believers.

☐ For those who love God (Rm 8:28–30)

Paul again assumes that the audience is already knowledgeable, as he states that 'we' know that for those who love God (οἴδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν [Rm 8:28a–b]), all things work together for good (πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν [Rm 8:28c]). An idiosyncrasy of this group of people who love God comes within the purview, for those who are called according to his purpose (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν [Rm 8:28d]). This is because for those whom God foreknew (ὅτι οὓς προέγνω [Rm 8:29a]), he also predestined to be conformed to the image of his Son (καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ [Rm 8:29b]), in order that he might be the firstborn amongst many brothers (εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς [Rm 8:29c]) and those he predestined (οὓς δὲ προώρισεν [Rm 8:30a]), those he also called (τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν [Rm 8:30b]); those he called (καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν [Rm 8:30c]), those he also justified (τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν [Rm 8:30d]); and those he justified (οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν [Rm8:30e]), those he also glorified (τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν [Rm 8:30f]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:28–30

The final section of the argument of the Romans 8:18–30 pericope is introduced in Romans 8:28a with the recurrently utilised formula οἴδαμεν δέ [for we know]. The formula assumes the audience is aware that divine action equates good results that will follow.[745] Particular emphasis is given to 'those who love God' (τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν) illustrated by the placement in the ὅτι-*recitativum* clause of Romans 8:28b (ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν). This is reminiscent of ἀγάπη in Romans 5:5, as God's love has been poured out into the heart of believers. Love derives from being in the right relationship with God.[746]

People who love God are specifically in the position that all things will work for them towards the direction of that which is good. In Romans 8:28c (πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν), it is grammatically possible that πάντα takes the subject as the neuter nominative plural correlating with συνεργέω [to work together] or it could be a neuter accusative plural, thus being an accusative of respect with

745. In Plato's *Apol.* 41d, Socrates' famous confidence can be seen that οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ κακόν [no evil can come to a good man]. Josephus also wrote in *Ant.* 1.14 'that men who conform to the will of God and do not transgress laws that have been excellently laid down, prosper in all things beyond belief'. Black (1973:118), Michel (1966:275), Käsemann (1978:234) and Schlier (1977:270) also indicate various parallels with early Jewish tradition that was used in early Christian catechism.

746. This language of a loving God is typical of traditional Jewish teaching (Cranfield 1975:424; Jewett 2007:526; Kruse 2012:355; Zeller 1985:163).

the subject of the clause 'he' implying God (Hultgren 2011:326). The verb συνεργέω with πάντα is used transitive (Blass et al. 1961:§148[1]),[747] indicating that divine action results in good things for believers in a relationship with God. The preposition εἰς is used as a specific point of reference 'for/to/with respect to', namely, ἀγαθός [good] (Bauer et al. 2000:291). On account that people have been put in the position to have a relationship with God as seen in Romans 5:1–11, turmoil and suffering of the present experiences in believer's lives, as seen in Romans 8:18, will cease when they are conformed to the image of the Son (cf. Rm 8:29). The future glory will be revealed in the bodies of believers (cf. Rm 8:18) as the bodies marked by God's glory will not decay.

Those who love God are further described in the subordinate clause τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν [for those called according to a purpose] (Rm 8:28d). The participle (οὖσιν) is used as a substantive (Blass et al. 1961:§413[3]). Believers are now described as κλητός [called].[748] Paul already described himself in Romans 1:1 as not only a slave of Jesus Christ but also as an apostle set apart for the gospel of God (κλητὸς ἀπόστολος ἀφωρισμένος εἰς εὐαγγέλιον θεοῦ). Not only are believers called, but they are called according to a divine purpose (πρόθεσις) (Bauer et al. 2000:869).[749]

The causal conjunction ὅτι connects Romans 8:29 and 8:30 with Romans 8:28. The *gradatio* chain in Romans 8:29–30 indicates God's actions, προέγνω, προώρισεν, ἐκάλεσεν, ἐδικαίωσεν and ἐδόξασεν (Black 1973:119; Lohse 2003:252; Michel 1966:276),[750] and builds the climax of this segment of the argument, that is, believers are to be in the image of God's Son. The purpose (πρόθεσις) of Romans 8:28 is clarified in Romans 8:29. The verbs προγινώσκω [know beforehand] and προορίζω [destined beforehand] also reduplicate the preposition πρό used in πρόθεσις [purpose]. The genitive (τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ) is used with the adjective συμμόρφους to convey 'participating in the form of his image' in Romans 8:29b (Blass et al. 1961:§182[1]). The purpose clause εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν πρωτότοκον ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς [in order that he might be the firstborn in many brothers] (Rm 8:29c) indicates that participation in the form of his image is in order that all believers resemble the firstborn Son. The phrase ἐν πολλοῖς ἀδελφοῖς [amongst many brothers] is a container metaphor with the noun ἀδελφός functioning as a metonymy referring to all

747. Συνεργέω means to engage in cooperative endeavour and thus to assist someone to obtain something or bring something about (Bauer et al. 2000:969).

748. Κλητός pertains to be called in accordance with God's purpose (Bauer et al. 2000:549). The word κλητός was prominent not only in the Hebrew Bible, but also in the Qumran community as giving thanks for being 'men of your purpose' who stand before the throne of God. See QH 6:11–13; 1 QS 3:6; 1 QS 1:13 and 1 QH 4:13.

749. Romans 8:28 marks the first occurrence of πρόθεσις [purpose] in Romans. It is used again in Romans 9:11.

750. Black (1973:119) remarks four stages in the divine plan are set out: (1) the divine foreknowledge, (2) the divine call when 'saints' become aware of their election, (3) 'justification' the act of salvation by faith and (4) the final glorification defined as conforming image of the Son of God.

believers. The familial image (ἀδελφοῖς) recalls υἱοὶ θεοῦ (Rm 8:14, 19), υἱοθεσία (Rm 8:15, 23), τέκνα θεοῦ (Rm 8:16–17, 21) as well as (συν) κληρονόμοι θεοῦ (Rm 8:17) (Breytenbach 2013c:210). The purpose is that believers as God's children have the Spirit and God knows and recognises them to be conformed in the image of his Son (Schlier 1977:272).[751]

In Romans 5:1–11, believers' base for participation is established, particularly, as it is literally the body of Jesus Christ that warded the calamity of the wrath of God off in order to protect people even if people are not worthy (cf. Rm 5:9–11). Apart from the fact that Jesus has made it possible for believers to be in a relationship with God, believers undergo a status change and partake in the glory of the Father by having died with Christ and sharing in his resurrection in their baptism (cf. Rm 6:4). Believers are destined to partake in his glory, but as is prevalent in Romans 6–7, Sin remains problematic. Romans 8:18–30 illustrates the glory God intended for all as a future state of the believers' body. The noun πρωτότοκος refers to having special status associated with Christ as the firstborn Son of God and the firstborn of a new humanity, which is to be glorified as its exalted Lord is glorified (Bauer et al. 2000:894). Breytenbach (2013c) puts it that:

> [*T*]he liberation of the prisoners of war, kept by Sin in their body parts, comes to its full effect when the mortal body is made alive (Rm 8:11), when the captured body is set free (Rm 8:23) and takes the form of the appearance of the resurrected son who is the firstborn of the family of God. (p. 210)

Not only will believers be partaking in the glory of the Father, but by doing so, they are fulfilling their purpose as heirs and children of God being part of God's family.

In Romans 8:30, οὓς, τούτους and καί are repeated three times. The relative clause in Romans 8:30a (οὓς δὲ προώρισεν) repeats the verb προορίζω [destined beforehand] used in Romans 8:29b with οὓς also referring back to Romans 8:29 and creating a strong link between Romans 8:29 and Romans 8:30. This also recaps Romans 3:24–30 and prepares the audience for Romans 8:31–39 (Breytenbach 2013c:210). The verb καλέω [to call], seen in the consecutive clause τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν [and these he called] (Rm 8:30b), is repeated in the relative clause of Romans 8:30c (καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν). Again, δικαιόω, seen in consecutive clause Romans 8:30d (τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν [and those he justified]), is repeated in the relative clauseof Romans 8:30e (οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν). The consecutive clause τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν [also those he glorified] concludes the pericope. Again, the resurrected Christ defines δοξά (Lohse 2003:253). This is a bodily image. In baptism, believers already received sonship, but the

751. Cf. 1 Corinthians 8:3; 13:12; Galatians 4:9; 1 Timothy 3:19. Zeller (1985:165) notes that it is deliberately 'God's Son' as the resurrected Son to enlighten the eschatological sonship. The verb προγινώσκω refers 'to choose beforehand' (Bauer et al. 2000:866). According to Jewett (2007:528), these themes are assumed by Paul to be known by believers in Rome via their use of baptismal homilies or ceremonies.

δοξά of their reality with God will be revealed when their mortal bodies are made alive (Breytenbach 2013c:210).

Persuasion in Romans 8:18–30

Believers are still susceptible to pain and suffering, but Paul comforts his audience that it is nothing compared to the glory that will be revealed in the believers' bodies (cf. Rm 8:18). Paul develops the creation, the believers and the Spirit's experience of groaning in the segments of the argument in Romans 8:18–30. With the personification of creation, Paul illustrates with the συστενάζω [groaning together] and συνωδίνω [pain of birth] metaphors the frustrations of the mortal body and the coming spiritual body associated with the glory of God. It becomes a persuasive image illuminating the allure the liberation of God offers. The personification etches the futility of creation on account of decay in contrast to the liberation proffered through the glory of the children of God into the minds of the audience. In Romans 8:18–30, Paul argues believers' bodies, concomitant of the creation, will no longer be mortal and subjected to decay. These bodies will be made alive. This notion connotes the resurrection, as seen in Romans 8:11, make alive (cf. 1 Corinthians 15:22, 45), but also partake in the glory of God, as seen in Romans 6:4. Believers' bodies has become a space where the Spirit of the resurrected Christ comes to the aid of believers. The same Spirit warranties the liberation and vivification of their mortal bodies (Breytenbach 2013c:211). Believers' perishable bodies will transform into imperishable spiritual bodies (Breytenbach 2013c:212).

Nothing can separate believers from the love of God (Rm 8:31–39)

Paul moves the audience to accept the central argument of Jesus Christ's triumph over all forces, good and evil, in the climax of Romans 8:31–39 (Black 1973:119; Kruse 2012:359). Paul affirms God's dominion over the cosmos with height and depth and all over the world of spirits with 'angels' principalities and powers (Fitzmyer 1993:530). Romans 8:31–39 echoes Romans 5:1–11.[752] The same themes are repeated, for example, set right (Rm 5:1, 9//Rm 8:33), suffering (Rm 5:3//Rm 8:35–37), God's love (Rm 5:5, 8//Rm 8:35, 39), Christ's death (Rm 5:6, 10//Rm 8:34), saved from God's wrath (Rm 5:9//Rm 8:31–34) and Christ's resurrection (Rm 5:10//Rm 8:31–39) (Jewett 2007:535).

752. The suggestion that Romans 8:31–39 is a diatribe is unsupportable (Haacker 1999:173; Longenecker 2016:745; Stowers 1981:122–123; Zeller 1985:165). Contra Käsemann (1978:238). Cf. Schlier (1977:275) elements of diatribe.

Romans 8:31–39 can be divided into three parts: 8:31b–34; 8:35–37 and 8:38–39 (Hultgren 2011:335; Longenecker 2016:747).[753]

☐ What opposition? (Rm 8:31–34)

Romans 8:31–34 highlights if God is for believers, no one or no force can be against them. Romans 8:31 commences with the rhetorical question: what then shall we say in view of these things (τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; [Rm 8:31a])? If God is for us, who is against 'us' (εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ᾽ ἡμῶν; [Rm 8:31b])? Paul continues his reasoning illustrating that God who surely did not even spare his own Son (ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο [Rm 8:32a]), but delivered him up for 'us' all (ἀλλ᾽ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν αὐτόν [Rm 8:32b]), how will such a God not also with him freely give 'us' all things (πῶς οὐχὶ καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ τὰ πάντα ἡμῖν χαρίσεται; [Rm 8:32c])? Who shall bring any charge to God's elect (τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ; [Rm 8:33a])? It is God who justifies (θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν). Who is the one who condemns (τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν; [Rm 8:34a])? Christ Jesus who died (Χριστὸς [Ἰησοῦς] ὁ ἀποθανών [Rm 8:34b]), but even more so, who was raised (μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς [Rm 8:34c]), who is at the right hand of God (ὃς καί ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 8:34d]) and who also intercedes for us (ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [Rm 8:34e]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:31–34

Paul often uses the inferential formula τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν [what then shall we say], but in Romans 8:31, the formula is employed to introduce Paul's conclusion, as no false inference is rejected (Cranfield 1975:435; Haacker 1999:173).[754] However, the repetition of τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν also signifies that a summary of Romans 5–8 is at hand (Kruse 2012:359; Lohse 2003:255; Schlier 1977:276).[755] There is debate concerning to which things πρὸς ταῦτα [these things] refer, but in all likelihood, Paul refers to Romans 8:29–30 (Longenecker 2016:750).[756]

753. Harrisville (1980:135) marks the clusters as 31–34 'for us' and 35–39 'who shall separate?' (cf. Morris 1988:334).

754. Contra Black (1973:120) and Kruse (2012:359). Zeller (1985:165) notes that Paul has not yet fully addressed the suffering of Romans 8:18, and with the objection in Romans 8:30, Paul illustrates God has already established a future for believers, and also that God has already managed this for believers. The inferential formula, which is used here as an introduction, is augmented with the expression πρὸς ταῦτα [in view of these things]. This phrase is also seen in Plato's *Crito* 50b5 τί ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ ἄλλα τοιαῦτα [what shall we say, in view of these things and other such things?] (Kruse 2012:359). Paul is possibly thinking in terms of a law court as the same rhetoric questions are asked as seen in Plato's *Crito* with forensic allusion (Black 1973:120).

755. Schlier (1977:276) mentions that the rhetorical question also refers to Romans 8:28–30.

756. Cf. Fitzmyer (1993:530) with focus on love; Käsemann (1978:238); Schlier (1977:276); Morris (1988:334) posit that it refers to the spiritual gifts, defined as his version of the gospel seen from Romans 5:1–8:39. Käsemann (1978:238) '*nicht ein Gottesgedanke*', but the death of Jesus centred Heilstat characterises God for us. Kruse (2012:360) notes that it probably refers to the blessings of salvation and includes the inheritance promised to believers (cf. Rm 4:13; 8:17).

'What shall we say of these things' (τί οὖν ἐροῦμεν πρὸς ταῦτα; [Rm 8:31a]) expresses vivid emotion.[757] The second rhetorical question 'if God is for us who can be against us' (εἰ ὁ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, τίς καθ᾽ ἡμῶν; [Rm 8:31b]) is put forth as a dramatic conclusion.[758] The question elicits the expected answer: of course no one! (Kruse 2012:360). The plural of the personal pronoun ἐγώ is repeated, emphasising the effect of God being in favour of the audience.[759] The phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is reminiscent of Romans 5:5–8, where God displayed his love in that Christ died 'for the ungodly' (ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν [Rm 5:6]) followed up by three occurrences of ὑπέρ indicating Christ's saving death (Haacker 1999:173; Jewett 2007:535; Zeller 1985:166), as it is the body of Christ that offers protection. Christ's selfless deed on the cross protects and saves people from the wrath of God.

The relative clause ὅς γε τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο (Rm 8:32a) revisits the notion of God not sparing his own Son. Emphasis is created with the use of the relative pronoun ὅς [who] in conjunction with the emphatic particle γέ.[760] The phrase τοῦ ἰδίου υἱοῦ οὐκ ἐφείσατο echoes hymnic citations, for example, Philippians 2:6–11 and Colossians 1:15–20 (Jewett 2007:536; Schlier 1977:277), but also Romans 5:6–8 (Zeller 1985:166). In Romans 5:6–8, it has become clear that Paul draws on the tradition of the ὑπέρ phrases. Through the sacrifice of Jesus' body, all other bodies are warded off from the calamity of God's wrath in order to provide hope for all.[761] In contrast to the intended Roman peace, Jesus inaugurates a spiritual peace. The dominating language of Paul is employed to communicate love. The concept of φείδομαι [to spare] is not

757. Emotion such as astonishment or indignation, but also joyous elation (Blass et al. 1961:§496[2]).

758. The subordinating conjunction εἰ does not function as a condition that may or may not be fulfilled, but rather indicates Paul's conviction that the following rhetorical question is a fact (Cranfield 1975:435). Usually a conditional clause expresses contingency, but in this case, the reality of the premise is assumed (Harrisville 1980:136; Hultgren 2011:336).

759. The passage recalls God has acted on behalf of humans, although the translation 'for us' is sufficient (Longenecker 2016:752). The preposition ὑπέρ denotes 'to be for someone or be on their side' (Bauer et al. 2000:1030).

760. The emphatic or intensive particle γε without another particle is used in Romans 8:32 with ὅς γε rendering 'he who' (Blass et al. 1961:§439[3]). This is the only occurrence in the New Testament of the relative particle with the emphatic particle (Cranfield 1975:436; Porter 1992:134).

761. The tradition of Abraham who was willing to sacrifice his own son is often interpreted in this text (Cranfield 1975:436; Haacker 1999:174; Hultgren 2011:337; Longenecker 2016:753; Lohse 2003:255; Zeller 1985:166). There is debate whether Paul was aware of the 'Akedah' or 'Aqedat Yishaq' tradition in ancient Judaism that suggests Abraham's willingness to offer his son Isaac had an atoning significance and consequently the event was recalled in prayers asking God to remember it to the benefit of Israel. If Paul was aware of this, he was using it to indicate the benefit of the sacrifice for the whole of humanity (Fitzmyer 1993:531; Hultgren 2011:337; Käsemann 1978:239; Longenecker 2016:753). In Barn 7:3, Abraham is set up as an anticipatory type of Jesus in light of his sacrifice (Longenecker 2016:753). Barrett (1957:172) marks the allusion to LXX Genesis 22:16 is as likely as an allusion to the suffering servant in Isaiah 53:12. Haacker (1999:174) refers to the events of Masada. Cf. Josesphus, *Bell.* 7, 389–393 §400. However, this study does not agree with this interpretation. Romans 5:6–8 must be read with Romans 8:32.

strange in the ancient context where the vanquished often fell to the mercy of victors (Jewett 2007:537). Gaventa (2011:272) notes that this verb is often used in military settings, having to do with the sparing of someone's life as seen in *Iliad* 15.215; 21.101; *Odyssey* 9.277; 22.54; Josephus, *War* 1.352; 4.82; LXX Deuteronomy 7:16; 1 LXX Samuel 15:3.[762]

The link between 'sparing' and 'handing over' is common in the ancient world.[763] Paul also uses παραδίδωμι again, denoting 'hand over, give up a person' (Bauer et al. 2000:762).[764] The verb παραδίδωμι especially occurs in connection with war (Eschner 2010b:197; Gaventa 2011:272).[765] However, in Romans 8:32, Paul uses παραδίδωμι to focus on a court image (Eschner 2010b:201).[766] Christina Eschner (2010b:197) convincingly argues that Paul's use of παραδίδωμι refers to the 'Hingabeformulierungen' as the combination of the personal object of the handing over of a person in the violence of another person, especially the handing over of a person to an enemy.[767] Moreover, Eschner (2009:676) convincingly argues that Isaiah 53 is not the pre-tradition for Romans 8:32.

God gave his Son up for believers. The phrase ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [for us] is repeated in Romans 8:32b, establishing emphasis on God's saving action. The phrase is used with πάντα, which underscores the inclusivity of God's saving action.[768] The immense importance of the relation between fathers and sons in the ancient context establishes that nothing could more clearly display that God is on the side of believers.

If God could not even spare his own Son and hand him over for believers, how will he not also freely give to the believers? The interrogative particle

762. For argumentation in support of this paragraph, see Gaventa (2007:113–123, 194–197).

763. Dionysius Halicarnassus Antiq. Rom. 5.10.7 writes about Brutus words to his treacherous co-consul 'since I, not having spared my own children, shall spare you, O Collatinus'. Diodorus Siculus in Hist. 13.76.5 reports that the Spartan admiral Callicratidas conquered Methymene but 'sparing the men, he handed over to the city to the Methymnaeans'.

764. Black (1973:120) remarks that the verb especially emphasises the sheer goodness of the divine gift.

765. The verb παραδίδωμι is also used in military contexts, for example, Herodotus, *Histories* 1.45.1; 3.13.3; Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 5.1.28; 5.4.51. Cf. Deuteronomy 2:24, 31; 20:13; Joshua 2:14, 24; Jeremiah 21:20; Ezekiel 7:21.

766. Cf. Thuk. 3,67,5; Plut. Gracch. 37,2; in jail Diod.10,30,1; Acts 12,4; 22,4; as punishment Plut. Alc. 8,2. The image of being handed over to death is expressed with the receiver who is handed over to the hangman, which is expressed in the dative: Lys. 14, c17; Dion Chrys. 31,82; Cass. Dio 51,2,6, or the death itself: Ach. Tat. Leuc. Clit. 8,8,6,9.; to be led with a *participium*: Plut. Caes. 8,2; cf. Plut. Demost. 14,5; Agis 20,3; Mor 216D; Ach. Tat. Leuc. Clit. 7,3,7.

767. Cf. Plut. Cat. Min. 68,5; Marc. 20,6; Jos. *Ant.* 13,4' Cass. Dio 17 at Zon. 9,13,5; I,265,11. In LXX, especially the handing over of Jews to another nation by God, for example, 2 Maccabees 10:4.

768. The saying 'gave him up for us all' contains two pre-Pauline creedal traditions, the first, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων is one of the several kerygmatic formulae and παρέδωκεν αὐτόν derives from the passion narratives of the gospels (Black 1973:120; Hultgren 2011:338; Jewett 2007:538; Schlier 1977:277).

(πῶς) with the negative οὐχί in 8:32c creates a style reminiscent of Romans 5:9–11 with the *ad minori ad maius* argument.[769] The phrase σὺν αὐτῷ [with him] clarifies believers' position as being with God and per implication under the lordship of Christ. Paul utilises πᾶς in a cosmological sense indicating all things as is often seen in his letters, for example, as in 1 Corinthians 3:21–23.[770] This is the first time that the verb χαρίζομαι is used but is coherent with the χαρίς leitmotiv Paul employs throughout the argument (Du Toit 2009:129).

Another question ensues in Romans 8:33a with τίς ἐγκαλέσει κατὰ ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ [Who shall bring any charge to God's elect?].[771] Paul draws on a forensic image again with ἐγκαλέω [to bring charges against, accuse] (Bauer et al. 2000:273).[772] This is the only time that Paul uses ἐκλεκτῶν θεοῦ [God's elect] and the term ἐκλεκτός also refers to κλητός in Romans 8:28.[773] God's elect functions as a synonym for the sons of God.

It is God who justifies. Romans 8:33b is tightly interwoven with Romans 8:34a, b with three parallel periods occurring, the last being by far the longest in both its members (Blass et al. 1961:§490). The first part of the parallel θεὸς ὁ δικαιῶν may be an allusion to Isaiah 50:8–9 (Fitzmyer 1993:532–533; Käsemann 1978:240; Morris 1988:336; Schlier 1977:277; Zeller 1985:166).[774]

The second rhetorical question τίς ὁ κατακρινῶν [who will be the condemner?] (Rm 8:34a)[775] links to the formulation of Romans 8:1: 'there is no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus'. It would be preposterous to think of Christ as a condemner, and accordingly this evokes the audience to answer 'no way!'

769. Jewett (2007:538) mentions that πῶς οὐχί creates the meaning 'surely most certainly', which completes the 'lesser to greater' argument.

770. Longenecker (2016:755) notes that τὰ πάντα suggests 'everything' referring to what God has already done in the past for humanity (cf. Käsemann 1978:239; Schlier 1977:277). Jewett (2007:539) interprets πᾶς to indicate that believers will inherit the world. Accordingly, imperialism is reconstructed in a way that power and prestige no longer play a role. Contra Black (1973:120) as 'All things' can hardly refer to absolute dominion over all things.

771. Morris (1988:336) remarks that it is not clear how many rhetorical questions feature on account of punctuation problems.

772. Cf. Wisdom 12:12; Sirach 46:19 (Hultgren 2011:338; Kruse 2012:361; Schlier 1977:277). The word ἐγκαλέω also appears in Acts 19:38, 40; 23:29; 26:2, 7; Sirach 46:19; Jos C. Ap 2,138 NT Apg 19:38; 23:28, all of which are public trials depicting an idea of final judgement (Jewett 2007:539; Schlier 1977:277). In Dio Chrysostom Orat. 52.5.7, a group is impeached for vague reasons: ὥστε τυχόν ἄν τις ἐγκαλέσαι τῶν οὐ φιλούντων τὸν ἄνδρα [so that anyone might happen to indict those who do not love the man].

773. Black (1973:121), Kruse (2012:361–362) and Schlier (1977:277) remark that it is an old name for Israel. See 1 Chronicles 16:13; Psalms 105:6, 43. The Qumran community especially uses it as well as the early church, for example, in Matthew 24:22; Mark 13:27; 2 Timothy 2:10; 1 Peter 1:1 (Hultgren 2011:338; Lohse 2003:257).

774. Harrisville (1980:137), Black (1973:120) and Kruse (2012:362) remark that Romans 8:34–35 is influenced by Isaiah 50:4–11, the third servant song with the similar motifs of confidence. The rich courtroom language can also be traced (Black 1973:120; Harrisville 1980:137; Schlier 1977:277).

775. The future participle is employed with ὁ κατακρινῶν (Blass et al. 1961:§351[2]).

(Kruse 2012:362; Schlier 1977:277).[776] The formulation Χριστὸς [Ἰησοῦς] ὁ ἀποθανών echoes Romans 5:6–8. It reflects pre-Pauline tradition and was widely known in communities following Jesus.[777]

In the comparative clause μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγερθείς (Rm 8:34c), the adverb μᾶλλον[778] is used in connection with δέ rendering a translation 'even more so'.[779] The passive ἐγερθείς was known to the audience and would have been connected to Christ. For Paul, it describes the risen Christ not only as a status but also as an authority (Hultgren 2011:339). The relative clause 'who is at the right hand of God' (ὃς ἐστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 8:34d]) is a technical expression drawing on the image sketched in Psalms 110 (Jewett 2007:542; Schlier 1977:278). The second relative clause 'who also intercedes for us' (ὃς καὶ ἐντυγχάνει ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν [Rm 8:34e]) underscores God's action as ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν is repeated. The verb ἐντυγχάνω [to intercede] picks the motif of intercession from Romans 8:26–27. The verb derives from the conceptual world of the ruler's court, being a space where accusations and requests are heard.[780] Being part of the power of God means that God also intercedes for believers (Schlier 1977:278). Believers under the lordship of Jesus Christ are aligned with the ultimate dominant power, who not only is on the side of believers but also champions them.

☐ Who shall separate? (Rm 8:35–37)

'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ' (τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ; [Rm 8:35a])? 'Affliction, or distress, or persecution, or hunger, or nakedness, or peril, or sword' (θλῖψις ἢ στενοχωρία ἢ διωγμὸς ἢ λιμὸς ἢ γυμνότης ἢ κίνδυνος ἢ μάχαιρα; [Rm 8:35b])? Paul then cites Scripture to enforce his argument. Just as it has been written (καθὼς γέγραπται [Rm 8:36a]), 'for your sake we are being put to death all day long' (ὅτι ἕνεκεν σοῦ θανατούμεθα ὅλην τὴν ἡμέραν [Rm 8:36b]), 'we are reckoned as sheep for slaughter' (ἐλογίσθημεν ὡς πρόβατα σφαγῆς [Rm 8:36c]). But in all these things, we are supervictors through him who loved us (ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς [Rm 8:37a–b]).

776. Paul knows how to change his tone, using prodiorthosis when he thinks he is about to be offensive or, as seen in Romans 8:34, epidiorthosis when he feels that he offended and provides a subsequent correction (Blass et al. 1961:§495[3]).

777. Haacker (1999:175) and Lohse (2003:258) indicate that the motif 'sit on the righthand' is closely linked with motif of 'being close throne' (Ps 110:1; Mk 14:62; Apg. 2:34; 1 Cor 15:25; Eph 1:20). Zeller (1985:167) notes that the link with the psalm indicates God stepping on for us on our behalf (Jewett 2007:541). Black (1973:120) notes the style is modelled to Isaiah 50:7–9 (cf. Schlier 1977:277).

778. Usually intended as a corrective. In this case, the resurrection is seen as superior to the crucifixion.

779. Similar instances in Romans 5:9, 10, 15, 17.

780. For example, Polybius Hist. 4.76.9; Aratus, one of King Philip's influential advisors, approached him on behalf of some injured parties and ἐντυγχόντων δ᾽αὐτῶν τῷ βασιλεί περὶ τούτων [when they interceded with that king about these matters, Philip listened intently to what happened and encouraged the lads to take heart].

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:35–37

The section ensues with a set of rhetorical questions marked τίς [who] (Schlier 1977:279). Paul asks who shall separate 'us' from the love of Christ (τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ [Rm 8:35a])? Paul emphatically places ἡμᾶς [us] in the beginning of the sentence. The ἡμᾶς [us] is facing serious adversity to be separated from the love of Christ, as the verb χωρίζω indicates a separation through use of space between (Bauer et al. 2000:1095). The subjective genitive τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Χριστοῦ [the love of Christ] underscores Christ's love for the undeserving (Jewett 2007:543; Porter 1992:95; Schlier 1977:278).[781] Paul's use of ἀγάπη in Romans 8:35 and 8:39 refers to Christ and designates the love of God and Christ for humans (Bauer et al. 2000:6). Being separated from Christ implies being separated from his love. This echoes Romans 5:5–8; as such a separation means damnation and falling again under God's wrath (Jewett 2007:543; Zeller 1985:167).

The nouns run together in Romans 8:35b for a powerful rhetorical effect illustrating no human forces can separate believers from Christ (Hultgren 2011:339; Schlier 1977:278). There are seven forms of adversity described: θλῖψις [affliction], στενοχωρία [distress], διωγμός [persecution], λιμός [hunger], γυμνότης [nakedness], κίνδυνος [peril] and μάχαιρα [sword].[782] This catalogue of hardships can also be found in ancient literature, for example, Dio Chrysostom Orat. 16.3.[783]

In Romans 8:36a, Paul draws on a citation from LXX Psalms 43:23 introduced with the formula καθὼς γέγραπται [just as it has been written].[784] The main purpose of the citation is revealed in the phrase ἕνεκεν σοῦ [for your sake] (Barrett 1957:173; Hultgren 2011:340; Kruse 2012:363; Schlier 1977:279).[785] Jesus' believers suffer tribulations for Christ's sake.[786] No one can claim that their suffering separates them from Christ and the cross. In Romans 8:36c, the comparative clause likens believers to sheep for the slaughter.[787]

781. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:14, where it is utilised in light of Christ's death 'for us'.

782. The number seven is probably without significance (Black 1973:121). Hultgren (2011:339) and Kruse (2012:362) note that all these forces are related to the experience of Jesus' believers in persecution. Longenecker (2016:757) and Käsemann (1978:240) mark that the list is common amongst philosophers, sages and religious teachers in Paul's day, not only Greco-Roman, Stoic, Epicurean and Cynic philosophers, but also Jewish rabbis and sectarian writers. Paul has used the terminology in prior letters, especially describing his own suffering as an apostle (Hultgren 2011:340; Kruse 2012:362).

783. Schlier (1977:279) remarks that it refers to the current life.

784. Cf. Romans 1:17.

785. Barrett (1957:173) also adds that it is noteworthy that Paul makes no cross-reference to Isaiah 53.

786. For God's or Christ's sake (Black 1973:121).

787. The verb λογίζομαι denotes a result of calculation in Romans 8:36 (Bauer et al. 2000:597). The comparative particle ὡς with the accusative is sometimes used for the predicate accusative as for the predicate nominative as seen in ὡς πρόβατα (Blass et al. 1961:§157[5]).

The culmination of the seven tribulations is seen in the continuance of the Psalmic citation as ἐν τούτοις πᾶσιν ὑπερνικῶμεν [in all these things we are supervictors] (Schlier 1977:279). Paul transforms ὑπερνικάω [to be more than a conqueror]. The word is a heightened form of νικᾶν [prevail completely] and denotes 'we are winning a most glorious victory' (Bauer et al. 2000:1034; Black 1973:121; Longenecker 2016:753). The term ὑπερνικάω is usually associated with divinely inspired warriors and kings who achieve absolute victories over their enemies (Jewett 2007:548). In contrast to the accustomed Roman imperialism embodied in victory, the ceremonies of victory parades, triumphal arches and gladiatorial games that feature defeated barbarians, Paul's victory is achieved through him who loved us (διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπήσαντος ἡμᾶς)[788] and is shared equally. The aorist participle ἀγαπάω indicates a single act of love (Jewett 2007:549). Barrett (1957:174) notes that Paul's affirmation of God's love turns to what his readers probably regarded as their most dangerous enemies, the astrological powers by which many in the Hellenistic world believed the destiny of humankind was controlled.

☐ Neither height nor depth (Rm 8:38–39)

Romans 8:38–39 lists 10 rhetorical merisms (Fitzmyer 1993:535)[789] stipulating things that make it impossible for believers to be separated from God's love. For 'I' have become convinced (πέπεισμαι γὰρ [Rm 8:38a]) that neither death, nor life (ὅτι οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε ζωὴ [Rm 8:38b]), nor angels, nor rulerships (οὔτε ἄγγελοι οὔτε ἀρχαὶ [Rm 8:38c]), nor things present, nor things to come (οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα [Rm 8:38d]), nor powers (οὔτε δυνάμεις [Rm 8:38e]) can separate believers from God's love. Paul moves from *a minori ad maius* style to the climax in Romans 8:39 (Black 1973:121; Kruse 2012:364). Nor height, nor depth (οὔτε ὕψωμα οὔτε βάθος [Rm 8:39a]), nor any other creature (οὔτε τις κτίσις ἑτέρα [Rm 8:39b]) shall be able to separate us from the love of God (δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 8:39b]), which is in Christ Jesus our Lord (τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν [Rm 8:39c]).

☐ Detail analysis of Romans 8:38–39

Romans 8:38a opens with a typical Pauline assurance formula πέπεισμαι[790] in the perfect passive meaning 'I have become convinced' (Bauer et al. 2000:792; Schlier 1977:280). The conjunction γάρ indicates that an elaboration of Romans 8:37 follows. The causal clause Romans 8:38b illustrates the grounds for Paul's certainty, with a list of 10 forces that are not successful against God.

788. The genitive has a sense of agency.

789. Cf. 1 Corinthians 3:22.

790. Cf. Romans 2:19; 14:14; 15:14; 2 Corinthians 1:9; 2:3; 10:7; Galatians 5:10; Philippians 1:6, 14, 25; 2:24; 3:3; 2 Thessalonians 3:4. Cf. 2 Corinthians 5:11 and Galatians 5:7.

The nature of these 10 forces has been debated.[791] The first two items on the list, death and life refer to believers' reality, but also to the spiritual interpretation.[792]

The terms ἄγγελος [angel][793] and ἀρχή [rulers][794] appear here for the first time in Romans.[795] The connection between ἀρχαί and δυνάμεις is abundantly attested in Jewish writings of the Greco-Roman period unconnected with Paul (Van Kooten 2003:96).[796] In Greek fragments of 1 Enoch 6:8, some of the fallen angels are called ἀρχαί. In Jewish writings, ἀρχαί [principles] are ranked together with angels, archangels, powers and thrones.[797] In Jewish sources of the Greco-Romans period, δυνάμεις often refers to cosmic forces and rarely to angels (Van Kooten 2003:97).[798] Philo remarks in *De Decalogue* 53:281; 53:154 that some have deified the ἀρχαί (Van Kooten 2003:101).[799] The frequent use attests to the widespread manner in which Jewish writers typified an awareness of God's authority over the cosmos and its forces (Van Kooten 2003:99).

791. The forces are mainly viewed as negative forces, although such a view complicates the interpretation of ἄγγελοι [angels] and ζωή [life]. However, it could also be astrological. Jewett (2007:551) contends that Paul uses opposites to counterbalance groups fighting one another about their stances. Another possibility is that martyrdom favoured death over life, for example, 1 Corinthians 13:3, but there is no evidence from earlier letters or elsewhere to support such a claim.

792. According to Bauer et al. (2000:430), the noun ζωή is applied in Romans 8:38 as a designation of life in the physical sense. Hultgren (2011:341) and Kruse (2012:364) state that life and death's addition to the list must not be interpreted as supernatural beings, but as spiritual realities (cf. Black 1973:121). Note that life and death do not function as cosmic powers of evil, but may in this instance be personified. Zeller (1985:168) notes that 'death' and 'life' are not used in an eschatological sense. Cf. 1 Corinthians 3:22; Romans 14:8; Philippians 1:20. Paul has various meanings intended for θάνατος, especially in Romans 5–8, ranging from death as a force, death as a natural inevitability or death symbolic of dying with Christ. The pairing of life with death in this context portrays that nothing at all in human experience can separate believers from the love of God (Jewett 2007:550). Most commentators view death as a cosmic power in this verse. The closest parallel is in Epictetus Diss. 1.11.33: 'And simply put, it is neither death nor exile nor pain nor any other of these things οὔτε θάνατος οὔτε φυγὴ οὔτε πόνος οὔτε ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων that is the reason for our doing or not doing something'.

793. Ἄγγελος refers to intermediate beings in general with no reference to their relation to God (Bauer et al. 2000:9).

794. 'Αρχή refers to an authority figure that initiates activity or process, namely, a ruler (Bauer et al. 2000:138).

795. Jewett (2007:552) suggests that Paul might perhaps have fallen angels in mind. Concerning rulers: it is not sure whether cosmic or earthly rulers are intended. A related term in 1 Corinthians 2:6, 8 refers to political authorities opposing Christ. Ephesians and Colossians employ it again as reference to cosmic forces.

796. Cf. LXX Esther 4:17; LXX 1 Chronicles 29:12.

797. Cf. Testament of Abraham 13:10 (Van Kooten 2003:96).

798. Van Kooten (2003:100) argues that principles and powers in 1 Corinthians 15:24 are unlikely to mean angelic beings, but rather imply powers of a cosmological nature. Paul regards agents of Satan as angels (2 Cor 12:7; 11:14).

799. Cf. Plutarch, *De facie in orbe lunae* 926E_927A.

Paul's list is thorough with the verbs: ἐνίστημι indicates 'to be present as a condition or thing at the time of speaking' (Bauer et al. 2000:337)[800] and μέλλω refers 'to the future or to come' (Bauer et al. 2000:628). Δύναμις denotes 'an entity or being whether human or transcendent that functions in a remarkable manner as a power' (Bauer et al. 2000:263). But what is more, nearly 30 passages in the LXX describe these forces as under the control of God himself as in the phrases 'lord of the forces'.[801]

The list continues in Romans 8:39. The terms ὕψωμα and βάθος are closely associated with bottomless and expresses distance, not only vertically but also horizontally, describing some power oppressing humankind (Blunck 1976a:197–198; Schlier 1977:280).[802] The combination of height and depth is derived from astronomy indicating the extremities of the created cosmos (Black 1973:122; Fitzmyer 1993:535; Hultgren 2011:342; Jewett 2007:554; Lohse 2003:260; Morris 1988:341).[803] In Romans 8:39, κτίσις refers to the result of a creative act, namely, that which is created (Bauer et al. 2000:573). There is no power, human or nonhuman, that can separate a believer from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord who is the true ruler of all (Kruse 2012:364; Schlier 1977:281; Zeller 1985:168). The article is repeated in Romans 8:39 for emphasis (Blass et al. 1961:§269(2)). The preposition ἐν describes a new life expression: love in Christ (Bauer et al. 2000:328).

☐ Persuasion in Romans 8:31–39

The rhetorical climax of Paul's argument culminates in Romans 8:31–39. Throughout the argument, Paul has illustrated the bodies of humans as a space of contestation. Within this space, Jesus Christ is the superior power in comparison to Death and Sin. In Romans 8:31–39, Paul drives the argument that no power, human or otherworldly, can separate believers from the love of God. Paul draws in Romans 5:6–8 to illustrate how the body of Christ has provided protection for believers. This protection is climactically explained in Romans 8:31–39. The audience is reminded of the love of God. Although Paul's imagery in Romans 5:6–8, reused in Romans 8:31, 32, is violent, Paul reassures believers of God's love and that God can truly protect them from any other force or entity. The fact that believers are God's elect, reminds the audience of

800. Paul might be thinking of the period in Roman history in which he lived and what was imminent (Fitzmyer 1993:535).

801. Cf. 2 Kings 6:2; 3 Kings 18:15; 4 Kings 3:14; 19:31; Psalms 23:10; 15:8; Jeremiah 40:12 (Van Kooten 2003:97).

802. ὕψωμα is an astronomical term indicating 'the space above the horizon, which would have been perceived as the domain of transcendent forces' (Bauer et al. 2000:1046; Schlier 1977:280) and βάθος denotes 'the space or distance beneath a surface, depth' (Bauer et al. 2000:162).

803. Plutarch Moralia 149a, 782e. They are probably related to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κοσμοῦ, the elemental powers of this world (Blunck 1976b:200).

the spiritual body they will have conformed to the image of the Son in Romans 8:29. Believers are people who have undergone a status change. God has made this status change possible for them, but by having been baptised into the death of Christ, they also partake to die in the glory of the Father that resurrected Christ. The mortal body may be subjected to decay, but believers will be made alive again with their spiritual bodies. They are assured of this happening as they are not only slaves of God, but they are children, heirs and co-heirs with Christ. Whatever ineptitudes the mortal body has, the Spirit intercedes confirming the protection Christ wields. All other powers and forces are rendered powerless. This protection of Christ is based on the love God has for all people.

Chapter 4

The body as contested space

Introduction

The prevalence of metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8 is established in Chapter 3. As already mentioned, dominion encompasses a ruler and something or someone being ruled. Accordingly, space is intricately linked to dominion. This chapter investigates the link between hegemony and the dominated space throughout Romans 5–8.

Hegemony and the body

Bodily imagery is convolutedly woven like a golden thread throughout the argument in Romans 5–8, as Paul continually hints or bluntly states the body (σῶμα) as the specific place of God's interaction with humans. Believers are depicted as having access to the Favour by faith in which believers are already standing (ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν (Rm 5:2)). The spatiality evoked by the image of standing is often overlooked. The 'we' stand bodily, on their feet and surrounded by Favour. Commentators such as Moo (1996:300–301), Cranfield (1975:259), Jewett (2007:227) and Kruse (2012:227) are concerned with determining the relative clause to refer to the subordinate clause in which believers are justified by faith. The image, however, stems from the main clause in which believers

How to cite: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'The body as contested space', in *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* (HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7), pp. 215–230, AOSIS, Cape Town. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248.04

have peace with God. This is a vital understanding and as the ensuing argument unfolds it becomes clear that the body becomes the space that is contested. However, Paul's initial spatial imagery clearly communicates a God that changes enemies into friends so that believers stand in His Favour. Part and parcel of the underestimation of the image is the translation of χάρις as 'grace' instead of 'Favour'. This adds to the misinterpretation of the full power of the image, as the quintessential backdrop of the patron-client system becomes diluted. Michael Wolter (2014:321) aptly notes that 'standing' (ἵστημι) extends the spatiality already established with δι᾽ οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν 'through whom we also have access' (Rm 5:2), as προσαγωγή evokes an image of a throne room.

The powerful spatial image is followed up by a metaphor of abundance, which inadvertently also functions as a metaphor of dominion. In Romans 5:5, Paul claims that the love of God has been poured out into the hearts of believers (ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν). The use of καρδία 'heart' – which is part of the body – immediately recollects the body, even though the meaning encompasses the whole of a persons' being comprising both thoughts and desires. This image signals the presence of God's Spirit within the central space within the believer's body, which controls their personality and their intentionality (Wolter 2014:328). Moo (1996:305) acknowledges the domination locked up in the metaphor, as he regards the image to convey God's possession of people. However, the inherent spatiality implied by καρδία, even though subtle, is often overseen as commentaries do not notice the bodiliness (Black 1973:76; Kruse 2012:232; Moo 1996:305). Within this space, the love of God had been poured out into the believers through the Holy Spirit (διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου τοῦ δοθέντος ἡμῖν). The spatiality evoked by the heart (καρδία) is repeated in Romans 6:17 and Romans 8:27.

Paul steadily develops the body as a place where powers vie for control. In Romans 5:2 and Romans 5:5, God's control is illustrated. Jeremy Punt (2005:374) sheds light on a Pauline theology of the body and touches on the relationship between the body and control. He remarks that the body of Christ functions as the archetypal body that believers aspire to live according to (Punt 2005:374). However, Jesus Christ dying for 'us' is more than just an example of life, but a fundamental bodily experience for believers who are transported through baptism from a body of death to a body of life.

In Romans 5:6–8, Paul draws on the tradition of the notion of ἀποθνῄσκω – ὑπέρ – τινος 'dying for' someone else in their place to illustrate God's love for humans. This formula has an inherent spatial connotation as one body is dying in the place of another. Justification and reconciliation with God are possible because Christ died 'for us'. Believers did not start out as just friends of God but were perceived as ungodly enemies. Nonetheless, Christ died on behalf of the ungodly (Χριστὸς … ὑπὲρ ἀσεβῶν ἀπέθανεν [Rm 5:6]) and while believers were still sinners, Christ died for 'us' (ἔτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν

[Rm 5:8]). It is significant that Christ takes the place of someone else, even if they are not worthy as Romans 5:7[804] highlights. Paul uses the dying for 'us' formulation instead of the traditional formulations usually linked to impersonal prepositional phrases found in 1 Corinthians 15:3 and Galatians 1:4, as mentioned in Chapter 3. Accordingly, this adds bodiliness to the argument as the death of Christ is to deter calamity for believers. This action wards off a war as the dominion of God brings peace and reconciliation and illustrates God's love for humans. Christ's dying for sinners and unworthy people is magnified as it applies to all people in Romans 5:9–11. The importance of God's ruling action is emphasised with the phrase διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ 'through Jesus Christ our Lord' (Rm 5:11). In order for the body to be dominated by God, the bodies of the believers need to metaphorically partake in the death as seen in Romans 6:4.

The bodiliness of the argument continues to take shape in Romans 5:12. Sin and Death are depicted as forces invading the human world. Paul introduces this location as εἰς τὸν κόσμον 'into the human world' (Rm 5:12) synonymous with εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους 'into all humans' (Rm 5:18). The space envisioned is the bodies of humans, although κόσμος refers to the world. I interpret all humans to refer to the multiplication of humans. Adam becomes a bodily illustration of the specific location where these forces vie for dominion. Schnelle (1996:65) heralds that humans are set in a disastrous situation as they are affected by the power of Sin, even if they did not cause the situation themselves. For Schnelle (1996:65), the reality of Sin and sinning is the starting point of Paul's argumentation, especially considering Romans 3:9 (ὑφ᾽ ἁμαρτίαν 'under Sin'). Käsemann (1969:67) remarks that Romans 5:12 makes it clear that Paul does not understand history as a continuous evolution process, but rather as the contrast of the two realms of Adam and Christ. Firstly, he deems that Pauline theology unfolds in this contrast between the struggle of life and death, Sin and salvation, and law and the gospel (Käsemann 1969:67). The dialectic of 'once' and 'now' is absorbed into anthropology in the form of 'already saved' and 'still tempted' (Käsemann 1969:67). Secondly, the two realms should rather be described as the body under dominion of Sin and the body inhabited by God's Spirit. In my view, Paul's argument is personal and somatic, pertaining to the believer with the contestation embodied in believers. Paul envisions either a body of life or a body of death.

Paul's argument begins to illustrate what believers look like when controlled by God and when not controlled by God. The difference between the dominions of the Spirit and Sin takes shape in an analogy between Christ and Adam in Romans 5:15–17, with the former as the superior power. It is noteworthy how Paul elaborates on the spatiality in Romans 5:12–21 as the motif of standing or

804. For barely will one die for a righteous person (μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται).

stepping is broadened. Adam, who serves as the entrance point for Sin and Death, is depicted as having made a transgression (παράβασις [Rm 5:14]) and a misstep (παράπτωμα [Rm 5:16]). Both παράβασις and παράπτωμα have an inherent spatial meaning pertaining to the idea of stepping as bodily action. Παράβασις intrinsically means 'overstepping' and παράπτωμα 'false step'. The space contributes to convince believers that to be reconciled with God is the sagacious course of action.

Furthermore, Paul personifies other powers such as ἡ ἁμαρτία 'Sin' (Rm 5:12), ὁ θάνατος 'Death' (Rm 5:12), νόμος 'Law' (Rm 5:20) and ἡ χάρις 'Favour' (Rm 5:21) as powers that might dominate the body. Human qualities are attributed to these powers creating a familiarity for the hearers. Sin invades the human world (ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν [Rm 5:12]), Death reigned (ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος [Rm 5:14]), the Law slipped in (νόμος … παρεισῆλθεν [Rm 5:20]) and Favour might rule (ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ [Rm 5:21]). For Paul, Favour might rule the believer's body if the believer is under the dominion of Christ.

In the pericope of Romans 6:1–14, the bodiliness of Paul's argument crystallises in an understanding of the body as determined by either Sin or Christ. The body is destined for death when ruled by Sin. In contrast, the body ruled by Jesus Christ the Lord is destined to life. An interesting spatial shift occurs, as believers are introduced as people standing in the Favour of God. In Romans 6:1, Paul prompts whether believers shall remain in sin. The verb ἐπιμένω inherently has an implicit spatial connotation as a believer stays in a certain situation, which in this case is under the control of Sin. However, believers are in fact standing in the Favour of God, the direct opposite situation as depicted in Romans 6:1. This becomes especially prevalent with Paul's use of the metaphor of baptism. Bodiliness becomes intertwined, being either dead or alive, as Paul uses baptism as a metaphor to illustrate that believers baptised into Christ are baptised into the death of Jesus. Just like Christ was resurrected by the glory of the Father, the baptised may walk in the newness of life. It is with believers' bodies that they stand (ἑστήκαμεν) in the Favour of God (Rm 5:2) and have the possibility to walk (περιπατήσωμεν) in a new way (Rm 6:4), drawing on the glory and life that God made possible through the resurrection of the Christ crucified.

Paul expounds his argument, illustrating that believers have become united in the likeness of Christ's death (σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ [Rm 6:5]) and will also become united in the likeness of Christ's resurrection (καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα [Rm 6:5]). The bodiliness takes shape when Paul illustrates that the old person has been co-crucified (ὁ παλαιὸς ἡμῶν ἄνθρωπος συνεσταυρώθη [Rm 6:6]) with the purpose that explicitly the body of Sin might be nullified (ἵνα καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας [Rm 6:6]). Paul renders an understanding of the body under two perspectives. Within the body, the old self was dominated by Sin, which Paul has already portrayed in Romans 5:12–21

as the defeated power. In Christ, the body is now ruled by Favour, and believers are called upon to serve God through their bodies. In Romans 8:29, Paul depicts the future state of the bodies of believers as God foreknew and predestined believers to be conformed to the image of His Son. Accordingly, Paul's understanding of resurrection envisions a spiritual body like that of the risen Christ for a believer after the death of the mortal body (see 1 Cor 15).

Paul's use of slavery images is bodily at the core as it entails a master having dominion over a person who is only viewed as a body or an object that does things. In Romans 6:6, he explains that believers are no longer slaves to Sin (τοῦ μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτία [Rm 6:6]). As being in Christ, they are rather called to live for God, as they are under the dominion of God's Favour (Rm 6:11, 14). Schnelle (1996:66) also mentions how Paul's description of the power of Sin reflects a master–slave dynamic, as terms such as δουλεύω 'to be a servant', βασιλεύω 'to be king over', ὑπακούω 'to be obedient', κυριεύω 'to be lord', παρίστημι 'to put at someone's disposal', ἐλευθερόω 'to be set free', ὑπακοή 'obedience' and δοῦλοι 'slaves' are evident.

The body is the specific place that is dominated, indicating that the rule of Jesus Christ the Lord leads to life. The metaphor of dominion illustrating that death no longer has dominion over Christ (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει) in Romans 6:9 affirms that Christ even dominates death. Believers may obtain eternal life when ruled through Jesus Christ the Lord (cf. 5:21). Accordingly, the body of the believer is implied as the space where Christ has the controlling influence, as being in Christ Jesus (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 6:11]) functions as a metaphor of dominion.

In Romans 6:12–14, Paul explicitly states that believers should not allow Sin to rule in their mortal bodies (μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι [Rm 6:12]). Again, bodies are implied as Paul urges that believers should not present the members of their bodies as instruments of injustice to Sin (μηδὲ παριστάνετε τὰ μέλη ὑμῶν ὅπλα ἀδικίας τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [Rm 6:13]). The rule of Sin has no effect as believers are under Favour (ὑπὸ χάριν [Rm 6:14]) as their bodies are positioned under the command of Favour.

The slavery metaphors in Romans 6:15–23 expound the notion of bodies being under the control of a master. In Romans 6:18, God has freed believers from the dominion of Sin. The past state of the body is compared with the current state of the believers' body. The result of the body under dominion of Sin and the body under dominion of God is crystallised in Romans 6:20–23. The body, when ruled by Sin, only leads to death, whereas the body, serving God, leads to life. The body separated from the influence of Sin becomes a place with the possibility to bear fruits leading to sanctification and eternal life (τὸν καρπὸν ὑμῶν εἰς ἁγιασμόν, τὸ δὲ τέλος ζωὴν αἰώνιον [Rm 6:22]). What is more, believers are no longer slaves of Sin receiving wages of death. Their bodies

are not owned by a dominator that only offers them to ruin and decay. Rather, believers have the choice to orientate their bodies in service of God with the result of eternal life and the dominion of Jesus Christ their Lord (τὸ δὲ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ζωὴ αἰώνιος ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν).

The body as a dominated space continues to surface as Paul uses a marriage analogy in Romans 7:1–4. In Romans 7:1, the law is deemed to rule over a person for as long as they live, implying bodiliness. The marriage analogy depicts the woman as being bound to her husband as long as he lives. The bodiliness of the image is evident, illustrating that believers are truly separated from Sin. It is not possible for their bodies to be under the command of Sin when they died through the body of the crucified Christ to belong to Him as resurrected Lord. In Romans 7:4, Paul refers to the body of Christ (τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ) and his resurrection by God functioning as the reference points to Romans 6:4–8. Käsemann (1969:104) remarks that 'the body of Christ' indicates a reality, which is intended through the concrete application of the statement of identity to the life of the Christian community. In Romans 7:5, Paul uses ἐν τῇ σαρκί 'in the flesh' with σάρξ as is used as a reference to the body. It becomes synonymous with the body being in a state of control by Sin. Throughout the argument, Paul construes patterns of repetition that aids in the persuasiveness of his argument. In Romans 7:6, he picks the slavery metaphor up again. The imagery purports that believers have been freed from the Law and are no longer held back by that which kept the body captive. The body has the possibility to serve in the newness of the Spirit, which is perceived as a positive type of dominion. In contrast, believers are no longer slaves to the oldness of the letter, meaning that the Law is obsolete in their new situation.

In Romans 7:7–25, the body may be traced in Paul's use of the 'I' as phrases such as ἐν ἐμοί 'in me' (Rm 7:8) suggest. Paul ensues with a description of the 'I' living (ἐγὼ … ἔζων [Rm 7:9]) and the 'I' died (ἐγὼ … ἀπέθανον [Rm 7:10]). In Romans 7:11, Sin managed to deceive (ἐξηπάτησέν με [Rm 7:11]) and kill (ἀπέκτεινεν [Rm 7:11]) the 'I'. In Romans 7:14–20, Paul continues to display the dichotomy of the predicament of the 'I'. The 'I' has been sold under Sin like a slave, an image innately drawing on bodiliness. The 'I' cannot do what the 'I' wants to do, but the 'I' does what the 'I' hates even though the 'I' deems the law as good (Rm 7:15). The action of the 'I' is done by the body and functions as the contested space.

The bodily contestation in Romans 7:17–20 is described as a space that is inhabited, thus bordering possession. Sin is depicted as indwelling in the 'me' (ἡ οἰκοῦσα ἐν ἐμοὶ ἁμαρτία [Rm 7:17; 18]) and 'in my flesh' (ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου [Rm 7:18]). The image of Sin's possession is utterly negative. Up until this point, the believer has been depicted as a slave without the ability to do the good that he or she truly desires to do. A slave could, however, still do something that the master does not want him or her to do, even though it would entail

punishment or even death. The possession image depicts an even worse situation than slavery, as the body is stripped of all autonomy. The possessor is in complete control of the person's body, placing it in a state of trouble.

The phrase ἐμοί in Romans 7:21 again hints to the body as Paul describes an ensuing conflict within it. Paul distinguishes between an inner person and an outer person ἔσω ἄνθρωπον (Rm 7:22). He expresses the conflict in no uncertain military terms with the verbs ἀντιστρατεύομαι 'to be at war with' and αἰχμαλωτίζομαι 'to be captured in war'. The phrase ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου 'in my members' (Rm 7:23) has already been used in Romans 6:13 and refers to a person's body. Within the body, Paul describes an ensuing war between the law of the mind and the law of Sin that already dwells in the body. The law of Sin holds the law of the mind captive. In Romans 7:24, the body is displayed in the worst possible manner as 'this body of death' (τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου [Rm 7:24]) is engulfed by Sin. This state of Sin's utter control causes the 'I' to be labelled a wretched human (ταλαίπωρος ... ἄνθρωπος [Rm 7:24]) in dire need of saving. However, this dire state of already being dead is not intended for believers. Believers serve Christ, but there is an ensuing dichotomy that unfolds as the flesh remains susceptible to the law of Sin. Believers must actively allow the Spirit of the risen Christ to dominate them, as the temptation for the body to adhere to Sin is ever existent.

In Romans 8:1, bodiliness breaks through the periphery with the metaphor of dominion describing Christ Jesus' control of the bodies of believers τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Rm 8:1,2). Believers through presenting their bodies in service to God become a container that is filled with Jesus Christ their Lord. The phrase ἐν ἡμῖν 'in us' (Rm 8:4) again highlights the body of believers as the specific place where all these events occur. The notion is established that when a believer continually remains under God's Favour, then Christ Jesus controls him or her. The dominion of Christ elevates the flesh from a place associated with Sin, to a place where it is possible for the righteous requirement of the law to be fulfilled in the bodies of believers (τὸ δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου πληρωθῇ ἐν ἡμῖν [Rm 8:4]).

It becomes clear in Romans 8:9–11 that in the body of a servant of God the Spirit of God dwells in him or her (πνεῦμα θεοῦ οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν [Rm 8:9]). The result is that the body is dead to Sin (τὸ μὲν σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν [Rm 8:10]). However, if the body becomes contaminated by Sin again, the body is subjected to the rule of Sin. This could happen if believers choose not to present their bodies to God. The metaphor 'from death to life' that Paul employs in Romans 8:11 is significant, seeing that the mortal bodies undergo an enlivening activity. The rule of God's Favour entails that God's spirit makes a home in the believers' body. This results in the mortal body being a place where the Spirit can aid a believer in partaking in life and also revives the believer from the rule of Sin. Believers belong to the resurrected Christ.

Accordingly, God's spirit ensures that even 'recontaminated' believers cannot be separated from God as they belong to the resurrected Christ.

In Romans 8:12–17, Paul again notes that believers, brothers, are not obligated to live according to the flesh (ἀδελφοί, ὀφειλέται ἐσμὲν οὐ τῇ σαρκὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ζῆν [Rm 8:12]). Believers have put the disgraceful deeds of the body of death behind them (Rm 8:13). The adoption metaphor is a bodily image, which clarifies the bond believers have with God as they benefit from the dominion of God. In Romans 8:17, Paul extends the adoption metaphor, naming believers 'heirs' (κληρονόμοι [Rm 8:17]), 'heirs of God' (κληρονόμοι ... θεοῦ [Rm 8:17]) and 'joint-heirs' with Christ (συγκληρονόμοι Χριστοῦ [Rm 8:17]). This is the zenith of the bodily images associated with being children of God and a clear status indicator of who the dominator is, namely Jesus Christ.

The dominion of God entails that the bodies of believers obtain freedom. Again, the personal pronoun εἰς ἡμᾶς (Rm 8:18) points to the bodies of believers as the place where the coming glory will manifest. Romans 8:19 makes this notion even more explicit, indicating the sons of God (τῶν υἱῶν τοῦ θεοῦ) as the specific place where the glory of God will manifest. Both the sons of God and the glory of God are essentially bodily images.

The destinies of creation and humans are interwoven (Schnelle 1996:37). Schnelle (1996:58) describes the body as the convergent point of humans in the world as well as God's activity in the world. The domination of Christ over adopted bodies entails the freedom of the glory of the children of God (εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ θεοῦ [Rm 8:21]). Glory is also a bodily image reminding the audience of the glory of God signifying an attribute of God as imperishable. Paul argues that believers' bodies will no longer be mortal and subjected to decay.

Romans 8:22–27 explicitly describes the redemption of the body. The body is prominent as believers groan within themselves while awaiting the redemption of their body (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν [Rm 8:23]). Again, the dominion of Christ liberates the mortal body making it possible for the believer to obtain life. The bodily image of adoption is repeated in Romans 8:23. It becomes clear that the redeemed body will not be separated from the love of God. This comes into the scope of Romans 8:28–30, as Paul describes those who love God are called according to His purpose (τοῖς κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν [Rm 8:28]), they are predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son (καὶ προώρισεν συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτου [Rm 8:29]) and predestined these to be called (τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν [Rm 8:30]), and made these right (τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν [Rm 8:30]) and also glorified these (τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν [Rm 8:30]). Believers obtain a special status when they are connected with Christ. Especially Romans 8:29 sheds light on this notion. Believers' bodies in service of God reflect the divine supremacy and glory of the Son. The body becomes fully alive when the captured body has been liberated.

In the climax of Romans 8:31–39, it becomes clear that if God is the dominator, no force or power can be against believers. The believers as the dominated space are implied by the use of the personal pronoun ἐγώ (Rm 8:31, 32, 34, 35, 37). The death and resurrection of Christ (Rm 8:34) are used again as substantiation of the power of Christ's dominion. Paul cogently argues that if Christ rules the body, nothing can separate the believer from the love of Christ.

For Paul, the body is clearly the place of contestation where powers vie for dominion. Throughout the argument of Romans 5–8, Paul postulates that believers' bodies are liberated from Sin and Death, and free to belong under the lordship of Christ. This opens the possibility to draw on Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor as a heuristic tool, differentiating believers' bodies as a container metaphor. The implied dominator of the body is integral to Paul's attribution of status. The body was ruled by Sin, leading to death, in contrast to the new state of the body where believers obtain life through Jesus Christ the Lord, which also leads to eternal life.

The body as the space of contestation is vital, as people identify with places, locations and sites of belonging (Obadia 2015:203). The body is central to Paul's theology (Punt 2005:368), as his worldview and understanding of the self are constantly focused on the body and bodiliness (Engberg-Pedersen 2010:vii). Incongruously, from the vantage point of traditional Pauline theology, the body is not seriously purveyed (Punt 2005:371), especially with regard to the link of dominion and the body.

The 'embodied or container' schema

Paul's various uses of terminology referring to the body contribute to the establishment of an 'image schema'. An image schema may also be referred to as 'embodied schema'. It consists of a small number of parts and relations, which can structure perceptions, images and events (Johnson 1990:29). It is a recurrent pattern that emerges as a meaningful structure tracing bodily movement through space manipulations of objects and perceptual interactions (Johnson 1990:29), for example: (1a) John went out of the room; (1b) Mary got out of the car and (1c) Spot jumped out of the pen (Asgari 2013:184). The common denominator in these examples is 'out'. Events are organised concerning the basic understanding of 'out'. The 'containment' schema structures recurring experiences of putting objects into, and taking them out of, a delimited area (Rohrer 2007:35). In Romans 5–8, the body is the common denominator indicating that which is 'contained'. This containment schema operates as a continuous structure organising activity according to which experiences can be comprehended (Johnson 1990:30). In Romans 5–8, the dominator of the body becomes pivotal in determining a believers' 'in' or 'out' status.

An essential theme to Paul's argument is the 'in–out' orientation. This thinking continually features as Paul describes believers to be orientated 'in' Christ or to be 'out', implying not adhering to the rule of Christ. Paul's use of body may be fathomed according to a 'good versus evil' scheme (Vorster 2002:304). The body operates as the place where the effects of the rule of Sin and powers associated with Sin lead to death and decay as juxtaposed to the rule of Christ and powers associated with Christ, such as God's Favour (χάρις), which result into truly living and procuring eternal life (Rm 5:21). The image schema becomes an active organisation of Paul's representations of the two types of dominion, namely the dominion of God's Favour and the dominion of Sin, into meaningful coherent unities (Johnson 1990:30).

The container features in Paul's argument in two ways, namely the contaminated container and the freed container. The contaminated container illustrates being subjected to the rule of Sin, whereas the freed container illustrates being freed from Sin and subjected to the rule of God's Favour. The container schema claims that everything is either in the category container or falling out of the category (Johnson 1990:39). Within this spatial reasoning, there is no third space, as it is not possible to be situated between being inside the container or outside of the container (Johnson 1990:39). In Paul's thought, the dominion of the container, that is the body, changes. The body as container is neither good nor bad; it is mortal. The container is determined either by Sin or by the Spirit or God or Christ. A believer is either situated 'in' Christ or positioned 'out' in Sin. Consequently, the container is a subject to either Sin or God's Favour. For Paul, there is no in-between positions or intermediate distinctions concerning the relationship with God.

Paul paints a potent picture as he presents Sin and Death as forces that invade the container. The container is to be understood as the human world. In this sense, Sin and Death pass through all humans. These forces irrevocably contaminated the container and the impact thereof is inescapable.

Although these forces continue to exist, it only has reigning power in a believer's life if the believer submits to it. In Romans 5:18, εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους 'into all humans' the container metaphor is repeated, thereby highlighting the container when leading to condemnation, and the opposite state when Jesus Christ 'our' Lord is dominating, leading to the justification of life. It is significant that obedience, which is inherently part of the metaphor of dominion, as already pointed out in Chapter 3, functions as the decisive factor for the continuation of a person's 'in' or 'out' status. Obedience to Christ enables the believer to stay under the dominion of God's Favour. This secures the paramount 'in' status for a believer.

Schemata are flexible as they can be modified to fit tantamount situations (Johnson 1990:30). Paul's use of the container scheme continually sheds light on different aspects of Sin as understanding 'is an evolving process or activity

in which image schemata partially order and form experience, which are modified by its embodiment in concrete experiences' as Johnson (1990:30) states. Initially, Sin is represented as invading the container, as Sin came into the world through one man (ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν [Rm 5:12]), but its power is nothing in comparison with the power of God's Favour as the argument in Romans 5:12–21 illustrates.

Remaining in this contaminated state results in the 'recontamination' of the container, which is problematic, especially as God has liberated believers through the body of Christ from this contaminated state and they do not need to be ruled by Sin as they have been given the chance to live.

In a similar way, 'the body of Sin' τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Rm 6:6) functions as a contaminated container. The schema illustrates the bad decision believers make to stay under the rule of Sin after God has enabled them to be under His reign of Favour. Believers should not present themselves as slaves for Sin. It is unnecessary for believers to continue to allow their bodies to be dominated by Sin, as they are no longer slaves thereof (μηκέτι δουλεύειν ἡμᾶς τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ [Rm 6:6]).

The container metaphor in Romans 6:12 ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι 'in your mortal body' returns to highlight the importance of obedience. Believers are admonished to not let Sin reign in their mortal body, so as to obey its desires. Obedience is an important motif in Paul's argument. The result of disobedience is that the person becomes a recontaminated container, whereas obedience leads to a container associated with God's Favour. A person's 'in' or 'out' status hinges on his or her obedience. As the body is under constant threat to surrender to Sin, obedience becomes a necessary means to remain under the lordship of Christ.

The embodied schema also accentuates the means by which Sin takes opportunity in the body. In Romans 7:8b, ἡ ἁμαρτία ... ἐγέννησεν ἐν ἐμοὶ πᾶσαν ἐπιθυμίαν Sin 'accomplished in me all desires'. The fleshly desires are especially perceived as negative. The degradation of the flesh on account of Sin features again in Romans 8:3 with σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας 'of the sinful flesh' and ἐν τῇ σαρκί 'in the flesh'. The former suggests that the state of sinfulness has entrenched the human, determining a state in which the flesh is irrevocably contaminated. The latter again illustrates the domain of Sin as a domain in the flesh.

The continuous development of the contaminated container metaphor shapes a full comprehension of the destruction of Sin. The members of the body are in conflict in Romans 7:14–25. This is evident as the 'I' is representative of the body, for example ἐγὼ δὲ σαρκικός εἰμι 'but I am of the flesh' (Rm 7:14). Paul represents the bodily parts as being in conflict for control of the whole body, for example ἀγαθόν τὸ γὰρ θέλειν παράκειταί μοι, τὸ δὲ κατεργάζεσθαι τὸ καλὸν οὔ 'for I have the will to do what is right, but not the ability to do it' (Rm 7:18). The 'I' does what it does not want to do, even if it is aware of what it should

do. In Romans 7:23, the members are also used to designate the body. However, in Romans 7:23, it does not represent intentional space but is used again within the pattern of container metaphors to illustrate another law taking hold in 'my' members (ἐν τοῖς μέλεσίν μου), which wages a war with the law of 'my' mind (τῷ νόμῳ τοῦ νοός μου [Rm 7:23]). The destruction of Sin is clear.

Those who have been baptised and received the Spirit are under the dominion of God's Favour. They are described as 'those in Christ Jesus' (τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 6:11,23; Rm 8:1]), which is repeated in Romans 8:2 (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). The interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ 'in Christ Jesus' in Romans 8:1, 2 is a contentious subject. I interpret the phrase as a metaphor of dominion referring to the body of the believer as the dominated space. The believer's body is under the lordship of Jesus Christ and Paul employs the phrase regarding its interpretation. In Romans 8:1, believers are clearly located as τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ 'those in Jesus Christ'. This metaphor sets the tone in Romans 8 as Paul veers the argument to illustrate the positive effects of the Spirit. The bodies of believers have been liberated from Sin. It becomes clear in Romans 8:23 that these bodies will be redeemed. Believers are deemed to be God's children, and therefore their bodies will become the space where Christ's glory will be revealed (Rm 8:18).

Paul also uses different terminology inferring the body parts that may be interpreted as container metaphors representing the body. Within the argument, each occurrence of καρδία 'heart' is associated with the Spirit of God.

Spatiality and relationship

In Romans 5–8, Paul's use of space delineates an understanding of believers' relationship with God and the incumbent forces. The body is the specific space Paul uses to communicate believers' relationship with God in his strategy of persuasion.[805] Accordingly, it is possible to speak of spatial reasoning (Thate 2014:283) and specifically a bodily reasoning in Romans 5–8.

Paul's spatial reasoning underscores three relationships explicitly with his use of ὑπό, namely, (1) ὑπὸ χάριν (Rm 6:14, 15), (2) ὑπὸ νόμον (Rm 6:14,15), and (3) ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. The preposition ὑπό describes the believers' subjugated position as 'under'. Paul depicts being ὑπὸ χάριν 'under Favour' as the relationships find themselves in. The domination of Favour enables believers to bear fruit and partake in life to its fullest extent. The nexus with the body of the crucified Christ and the Spirit of God that resurrected him from the dead protects believers so that there is no force or power that can harm them.

805. See Vorster (1997:390) on the body as persuasive strategy.

Both relationships of being under the Law and under Sin are undesirable and should belong to the past of the believers. Paul clearly states that the law in itself is not the problem, but the Law when manipulated by Sin becomes problematical. Essentially, 'under Law' communicates the same message as 'under Sin'. Paul illustrates the intense calamity that the rule of Sin havocs, from consuming a body from the bondage of slavery, to total possession and finally bringing the body into a state of being a 'body of death'.

The body and Sin

Paul uses the personification of Sin in a specific manner in his argument. Sin is portrayed as a power that invades the κόσμος (Rm 5:12), where Paul not only emphasises humans as the containers but also simultaneously introduces the severity of the problem as Sin is in the world. Paul stresses the problem depicting Sin as an entry point for Death, which spreads to all humans. Hearing Romans 5:12 would have been terrifying for believers situated in a context, where the impact of invasion is immediately comprehended. Paul dismantles this initial shock produced by the rule of Sin to convince believers that their bodies are under God's Favour. In a climatic manner, Paul's images in Romans 8:31–39 affirm that nothing in the world can separate believers from God's love.

Paul's portrayal of Sin throughout Romans 5:12–7:25 facilitates a mental effort from the audience imparting the knowledge that they are separated from Sin. The metaphorical mapping of Sin conveys the relationship between the body of a believer and Sin. Sin is a reality to which a believer is susceptible. However, a believer has undergone a status change through baptism (Rm 6:4). Paul's personification of Sin highlights the tension between the situation of not only already belonging to the Resurrected Christ (Rm 7:4) but also waiting for the redemption of their bodies (Rm 8:23). Believers are under God's Favour, but unlike the rule of Sin, a believer chooses to present his or her body to God (Rm 6:11). Paul's use of Sin underlines the urgency of a believer to continually be obedient to God as being under the dominion of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord becomes synonymous with a body being a space of life and eternal life.

The body and Death

Similar to Paul's use of the personification of Sin, Paul's mapping of Death convinces the audience of the reign of God's Favour as the superior power to orientate themselves towards. The metaphor of Death is particularly effective for an audience accustomed to daily life in Rome commemorated by Rome's victories with triumphal processions and statues. Paul disarms any threat of Death for believers as the Resurrected Christ has proved to be superior over

Death (see Rm 5:12–21) and Death no longer has dominion over Christ (Rm 6:9). The mapping of Death, similar to Sin, underscores the need for believers to present themselves to God and to continually do so. Even though the power of Death has been defeated, it is a reality in the world of believers. Believers should align themselves under God's Favour as their mortal bodies will be enlivened into a spiritual body. Accordingly, the personification of Death aids in creating the mental model that the body is a space that should be under God's Favour.

The personification of Death is also epistemic, instructing believers that the mortal body will be liberated from decay (Rm 8:18–30). Believers are the children of God and as His children, heirs and joint-heirs of Christ (Rm 8:17), they eagerly await the redemption of their bodies (Rm 8:23). The mortal body is susceptible to decay and suffering and believers' spiritual body is freed from purposelessness and rotting. In Romans 8:29, God foreknew and predestined believers to be conformed to the image of the Son with the purpose to be glorified. The image of the creation groaning and experiencing the pains of childbirth colours the understanding of the believers' mortal body as susceptible to pain and suffering, but similar to the pain of childbirth it produces something that is good, which in this case is the spiritual body. Believers who allow the dominion of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord in their mortal bodies will become a firstborn amongst many brothers with their spiritual bodies.

☐ The body and Favour

An integral part of the mental model that the body is a place that should be under God's reign is conveyed in Paul's depiction of Favour. In effect, Paul's portrayal of the body and its relationship with Favour unfolds as the location where salvation takes place. The scene is set in Romans 5:2, detailing the powerful image of believers standing in 'this' Favour (εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐν ᾗ ἑστήκαμεν). This Favour refers to the glory of God, which is a metonymy for the Christ event. In Romans 5:15–17, it becomes evident that χάρις is associated with Christ as a God-gift. It is through Jesus Christ that God has saved all underserving and ungodly sinners. The body of Christ protects believers from the calamity of God's wrath. The believer belonging to the Resurrected Christ entails an understanding of the believers' body being a protected space.

Paul's depiction of Favour not only convinces believers that they have undergone a status change but it also contributes to the target domain that the body under God's Favour is an eternal body. What is more, Paul's use of Favour motivates believers to act in a manner that will enable them to be under God's Favour.

The body and Law

Paul's depiction of law is complex as his use of νόμος is not always employed to refer to Mosaic Law. What is more, the portrayal of law is ambivalent in comparison with the depictions of Sin and Death. For Paul's initial audience, the law would have been known and respected as a way to have a relationship with God. It would have been easier to understand the negative renderings of Death and Sin. Paul does not wish to alienate his audience and also harbours the understanding of the law as a conducive factor for a relationship with God. The vital message Paul's depiction of Law conveys is that a person's 'in' or 'out' status is not determined by the law. For a believer to be 'in', the body needs to be under the dominion of God's Favour.

Paul's representation of Law is crucial in the build-up of his argument that no force or power or thing can separate a believer from the love of God. The marriage analogy (Rm 7:2–3) provides the frame to interpret Paul's depiction of Law. Paul takes a subject known by the audience and maps the understanding of believers belonging to a different dominator in the target domain, that is, belonging to the Resurrected Christ (Rm 7:4).

This depiction contributes to understanding the relationship with God. The message Paul conveys is when the body is under God's reign, the law is a good tool in a believers' relationship. However, when it becomes more important to orientate the body towards the Law, instead of God, then it becomes problematic. The Law must not bind a believer. Rather, Paul uses the Law to illustrate the freedom believers have in their new relationship with the Resurrected Christ as this is a relationship that defies time. This is also a testament to the superiority of God's reign, as no separation is possible.

Spatiality and persuasion

Paul sheds light on the space for the relationship between believers and God, namely the body. The body becomes integral in mapping the target domain that there is not force or power that can separate believers from the love of Christ. The rich bodily imagery continues to serve this macro-argument throughout Romans 5–8.

Paul's use of the body becomes the golden thread from which believers are orientated towards different powers. The body can also be something that is presented to a power, as is prevalent in Paul's use of the slavery image. A key difference Paul's images communicates to an audience situated in a culture of always being dominated is that unlike the forces of Sin and Death, the believer has the option to choose to present himself or herself to God. This action of agreeing continually aligning with God results in the body becoming under

the lordship of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord. Using Paul's slavery language for a modern debate concerning the ethics of slavery diverts Paul's immense focus on which power should be controlling a believer. The controlling force is a matter of life and death. Belonging to the Resurrected Christ not only results in life but also fosters being part of a family of believers. The reign of God's Favour is portrayed as life-giving and different from any other type of reign a believer might have encountered. This imagery of dominion connects to the audience's immediate daily life experience and contributes to the relevancy of the metaphors Paul used. Paul redefines a believer's experience of himself or herself as being under the dominion of God is synonymous with life, protection and the assurance that mortal death will only result in the enlivening of the spiritual body. This bodily argument would have comforted its initial audience and instilled a better understanding of their relationship with Christ.

The container schema continually highlights the different effects of the dominion of Sin in contrast to the dominion of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord. The container schema also accentuates what believers need to do to stay under the dominion of a lord, for example obedience in Romans 6:15–23. The significance of the status change of believers is also prevalent as God has liberated and freed believers from Sin through Jesus Christ 'our' Lord. The slavery metaphor and marriage analogy clearly envision this freedom and liberation spatially as the body features as the object that is affected.

Recurring applications of a metaphor can be argumentatively articulated converging towards the metaphorical construal into a representation of a current state of affairs (Oswald & Rihs 2014:134). The frequency of Paul's use of Sin and Death and their power on people suggest that Paul could have understood these forces as ontological realities affecting people. Similarly, Paul envisions the power of Christ as the triumphant power that invites believers to partake in the reality of the glory of God.

Paul uses the body as a specific manner to persuade his audience that they belong to the Resurrected Christ and are positioned under God's Favour with God's spirit making a home in them that no other force or power can separate believers from this superior power that is God. Accordingly, the body is used as a key strategy for persuasion (Vorster 1997:392), as Paul employs the believers' body as the space where forces vie for lordship. From Paul's perspective, the body of a believer is a controlled space of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord, thus providing no room for the behaviours associated with Sin. Moreover, a believers' body is a space that cannot be separated from the love of God.

Chapter 5

Hegemony and space

Introduction

This study traced occurrences of metaphors of dominion in Paul's argument in Romans 5–8. Amongst the plethora of studies concerning Romans 5–8, a coherent investigation into metaphors of dominion lacked. This study sheds light on the interaction between dominion and space. The space in which Paul envisions these forces to contend for dominion is specifically the body. The body consistently comes to the fore, whether directly stated (e.g. σῶμα), hinted at (e.g. καρδία) or inferred from the context (e.g. ἐμοί).

Some general observations

Paul operated in a world where the belief that people are susceptible to powers and forces prevailed, a world dominated by Roman rule and propaganda. Embedded in this worldview, Paul's argument in Romans 5–8 exemplifies a rich use of imagery saturated with images stemming from the cultures of his time. His language attests to Jewish as well as Greco-Roman influences curtailed to instil the message that believers cannot be separated from the love of God by any force, entity or thing. Adducing Paul's imagery as merely cultic or enlisting Paul in a rebellion against the Roman Empire, as

How to cite: Potgieter, A., 2020, 'Hegemony and space', in *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8* (HTS Religion & Society Series Volume 7), pp. 231–239, AOSIS, Cape Town. https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248.05

many studies often do, reduces the intricacies and complexities of Paul's argument especially in Romans 5–8.

Throughout the argument in Romans 5–8, Paul continually draws on imagery to substantiate and argue his point. His images predominantly depict two lords, namely Jesus Christ 'our' Lord and Sin. Other powers are also associated with both rulers, for example God's Favour is associated with Christ and Death is associated with Sin. *En fait*, Paul deems that there is only one worthy ruler to whom a believer should submit, namely Jesus Christ 'our' Lord, as various rhetorical techniques in the letter communicate (see ch. 3). Paul wants to persuade his audience that nothing, no force or power, can separate believers from the love of God 'in' Jesus Christ 'our' Lord. This is the result of him being the dominator of a believer's body.

Paul postulates that believers' bodies are liberated from Sin and Death, free to be under the lordship of Christ. The body serves as the location where forces contend for domination. The implied dominator of the body is integral to Paul's attribution of status. The body was ruled by Sin, leading to death, in contrast to the believers' body having been put under the lordship of Christ, leading to life.

Remarks on metaphors of dominion

This study continually stated that dominion is integrally linked with space. A ruler cannot rule if there is no subject or space to exercise dominion over. Accordingly, demarcating metaphors of dominion also entails cognisance of how a person is orientated. A person can be 'under' with a ruler or dominator 'on top'. The benefit of applying CMT in this study lies in the ability to extract an awareness of dominion and space. Lakoff and Johnson's theory of orientational and ontological metaphors aids in determining position within the frame of dominion. Other metaphors of dominion include the slavery metaphor and the marriage analogy.

However, CMT exhibits deficiencies especially when encountering ancient texts. Lakoff and Johnson's assertion that 'up' is good and 'down/under' is bad is problematical within the hierarchical frame of the 1st century CE, as all people, including believers, are always 'down/under'. The manner in which Paul uses prepositions indicates that being 'under' is not always perceived as negative. Rather, the incumbent force or power, namely God's Favour or Sin, is the determining factor establishing whether a person is in a situation leading to life or a situation resulting in death. Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor serves as a heuristic tool in delineating the 'in' or 'out' status of a believer. Correspondingly, where a person is positioned or keeps himself or herself positioned is of importance. A person is either 'in' or 'out', and this orientation is linked to status. The status 'in' connotes life and the status 'out' entails death.

Paul commences his argument in Romans 5:1 with the metaphor of dominion 'to have peace with God' drawing on the source domain of war. This pivotal image conveys believers' status change enabling an 'in' status. They were turned from being enemies into being friends. As the dominator, God's initiative in this relationship with believers is crucial as the divine passive (Rm 5:1) highlights. This metaphor is repeated in Romans 5:10 with the synonymous expression 'to be reconciled' where again, God is the actor.

Notwithstanding, the container, namely the body, is the location where forces dominate. Paul personifies various forces that strive for dominion in the body. Utilising a metaphor of dominion, Paul introduces Sin and Death as forces that invade the human world in Romans 5:12. The verb βασιλεύω 'to rule' explicitly communicates having dominion. In Romans 5:14, 17, Paul uses it in connection with the personification of Death as a ruler. Death is portrayed to have ruled from the time of Adam until Moses (ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως [Rm 5:14]) and also manages his rule through the one (ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός [Rm 5:17]). In Romans 5:21, Paul portrays Favour (χάρις) as a ruling force. However, Favour's reign is possible through the agency of Jesus Christ 'our' Lord (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν), which is another metaphor of dominion. In Romans 6:12, Paul draws on the source domain of βασιλεύω again, admonishing believers to not present their mortal bodies to the rule of Sin (μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι [Rm 6:12]).

Paul deviates from utilising βασιλεύω with the verb κυριεύω 'to be lord'. A pattern of repetition is established with κυριεύω, emphasising Christ as the supreme Lord when set against another power or force. In Romans 6:9, Death no longer rules Christ (θάνατος αὐτοῦ οὐκέτι κυριεύει) as He was resurrected from the dead. In Romans 6:14, Sin no longer rules (ἁμαρτία οὐ κυριεύσει) over the believers, as they are under the dominion of God's Favour. In Romans 7:4, believers are no longer subjugated to the law as, from the viewpoint of the marriage analogy, the risen Christ is their new husband. Accordingly, the lordship of Christ is underscored.

Paul often draws on the metaphor of slavery, which also functions as a metaphor of dominion. He depicts Sin as a slave owner (Rm 6:6,16–23). In Romans 6:16, Paul illustrates Sin as well as obedience (ὑπακοή) to slave masters. Believers are commanded to not present their body parts as instruments of unrighteousness, but to present them for God as instruments of righteousness (Rm 6:13).

As mentioned in Chapter 2, Paul's use of prepositions often signals metaphors of dominion. The preposition ὑπό denotes 'being under' and is issued twice in Romans 6:14, 15 and once in Romans 7:14. In Romans 6:14, ὑπὸ νόμον is juxtaposed with ὑπὸ χάριν. Believers are portrayed as subjected to Favour and not the Law diluted by Sin. The interpretation of ὑπὸ νόμον becomes clear in light of Romans 7:7–13. In Romans 7:14, ὑπό illustrates believers being under the power of Sin as they have been sold to Sin (ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν).

The perspective is from the position of the dominated, thus within the metaphor of dominion, and the focus is on the subjected. In Romans 6:1, ἐπιμένωμεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ 'shall we remain in Sin' is also from the viewpoint of the subjected. Sin is depicted as the dominator with a clear evaluation of the type of dominator it is, namely one not worthy to submit to.

The proximity between the preposition ἐν and its referent can signal a metaphor of dominion. In Romans 6:11, the preposition ἐν has a locative application, as the bodies of believers become the space where Christ Jesus rules (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ). Similarly, ἐν has the same function in Romans 6:23 indicating Christ Jesus 'our' Lord as the dominator of believers (ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ ἡμῶν). In Romans 8:1, 2, believers are those in Christ Jesus as the controlling influence in their bodies (τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [Rm 8:1,2]). In Romans 7:5, the preposition indicates Sin as the controlling influence with the metaphor of dominion ἐν τῇ σαρκί 'in the flesh'.

Similarly, the preposition διά may also indicate a metaphor of dominion. In Romans 6:11, the preposition διά indicates 'within the domain of' with Jesus Christ 'our' Lord functioning as the dominator (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν). In Romans 6:19, the phrase διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκὸς ὑμῶν functions as a metaphor of dominion. The preposition διά refers to the domain of Sin, namely the flesh, and this also occurs in Romans 8:3 with the phrase διὰ τῆς σαρκός, where the domination of Sin in the flesh is again implied. In Romans 8:10, the body as a place of death is explicitly stated on account of Sin (διὰ ἁμαρτίαν).

Paul also employs subtle metaphors of dominion. For example, in Romans 5:5, a metaphor of abundance also inadvertently functions as a metaphor of dominion as the love of God has been poured into 'our' hearts (ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν). In Romans 6:17, obedience from the heart (ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας) is a metaphor of dominion, illustrating believers' absolute compliance to a beneficent God.

Obedience also functions as a metaphor of dominion, as the word in itself denotes submission. In Romans 5:19, obedience to either Sin or Christ brings the body under the control of either the one or the other. This metaphor of dominion also features in Romans 6:12. Obedience to desires, which are controlled by Sin, leads to submission (εἰς τὸ ὑπακούειν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ).

In Romans 7:23, Paul draws on verbs from the realm of warfare ἀντιστρατεύομαι 'to be at war with an enemy' and αἰχμαλωτίζομαι 'to be captured in war'. The source domain of both verbs is war. With these metaphors of dominion, Paul illustrates the proclivity of Sin to take control of the body. In Romans 7:24, the body controlled by Sin is depicted as a body of death in dire need of saving. However, for believers, this is not the case as they are under the dominion of Christ.

In Romans 8:5–8, Paul draws on the source domain φρονέω τά τινος, which means 'to take sides in a conflict', to display the body as a space where

believers are either dominated by Christ or Sin. The phrase κατὰ σάρκα (Rm 8:12) illustrates conformity to the flesh controlled by Sin. Paul repeats this image in Romans 8:13 illustrating again what the dominion of Sin looks like in the body. Correspondingly, κατὰ θεόν (Rm 8:27) is a metaphor of dominion with God as the controlling influence.

Remarks on persuasiveness in Paul's argument

As Paul's argument progresses, his persuasion can be traced in each pericope as he adds to the broader argument circumposed between Romans 5:1–11 and Romans 8:31–39. Metaphorical patterns, such as repetition, recurrence, clustering, extension, combination-and-mixing and signalling crystallise in Romans 5–8, aiding Paul's perlocution. A mental model concerning dominion is established, reflecting the experience of believers in the 1st century CE.

In Romans 5:1–11, which mirrors Romans 8:31–39, Paul establishes that believers underwent a status change from being enemies into being friends. This status change is emphasised with metaphorical clusters in Romans 5:2 (peace) and Romans 5:10 (reconciliation). Within this new relationship, God is the benevolent dominator and believers are the dominated. This 'in' status entails that no force or power or thing can separate believers from the love of God.

Furthermore, Paul draws on the language of boasting forming part of a rhetorical ploy along with the image of the glory of God referring to the crucifixion as it subverts Roman conceptions of glory. The 'dying for' someone formula illustrates that believers' bodies have warded off the consequences of Sin by Christ dying 'for' sinners. Paul conflates the traditional formula and the notion of 'dying for' someone from the Euripides tradition to express God's saving action. Love is an important motivator in Paul's argument, as it is on account of God's love that Christ died for the ungodly sinners (Rm 5:6–8).

God's saving action is extrapolated in Romans 5:9–11 to be applicable to all believers. Believers will be saved from the wrath as they are already established as being in the Favour of God. Paul uses space to persuade believers that they stand in the Favour of God and that it is a beneficial position. This position of enjoying God's benefaction is vital, as it determines believer' 'in' status. This position of believers is solidified in Romans 8:31–39 as Paul illustrates that when a believer is under the dominating influence of God, no human or otherworldly power can separate them from the love of God in Christ Jesus 'our' Lord.

In Romans 5:12–21, Paul throws a spotlight on the actions of one. He develops a comparison between the power of Christ and the power of Sin drawing the audience's attention to the triumph of God's Favour and the gift by Favour of Christ, over Sin. Paul stacks the personifications in Romans 5:12–21.

It is the first time in the argument that Sin, Death, Law and Favour are personified to persuade the auditors of the effects these powers have on them.

Paul does not elaborate on the origins of Sin. He merely portrays Sin as an invading power to the human world. God is not accredited for creating Sin. However, Paul is not concerned with this subject as his aim is to convince the believers in Rome that Christ should be the dominating influence in their bodies. He convincingly illustrates Christ as the superior power. In Romans 5:21, the personification of Favour is utilised indicating that Favour reigns and triumphs over Sin. The following question arises in Romans 5:21: If Favour increases, why can Sin not increase? The argument in Romans 6:1–7:6 essentially responds to this question.

In Romans 6, Paul argues that it is preposterous that believers remain in Sin in order for Favour to increase, as they have been separated from Sin. Within two metaphorical expressions concerned with life and death (Rm 6:2), Paul explicates their status change. A pattern of repetition develops in Romans 6:1–11 with the contrast between life and death relating to the conceptual metaphor 'living from death'. However, within this pattern, life and death are not always used as metaphors. Believers cannot literally die or be buried with Christ, but there is a part of them, namely the wilful continuance in Sin that Paul envisions as being dead. Paul's permutation of contrasting metaphors is particularly influential in illustrating that believers have been separated from Sin in order to live for Christ.

Another recurrent pattern regarding the contrast of life and death develops in Romans 6:1–11. Death becomes associated with Sin and life with the resurrected Christ. Being baptised into the death of Jesus Christ enforces the separation from Sin. This metaphor proves especially effective as baptism is an image all believers would have been familiar with. Paul uses this known image to underscore that if a person is baptised into Christ, remaining under Sin is unimaginable. Baptism connects the believer to the death *and* resurrection of Christ. Just as Christ has been raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so too believers might walk in the new life. Paul argues spatially, connoting a burial metaphor with the baptism metaphor. The purpose of these metaphors is to emphasise the status change.

In Romans 6:5–7, Paul continues his argument that believers have been separated from the power of Sin. He employs images coherent with the spatiality found in Romans 6:3–4 and draws on the metaphor of unification, thereby strengthening believers' association with Christ. In Romans 6:6, Paul draws on several metaphors such as 'the obsolete person', 'crucified with', 'the body of Sin' and 'slave of Sin'. This metaphorical cluster contributes to the persuasiveness of the discourse as the images are intricately interwoven to illustrate to believers that they are not any longer under the dominion of Sin.

Romans 6:8–11 expound believers' orientation as dead for Sin and alive for Christ.

In Romans 6:12–14, Paul draws on the metaphor of slavery, which highlights the difference between the dominion of two lords, namely Sin and Righteousness. The personification of Sin proves to be powerful in communicating the influence of Sin. However, care should be taken not to refer to Sin as a military general, as Romans 6:13, 23 are not military metaphors. Romans 7:23 also does not offer such a description, as the military metaphor is applied to the law of the mind making the 'I' a prisoner of war to the law of Sin. Sin is depicted as a slave owner (Rm 6:13,17), which is an image that the first auditors would have had first-hand experience of as slavery was deep-rooted and predominant in Roman culture. Believers are urged to be slaves of Jesus Christ and not of Sin. In Romans 6:15–23, Paul illuminates the difference between being a slave of Sin and a slave of God in Christ Jesus their Lord.

In Romans 7:1–6, Paul revisits the topic of Law. He employs a marriage analogy, mapping legal terminology of being free from subjugation to illustrate that believers are free from Sin. Paul develops the horizontal space within this analogy, as the argument has been consistently preoccupied with the vertical space in relationships.

In Romans 7:7–13, Paul clarifies the relationship between Sin and the Law. Sin is personified again as an utterly destructive force, taking opportunity through the Law to deceive and eventually kill the 'self'. The conflict Sin creates is heightened as Paul develops the self, the 'I', in Romans 7:14–20 inferring the body as the space of conflict. Paul continually employs sharp contrasts elucidating the difference between being submitted to Jesus Christ and being submitted to Sin. The 'I' wants to do good, but is in the stronghold of Sin and only manages to do bad things that are at hand.

Romans 7:21–25 express the dire state that the 'I' is in when captured by Sin as a prisoner of war. The 'I' is entrenched in a conflict between the law of its mind and the law of Sin that dwells in its members. The situation becomes dire as the 'I' is trapped in a body of death desperately needing to be rescued. However, believers are reminded that they are liberated and under the dominion of Christ and therefore not subjected to Sin.

In Romans 8, Paul sheds light on the relationship between believers and the Spirit. The bodies of believers are a place where the Spirit has made a home (Rm 8:11). Paul establishes in Romans 8:1, 2 that believers are those who are in Christ. The dominating influence for believers is the Spirit. Throughout the argument, Paul makes it clear that believers have been put into a position where they have been reconciled with God, creating the possibility to have a relationship with God. In this relationship, believers are put forward as people who have been liberated from sin. In Romans 8, believers are portrayed as being the specific location where the spirit dwells.

Paul enforces the audience's understanding that they are under the dominant influence of the Spirit. In Romans 8:12–17, the metaphor of adoption convinces the audience that they are the children of God. This is again an image that the audience would have been particularly well acquainted with as adoption was custom to Roman culture.

The adoption image is continued in Romans 8:18–30 as it becomes clear that the glory of God will be revealed in the sons and daughters of God (Rm 8:18). Paul personifies the creation. The personification serves as an analogy to illustrate what happens to the believers' bodies. The bodies will be subjected to decay and futility, but will be liberated from this state and will be redeemed and made alive again. The same Spirit who resurrected Christ from the dead assures the liberation and vivification of believers' mortal bodies. Believers' biodegradable bodies will transform into immortal spiritual bodies like the body of the resurrected Christ. In Romans 8:29, Paul elucidates that God foreknew and predestined believers to conform to the image of his Son. Believers' status as children of God, chosen and known by God, inaugurates their participation in this spiritual body that is eternal and without suffering.

The climax of the argument features in Romans 8:31–39. Paul develops the spatiality to its fullest as no height or depth or mortal or otherworldly powers can separate believers from the love of God in Jesus Christ. Paul's proclivity for spatial imagery underscores the believers' 'in' status.

Remarks on hegemony and the body

The body is prominent in Paul's argument as it is continually posited as the space of contestation. The bodily images that he uses are prevalent from the inception of the argument, illustrating believers' stand in this Favour. The body becomes an important rhetoric tool, conveying 'in' or 'out' status. The 'in' status determines that believers are positioned under the dominating influence of a benevolent Lord, namely Jesus Christ 'our' Lord, whereas 'out' determines that people are under the dominating influence of Sin. There is no third space proffered as people are either under the dominion of Christ or under the dominion of Sin.

A container schema focusing on the body can be traced in the argument. The image schema continually illuminates the 'in' or 'out' positioning of the body. It is within this embodied container scheme that Paul illustrates the impact of the different forces. Sin as a dominator is ascribed to the positions of manipulator, deceiver and killer. The Law is personified in Paul's argument, but it serves as a vehicle through which Sin takes opportunities. Death is also personified as it enters the human container through Sin, but the death and

resurrection of Christ nullify Death. Believers will receive eternal life as seen in Romans 5:21.[806]

It is significant that either Sin or Christ determines the body. There is no third space. In Romans 6:6, Paul indicates that Sin in fact no longer has control over the body (καταργηθῇ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας). By participating in the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ through baptism, the power of Sin in the believers' body is nullified. In Romans 6:12, Paul warns believers to not allow Sin to reign in their mortal bodies (μὴ οὖν βασιλευέτω ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θνητῷ ὑμῶν σώματι). The threat of Sin remains as the body is always under control. If the believer is not adhering to God, then he or she is adhering to Sin. In Romans 7:4, Paul clearly portrays that believers are separated from Sin, which is made possible through the body of Christ (διὰ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ). Believers will partake in the glory of God when they have been baptised into the death of Christ.

The worst situation for a person to be in is being in a state of absolute control of Sin, seen in Romans 7:24 as this 'body of death' (ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου). In Romans 8:10–13, the status change of the body is revisited. Christ is in the believers, and the Spirit of God that resurrected him is in the believers (Rm 8:10), which implies that Christ is the dominator. Even though the body is subject to death (σῶμα νεκρὸν διὰ ἁμαρτίαν) on account of the constant threat of Sin, the dominion of Christ entails that the Spirit gives life because of righteousness (τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωὴ διὰ δικαιοσύνην). In Romans 8:11, Paul employs the powerful metaphor 'from death to life' to illustrate that if believers are under God's control, He will enliven their mortal bodies through the Spirit that dwells in their bodies just as He has risen from the dead (cf. ὁ ἐγείρας Χριστὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ζῳοποιήσει καὶ τὰ θνητὰ σώματα ὑμῶν διὰ τοῦ ἐνοικοῦντος αὐτοῦ πνεύματος ἐν ὑμῖν). Accordingly, believers are not under the dominion of Sin. Death is an inevitable consequence of the past rule of Sin, but believers, by putting the evil deeds of the body to death, will live (τὰς πράξεις τοῦ σώματος θανατοῦτε, ζήσεσθε [Rm 8:13]). Believers await eagerly the redemption of their bodies (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν τοῦ σώματος ἡμῶν [Rm 8:23]). The mortal body is subject to decay and death, but those bodies dominated by the Spirit will become alive again, transformed into the image of God's Son (Rm 8:29).

Space plays a vital role in instilling Paul's message that no force or power can separate believers from the love of Christ. The hegemony over space particularly takes a bodily shape. The σῶμα becomes the location where forces contest for dominion. Christ is the victorious (dominant) power and believers are invited to realise that life and eternal life are synonymous with being under this ruler.

806. Paul does not explicate the fate of people who are not under the dominion of Christ, and thus under the dominion of Sin. Sin reigns in death and the rule of Sin brings death. These nonbelievers do not participate in eternal life and already live their mortal lives as people who are not truly alive.

References

Aageson, J.W., 1996, '"Control" in Pauline language and culture: A study of Rom 6', *New Testament Studies* 42(1), 75–89. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500017082

Adams, C., 2007, 'War and society', in P. Sabin, H. Van Wees & M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge history of Greek and Roman warfare, Volume I: Greece, the Hellenistic world and the rise of Rome*, pp. 198–235, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Agourides, S., 1976, 'Discussion', in L. De Lorenzi (ed.), *Law of the spirit in Rom 7 and 8*, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Arnold, C.E., 1993, 'Power', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 723–725, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Asgari, T., 2013, 'The study of image schemas in Hafez poems: Cognitive perspective', *International Journal of Language and Linguistics* 1(4), 182–190. https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ijll.20130104.23

Aune, D.E., 1993, 'Religions, Greco-Roman', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 786–796, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Aune, D.E., 2003, 'Distinct lexical meanings of ἀπαρχή in Hellenism, Judaism, and early Christianity', in J.T. Fitzgerald, T.H. Olbricht & L.M. White (eds.), *Early Christianity and classical culture: Comparative studies in honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, pp. 103–129, Brill, Leiden.

Balz, H. & Schneider, G. (eds.), 2011, *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (Teil 1–3)*, Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart.

Barclay, J.M.G., 2011, *Pauline churches and diaspora Jews (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 275)*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Barclay, J.M.G., 2015, *Paul and the gift*, Williams B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Barrett, C.K., 1957, *The Epistle to the Romans (Black's New Testament Commentaries),* Adam & Charles Black, London.

Barrosse, T., 1953, 'Death and Sin in Saint Paul's Epistle to the Romans', *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 15(4), 438–459.

Bartchy, S.S., 1993, 'Slave, slavery', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 1098–1099, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Bartlett, D.L., 1995, *Romans*, John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

Bauckham, R., 2011, 'The story of earth according to Paul: Romans 8:18–23', *Review and Expositor* 108(1), 91–97. https://doi.org/10.1177/003463731110800109

Bauder, W., 1978, 'Παράπτωμα', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 585–586, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Bauer, W., Danker, F.W., Arndt, W.F. & Gingrich, F.W., 2000, *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, 3rd edn., University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Becker, J., 1993, *Paul – Apostle to the gentiles*, transl, O.C. Dean, Westminster/John Knox Press, Louisville, KY.

Berger, K., 2011, 'χάρισμα', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 1102–1104, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Bergmeier, R., 2011, 'περιπατέω', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 177–179, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Bernard, E., 1969, *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des Grecs en Égypte*, *Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon 98*, Université de Franche-Comté, Besançon.

Bermejo-Luque, L., 2011, *Giving reasons – A linguistic-pragmatic approach to argumentation theory*, Springer, Dordrecht.

Bersot, J., 2010, 'La paix avec Dieu, passage de la justification à la réconciliation. Observations structurelles et narratives en Romains 5:1–11 [Peace with God, passage from justification to reconciliation. Structural and Narrative Observations in Romans 5: 1–11]', *Science et Esprit* 62(1), 125–142.

Bertram, G., 1966, 'κατεργάζομαι', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 3, pp. 634–635, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Betz, H.D., 1995, 'Transferring a ritual: Paul's interpretation of baptism in Romans 6', in T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic context*, pp. 84–118, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Betz, O., 1977, 'Adam', in G. Krause & G. Müller (eds.), *Theologische Realenzyklopädie Band 1 Aaron–Agende*, pp. 414–424, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Black, C.C., 1984, 'Pauline perspectives on death in Romans 5–8', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103(3), 413–433. https://doi.org/10.2307/3260781

Black, M., 1973, *The New Century Bible commentary Romans,* 2nd edn., William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. & Funk, R.W., 1961, *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Blass, F., Debrunner, A. & Rehkopf, F., 1976, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Blunck, J., 1976a, 'Βάθος', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 2, pp. 197–198, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Blunck, J., 1976b, 'ὕψος', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 2, pp. 198–200, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Boers, H., 2001, 'The structure and meaning of Romans 6:1–14', *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63(4), 664–682.

Borgen, P., 2006, 'Crucified for his own sins – Crucified for our sins: Observations on a Pauline perspective', in J. Fotopoulos (ed.), *The New Testament and early Christian literature in Greco-Roman context – Studies in honor of David. E. Aune*, pp. 17–35, Brill, Leiden.

Bornkamm, G., 1969, *Paulus*, Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart.

Borse, 2011, 'προσαγωγή', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 388–389, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Breytenbach, C., 2002, 'Using exegesis: On "reconciliation" and "forgiveness" in the aftermath of the TRC', in L. Holness & R.K. Wüstenberg (eds.), *Theology in dialogue – The impact of the arts, humanities, and science on contemporary religious thought*, pp. 245–256, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Breytenbach, C., 2005, 'The "for us" phrases in Pauline soteriology: Considering their background and use', in J.G. Van der Watt (ed.), *Salvation in the New Testament – Perspectives on soteriology*, pp. 163–185, Brill, Leiden.

Breytenbach, C., 2010a, '"Charis" and "Eleos"', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Grace, reconciliation, concord – The death of Christ in Graeco-Roman metaphors, Supplements of Novum Testamentum 135*, pp. 207–238, Brill, Leiden.

Breytenbach, C., 2010b, '"For in hope we were saved:" Discerning time in Paul's letter to the Romans', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Grace, reconciliation, concord – The death of Christ in Graeco-Roman metaphors, Supplements of Novum Testamentum 135*, pp. 239–256, Brill, Leiden.

Breytenbach, C., 2010c, 'Salvation of the reconciled (with a note on the background of Paul's metaphor of reconciliation)', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Grace, reconciliation, concord – The death of Christ in Graeco-Roman metaphors, supplements of Novum Testamentum 135*, pp. 171–186, Brill, Leiden.

Breytenbach, C., 2012, *Der Römerbrief als Vermächtnis an die Kirche – Rezeptionsgeschichten aus zwei Jahrtausenden*, Neukirchener Verlagsgesellschaft, Göttingen.

Breytenbach, C., 2013a, 'Die erste Missionreise', in F. Horn (ed.), *Paulus Handbuch*, pp. 98–103, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Breytenbach, C., 2013b, 'Interpretationen des Todes Christi', in F. Horn (ed.), *Paulus Handbuch*, pp. 321–331, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Breytenbach, C., 2013c, 'Liberation of enslaved bodies: Christian expectancy according to Rom 8,18–30', in C. Tuckett (ed.), *2 Thessalonians and Pauline eschatology. For Petr Pokorny on his 80th birthday, Colloquium Oecumenicum Paulinum 21*, pp. 197–214, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Breytenbach, C., 2014, 'Grace and mercy', in R.L. Brawley (ed.), *The Oxford encyclopedia of the Bible and ethics*, pp. 349–356, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Breytenbach, C., 2016, 'Taufe als räumliche Metapher in den Briefen des Paulus', in F. Horn & C. Breytenbach (eds.), *Spatial metaphors. Ancient texts and transformations*, pp. 127–143, Topoi, Berlin.

Breytenbach, C., 2019, 'Metaphor in argument: The Beelzebul-controversy in the Gospel according to Mark', *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 110(2), 133–145. https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2019-0010

Brown, C., 1978, 'ἀπαρχή', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp 415–417, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Brunner, E., 1947, *Revelation and reason: The Christian doctrine of faith and knowledge*, transl. O. Wyon, Student Christian Movement Press, London.

Bühner, J.S., 2011, 'καθίστημι', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 553–555, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Bultmann, R., 1910, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, *Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 13*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Bultmann, R., 1938, 'καυχάομαι', in F. Kittel (ed.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, vol. 3, pp. 646–653, Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart.

Bultmann, R., 1947, 'Glossen im Römerbrief', *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 72, 197–202.

Bultmann, R., 1951, *Theology of the New Testament*, transl. K. Grobel, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, NY.

Bultmann, R., 1966, 'θάνατος, θνῄσκω, ἀποθνῄσκω, συναποθνῄσκω', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 3, pp. 7–25, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Bultmann, R., 1968, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 6th edn., Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Busse, U., 2006, *Metaphorik und Rhetorik im Johannesevangelium: Das Bildfeld vom König*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 200*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Byrne, B.S.J., 1996, *Romans* (Sacra Pagina Series Volume 6), The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, PA.

Byrskog, S., 2015, 'Adam and Medea – Eve: Revisiting Romans 7, 7–25', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Paul's Graeco-Roman context*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, pp. 273–299, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Carter, T.L., 2002, *Paul and the power of Sin: Redefining 'beyond the pale'*, Society of New Testament Studies Monograph Series 115, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Cerfaux, L., 1951, *Le Christ dans la théologie de saint Paul*, *Lectio Divina 6*, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris.

Clarke, A.D., 1990, 'The good and the just in Romans 5:7', *Tyndale Bulletin* 41(1), 128–142.

Coenen, L., 1978, 'ἐγείρω', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 279–281, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Comfort, P.W., 1993, 'Futility', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 320–322, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Conzelmann, H. & Zimmerli, W., 1974, 'χαρίζομαι, χαριτόω, ἀχάριστος', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 9, pp. 372–415, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Cosby, M.R., 1991, 'Paul's persuasive language in Romans 5', in D.F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive artistry – Studies in New Testament rhetoric in honor of George A. Kennedy,* JSOT Supplement Series 50, pp. 209–226, JSOT Press, Sheffield.

Crafton, J.A., 1990, 'Paul's rhetorical vision and the purpose of Romans: Towards a new understanding', *Novum Testamentum* 32(4), 317–339. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853690X00133

Cranfield, C.E.B., 1975, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, *The International Critical Commentary Volume 1*, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.

Croasmun, M., 2014, 'Real participation', in M.J. Thate, K.J. Vanhoozer & C.R. Campbell (eds.), *'In Christ' in Paul*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 385*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Dahl, N.A., 1951, 'Two notes on Romans 5', *Studio Theologica* 5, 169–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/00393385108599711

Dahl, N.A., 1977, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the early Christian Mission*, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Danker, E.W., 1982, *Benefactor: Epigraphic study of a Graeco-Roman and New Testament semantic field*, Clayton Publishing House, St Louis, MO.

Deissmann, A., 1892, *Die Neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'*, N.G. Elwert, Marburg.

Delling, G., 1964, 'ἀποκαραδοκία', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 393–394, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Denney, J., 1900, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans (Expositor's Greek Testament Roman's Commentary)*, Hodder and Stoughton, London.

De Ste. Croix, G.E.M., 1980, *Class struggle in the Ancient Greek world: From the archaic age to the Arab conquests*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

Dibelius, M., 1909, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Di Biase-Dyson, C., 2016, 'Spatial metaphors as rhetorical figures: Case studies from wisdom texts of the Egyptian New Kingdom', in C. Breytenbach & F. Horn (eds.), *Spatial metaphors. Ancient texts and transformations, Berlin Studies of Ancient World 39*, pp. 45–68, Topoi, Berlin.

Dodson, J.R., 2008, *The 'powers' of personification – Rhetorical purpose in the Book of Wisdom and the letter to the Romans*, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche Band 161*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Dodson, J.R., 2010, 'The voices of scripture: Citations and personifications in Paul', *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 20(3), 419–432.

Dunn, J.M.G., 1975, 'Rom. 7, 14–25 in the theology of Paul', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 31, 257–273.

Dunn, J.M.G., 1988, *Romans 1–8 Volume 38a, Word Biblical Commentary*, Word Books, Dallas, TX.

Dunn, J.M.G., 1993, 'Romans', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 838–850, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Du Toit, A.B., 1979, 'Dikaiosyne in Röm 6 – Beobachtungen zur ethischen Dimension der paulinischen Gerechtigkeitauffassung ['Dikaiosyne in Rom 6 - observations on the ethical dimension of the Pauline conception of justice]', *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 76(3), 261–291. https://doi.org/10.4102/ve.v24i1.311

Du Toit, A.B., 2003, 'Forensic metaphors in Romans and their soteriological significance', *Verbum et Ecclesia* 24(1), 53–79.

Du Toit, A.B., 2007a, 'Hyperbolic contrasts: A neglected aspect of Paul's style', in C. Breytenbach & D.S. Du Toit (eds.), *Focusing on Paul – Persuasion and theological design in Romans and Galatians*, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche Band 151*, pp. 35–44, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Du Toit, A.B., 2007b, 'The centrality of grace in the theology of Paul', in C. Breytenbach & D.S. Du Toit (eds.), *Focusing on Paul – Persuasion and theological design in Romans and Galatians*, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche Band 151*, pp. 77–94, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Du Toit, A.B., 2007c, 'Vilification as a pragmatic device in early Christian epistolography', in C. Breytenbach & D.S. Du Toit (eds.) *Focusing on Paul – Persuasion and theological design in Romans and Galatians*, *Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche Band 151*, pp. 45–56, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Du Toit, A.B., 2009, 'Paulus Oecumenicus: Interculturality in the shaping of Paul's theology', *New Testament Studies* 55(2), 121–143.

Ebel, G., 1978, 'Walk (περιπατέω)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 943–947, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Egg, M., 2016, 'Spatial metaphor in Pauline epistles', in C. Breytenbach & F. Horn (eds.), *Spatial metaphors: Ancient texts and transformations*, *Berlin Studies of Ancient World 39*, pp. 103–126, Topoi, Berlin.

Ehrensperger, K., 2012, 'Speaking Greek under Rome: Paul, the power of language and the language of power', *Neotestementica* 46(1), 9–28.

Eichler, J., 1978, 'Think, mean, consider, reckon (λογίζομαι)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 822–826, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Elliott, N., 2010, *The arrogance of the nations: Reading Romans in the shadow of Empire*, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Engberg-Pedersen, T., 2008, 'Gift-giving and friendship: Seneca and Paul in Romans 1–8 on the logic of God's χάρις and its human response', *Harvard Theological Review* 101(1), 15–44. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816008001715

Engberg-Pedersen, T., 2010, *Cosmology and the Self in the Apostle Paul – The material spirit*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Eschner, C., 2009, 'Die Hingabe des einziges Sohnes "für" uns alle', in U. Schnelle (ed.), *The letter to the Romans, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CCXXVI*, pp. 659–678, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Eschner, C., 2010a, *Gestorben und hingegeben 'für' die Sünder – Die griechische Konzeption des Unheil abwendenden Sterbens und deren paulinische Aufnahme für die Deutung des Todes Jesu Christi. Band 1: Auslegung der paulinischen Formulierungen, Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 122*, Neukirchener Verlag, Göttingen.

Eschner, C., 2010b, *Gestorben und hingegeben 'für' die Sünder – Die griechische Konzeption des Unheil abwendenden Sterbens und deren paulinische Aufnahme für die Deutung des Todes Jesu Christi*. *Band 2: Darstellung und Auswertung des griechischen Quellenbefunden*, *Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 122*, Neukirchener Verlag, Göttingen.

Esser, H.H., 1976, 'Law (Νόμος)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 2, pp. 436–451, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Eubanks, P., 1999, 'The story of conceptual metaphor: What motivates metaphoric mappings?', *Poetics Today* 20(3), 419–442.

Everts, J.M., 1993, 'Hope', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 415–417, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Fatehi, M., 2000, *The Spirit's relation to the risen Lord in Paul – An examination of its Christological implications*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 128*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Fee, G.D., 1993, 'Gifts of the spirit', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 339–347, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Fee, G.D., 1994, *God's empowering presence – The Holy Spirit in the letters of Paul*, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Fitzmyer, J.A., 1993, *Romans (The Anchor Bible vol. 33)*, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Fitzmyer, J.A., 2011, 'κύριος', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 812–820, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Fludernik, M., Freeman, D.C. & Freeman, M.H., 1999, 'Metaphor and beyond: An introduction', *Poetics Today* 20(3), 383–396.

Foerster, W., 1964a, 'κτίζω, κτίσις, κτίσμα, κτίστης', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 3, pp. 1001–1035, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Foerster, W., 1964b, 'κύριος, κυρία, κυριακός, κυριότης, κυριεύω, κατακυριεύω', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 3, pp. 1040–1058, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Forbes, C., 1986, 'Comparison, self-praise and irony: Paul's boasting and the conventions of Hellenistic rhetoric', *New Testament Studies* 32(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500013485

Frey, J., 1999, 'Die paulinische Antithese von Fleisch und Geist und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition [The Pauline antithesis of flesh and spirit and the Palestinian-Jewish tradition of wisdom]', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51, 45–77. https://doi.org/10.1515/zntw.1999.90.1-2.45

Frick, P., 2007, 'The means and modes of salvation: A hermeneutical proposal for clarifying Pauline soteriology', *Horizons in Biblical Theology* 29(2), 203–222. https://doi.org/10.1163/187122007X244093

Friedrich, G., 2011, 'ἀδύνατος', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 80–82, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Gaffin, R.B., 1993, 'Glory, glorification', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 348–350, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Gagnon, R.A.J., 1993, 'Heart of wax and teaching that stamps: τυπον διδαχης (Rom 17b) once more', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 112(4), 667–687. https://doi.org/10.2307/3267403

Garlington, D.B., 1993, 'The obedience of faith in the letter to the Romans', *Westminster Theological Journal* 55, 87–112.

Gathercole, S.J., 2001, 'After the new perspective: Works, justification and boasting in early Judaism and Romans 1–5', *Tyndale Bulletin* 52(2), 303–306.

Gaventa, B., 2004, 'The cosmic power of Sin in Paul's letter to the Romans: Toward a widescreen edition', *Interpretation* 58(3), 229–240. https://doi.org/10.1177/002096430405800302

Gaventa, B., 2007, 'Interpreting the death of Jesus apocalyptically: Reconsidering Romans 8:32', in T.D. Still (ed.), *Jesus and Paul reconnected: Fresh pathways into an old debate*, pp. 125–145, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Gaventa, B., 2011, 'Neither height nor depth: Discerning the cosmology of Romans', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 64(3), 265–278. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930611000111

Gaventa, B., 2013, 'The rhetoric of violence and the God of peace in Paul's letter to the Romans', in J. Krans, L.J. Lietaert Peerbolte, P. Smit & A.W. Zwiep (eds.), *Paul, John and apocalyptic eschatology*, *Novum Testamentum Supplements 149*, pp. 61–75, Brill, Leiden.

Gerber, C., 2014, 'Onesimus, der Nützliche. Sklaverei in der Welt des Paulus [Onesimus, the useful one. Slavery in Paul's world]', *Colloquium Paulinum Oecumenicum* (Unpublished).

Gerber, C., 2015, 'Καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, οὐ συμφέρον μέν ... (2 Kor 12,1): Selbstlob bei Paulus vor dem Hintergrund der antiken Gepflogenheiten', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Paul's Graeco-Roman context*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, pp. 213–251, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Gillmann, F.M., 1987, 'Another look at Rom 8:3: "In the likeness of sinful flesh"', *Catholic Biblical Quarter* 49(4), 597–604.

Goff, M., 2013, *4QInstruction: Wisdom literature in the ancient world, number 2*, Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, GA.

Goodrich, J.K., 2013, 'Sold under Sin: Echoes of exile in Romans 7:14–25', *New Testament Studies* 59(4), 476–495. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688513000180

Gräbe, P.J., 2000, *The power of God in Paul's letters, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 123* Reihe 267, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Green, J.B., 1993, 'Crucifixion', in G.F. Hawthorne & R.P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 197–199, Intervarsity Press, Downers Grove, IL.

Greijdanus, S., 1933, *De Brief van den Apostel Paulus aan de gemeente te Rome I*, Commentaar op *het Nieuwe Testament*, Van Bottenburg, Amsterdam.

Günther, W., 1978, 'Sin (ἁμαρτία)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 577–587, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Gupta, N.K., 2009, 'Towards a set of principles for identifying and interpreting metaphors in Paul: προσαγωγη (Romans 5:2) as a test case', *Restoration Quarterly* 51(3), 169–181.

Haacker, K., 1999, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, *Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 6*, Evangelische Verlagsanhalt, Leipzig.

Hahn, F., 2011, 'Χριστός', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 1147–1166, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Harnack, A., 1905, *Militia Christi: Die Christliche Religion und der Soldatenstand in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Harrill, J.A., 2012, *Paul the apostle – His life and legacy in their Roman context*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Harrison, J.R., 1999, 'Paul, eschatology and the Augustan age of grace', *Tyndale Bulletin* 50(1), 79–91. https://doi.org/10.1163/004810010X12547950424328

Harrison, J.R., 2003, *Paul's language of grace in its Graeco-Roman context*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 172*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Harrison, J.R., 2009, 'Paul and the Roman ideal of glory', in U. Schnelle (ed.), *The letter to the Romans, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CCXXVI*, pp. 229–369, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Harrison, J.R., 2010, 'The brothers as the "Glory of Christ" (2 Cor 8:23) Paul's doxa terminology in its ancient benefaction context', *Novum Testamentum* 52(2), 156–188. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816012000296

Harrison, J.R., 2013a, 'Augustan Rome and the body of Christ: A comparison of the social vision of the *Res Gestae* and Paul's letter to the Romans', *Harvard Theological Review* 106(1), 1–36. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017816012000296

Harrison, J.R., 2013b, 'Paul and the "social relations" of death at Rome', in S.E. Porter & C.D. Land (eds.), *Paul and his social relations, Pauline Studies Volume 7*, pp. 85–124, Brill, Leiden.

Harrisville, R.A., 1980, *Romans*, *Augsburg commentary on the New Testament*, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Hauck, F., 1966, 'ἀκάθαρτος, ἀκαθαρσία', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 3, pp. 427–429, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Hawthorne, G.F., 1993, 'Marriage and divorce, adultery and incest', in G.F. Hawthorne & R.P. Martin (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 594–601, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Hawthorne, G.F. & Martin, R.P. (eds.), 1993, *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Haynes, I., 1999, 'Military service and cultural identity in the *auxilia*', *Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary* 34, 165–174.

Heidland, H.W., 1967, 'ὀψώνιον', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 5, pp. 591–592, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Hekster, O., Claes, L., Slootjes, D., Manders, E., De Haan, N. & Klaassen., Y., 2014, 'Nero's ancestry and the construction of imperial ideology in the early Empire: A case study', *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 1(4), 7–27. https://doi.org/10.14795/j.v1i4.77

Hendriksen, W., 1980, *Romans 1–8*, The Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh.

Hengel, M. & Markschies, C., 1989, *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the first century after Christ*, SCM Press, London.

Holland, G., 1992, 'Paul's root metaphors: Slavery', *Proceedings of the Eastern Great Lakes and Midwestern Biblical Societies* 12, 185–194.

Horn, F., 2016, 'Introduction: Space and metaphor', in F. Horn & C. Breytenbach (eds.), *Spatial metaphors: Ancient texts and transformations*, pp. 9–20, Topoi, Berlin.

Horst, J., 1967, 'μέλος', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 4, pp. 555–568, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Hoskins Walbank, M.E., 2010, 'Image and cult: The coinage of the Roman Corinth', in S.J. Friesen, D.N. Schowalter & J.C. Walters (eds.), *Corinth in context – Comparative studies on religion and society, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 134,* pp. 151–197, Brill, Leiden.

Hübner, H., 1978, *Law in Paul's thought – A contribution to the development of Pauline theology*, transl. J.C.G. Greig, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.

Hultgren, A.J., 2011, *Paul's letter to the Romans*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Iosif, D., 2006, 'New Testament teachings and readings on the legitimacy of warfare', *Historein* 6, 7–19. https://doi.org/10.12681/historein.56

Jarrard, J.L., 1993, 'Romans 5:6–11: While we were sinners', *Review and Expositor* 90, 123–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/003463739309000109

Jewett, R, 1971, *Paul's anthropological terms: A study of their use in conflict settings*, Brill, Leiden.

Jewett, R., 2007, *Romans*, Augsburg Fortress Press, Minneapolis, MN.

Johnson, L.T., 1997, *Reading Romans – A literary and theological commentary*, Crossroad Publishing Company, New York, NY.

Johnson, M., 1990, *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination, and reason*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Joubert, S., 2000, *Paul as benefactor – Reciprocity, strategy and theological reflection in Paul's collection*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 124*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Joubert, S., 2005, 'ΧΑΡΙΣ in Paul', in J.G. Van der Watt (ed.), *Salvation in the New Testament – Perspectives on soteriology*, pp. 187–212, Brill, Leiden.

Karrer, M., 1991, *Der Gesalbte: die Grundlagen des Christustitels*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Käsemann, E., 1969, *Perspectives on Paul*, transl. M. Kohl, SCM Press, London.

Käsemann, E., 1978, *An die Römer – Kommentar zum Paulusbrief*, Evangelische Verlagsanhalt, Berlin.

Keazirian, E.M., 2014, *Peace and peacemaking in Paul and the Greco-Roman world, studies in Biblical Literature 145,* Peter Lang, New York, NY.

Kelly, C., 2006, *Roman Empire – A very short introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Kennedy, G.A., 1984, *New Testament interpretation through rhetorical criticism*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Kidwell, R.B., 2012, 'The Adamic backdrop of Romans', PhD thesis, Asbury Theological Seminary, Wilmore, KY.

Kim, S., 2008, *Christ and Caesar – The Gospel and the Roman Empire in the writings of Paul and Luke*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kirk, J.R.D., 2007, 'Reconsidering dikaioma in Romans 5:16', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126(4), 787–792. https://doi.org/10.2307/27638468

Kittel, G., 1964, 'αἰχμαλωτίζω', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 195–197, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kleinknecht, H., 1967, 'νόμος', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 4, pp. 1023–1035, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kövecses, Z., 2005, *Metaphor in culture – Universality and variation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Kövecses, Z., 2010, *Metaphor – A practical introduction*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Krentz, E., 2000, 'Meeting Paul anew: Rereading an old friend in a new age', *Journal of Theology* 39(4), 267–283. https://doi.org/10.1111/0012-2033.00045

Krentz, E., 2003, 'Paul, games, and the military', in J.P. Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman world: A handbook*, pp. 344–383, Trinity Press International, Harrisburg.

Kruse, C.G., 2012, *Paul's letter to the Romans*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kuhn, K.G., 1967, 'New light on temptation, sin and flesh in the New Testament', in K. Stendahl (ed.), *Scrolls and the New Testament*, pp. 94–113, Harper & Row, New York, NY.

Kuhn, K.G., 1968, 'ὅπλον', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 5, pp. 292–294, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Kümmel, W.G., 1929, *Römer 7 und die Bekehrung des Paulus*, *Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 17*, J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig.

Kuss, O., 1957, *Der Römerbrief: Erste Lieferung (Röm 1,1 bis 6,11)*, Verlag Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg.

Laato, T., 1995, *Paul and Judaism: An anthropological approach, studies in the history of Judaism 115*, transl. T. McElwain, Scholars Press, Atlanta, GA.

Lagrange, P.M.J., 1950, *Saint Paul épitre aux Romains*, Librairie Lecoffre J. Gabalda et Cie, Paris.

Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M., 1980, *Metaphors we live by*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Lakoff, G. & Turner, M., 1989, *More than cool reason – A field guide to poetic metaphor*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Lampe, G.W.H., 1964, 'The New Testament doctrine of "Ktisis"', *Scottish Journal of Theology* 17(4), 449–462. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0036930600023097

Lavery, G.B., 1980, 'Metaphors of war and travel in Seneca's prose works', *Greece & Rome* 27(2), 147–157. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383500025821

Larsson, E., 2011, 'ἔχω', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 238–242, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Lee, J.H., 2010, *Paul's gospel in Romans – A discourse analysis of Rom 1:16–8:39*, Brill, Leiden.

Légasse, S., 2002, *L'épître de Paul aux Romains, Lectio Divina Commentaires 10*, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris.

Liddell, H.G., Scott, R. & Jones, H.S., 1996, *A Greek–English lexicon*, 9th edn., Clarendon Press, Oxford.

Link, H.G., 1978, 'Weakness (ἀσθένεια)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 993–1000, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Link, H.G. & Tuente, R., 1978, 'Slave (αἰχμάλωτος)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 279–281, 590–591, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Livingstone, E.A. (ed.), 1997, *The Oxford dictionary of the Christian Church*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lohse, E., 2003, *Der Brief an die Römer, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Longenecker, R.N., 2014, 'The metaphor of adoption in Paul's letters', *The Covenant Quarterly* 72(3–4), 71–78.

Longenecker, R.N., 2016, *The Epistle to the Romans – A commentary in the Greek text*, *The New International Greek Testament Commentary*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Louw, J.P. & Nida, E.A. (eds.), 1988, *The Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament based on semantic domains*, United Bible Societies, New York, NY.

Lowe, B.A., 2013, 'Paul, patronage and benefaction', in S.E. Porter & C.D. Land (eds.), *Paul and his social relations, (Pauline Studies Volume 7)*, pp. 57–84, Brill, Leiden.

Lowe, C., 1999, 'There is no condemnation (Rom 8:1), but why not?', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 42(2), 231–250.

Lücke, F., 1829, 'Apokalyptische Studien und Kritiken [Apocalyptic Studies and Reviews]', *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 2(1–2), 285–320.

Lüdemann, H., 1872, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus und ihre Stellung innerhalb seiner Heilslehre*, Universitäts-Buchhandlung (Paul Toeche), Kiel.

Luter, A.B., 1993, 'Grace', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 372–374, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Lyall, F., 1970–1971, 'Roman Law in the writings of Paul – The slave and the freedman', *New Testament Studies* 17(1), 73–79. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500014922

Malan, F.S., 1981, 'Bound to do right', *Neotestamentica* 15(1), 118–138.

Malherbe, A.J., 1973, 'Ancient epistolary theory', *Ohio Journal of Religious Studies* 5(2), 3–77.

Malherbe, A.J., 1989, *Paul and the popular philosophers*, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Malherbe, A.J., 2000, *The letters to the Thessalonians, (The Anchor Bible Volume 32B)*, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Malherbe, A.J., 2008, *The letters to the Thessalonians: A new translation with introduction and commentary*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Malherbe, A.J., 2014, 'Μὴ γένοιτο in the diatribe and Paul', in C.R. Holladay, J.T. Fitzgerald, G.E. Sterling & J.W. Thompson (eds.), *Light from the gentiles: Hellenistic philosophy and early Christianity: Collected essays by Abraham J. Malherbe 1959–2012, Volume 1, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 150*, pp. 107–115, Brill, Leiden.

Marquette, S., 2007, 'Metaphors we lie by: Cognitive blending in the poetry of Elena Shvarts', *The Slavic and East European Journal* 51(4), 693–715. https://doi.org/10.2307/20459569

Marrou, H.I., 1956, *A history of education in antiquity*, Sheed and Ward, London.

Martin, D.B., 1990, *Slavery as salvation: The metaphor of slavery in Pauline Christianity*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Martin, R.P., 1992, 'Gifts, spiritual', in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2, pp. 1015–1018, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Martin, T.W., 2002, 'The good as God (Romans 5:7)', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 25(1), 59–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X0202500103

Mayer, B., 2011, 'ἐλλογέω', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), Exegetisches Wörterbuch *zum Neuen Testament*, p. 1066, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

McFadden, K.W., 2009, 'The fulfilment of the Law's δικαίωμα: Another look at Rom 1–4', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 53(3), 483–497.

Meecham, H.G., 1935, *The letter of Aristeas – A linguistic study with special reference to the Greek Bible*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.

Michaelis, W., 1968, 'Πάθημα', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 5, pp. 904–939, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Michel, O., 1966, *Der Brief an die Römer, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar unter das Neue Testament Band IV – 14 Auflage*, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Michel, O., 1978, 'Son', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 3, pp. 634–648, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Millis, B.W., 2010, 'The social and ethnic origins of the colonists in early Roman Corinth', in S.J. Friesen, D.N. Schowalter & J.C. Walters (eds.), *Corinth in context – Comparative studies on religion and society*, *supplements to Novum Testamentum 134*, pp. 13–35, Brill, Leiden.

Moo, D.J., 1996, *The epistle to the Romans: The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Moran, R., 1996, 'Artifice and persuasion: The work of metaphor in the rhetoric', in A. Oksenberg (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's rhetoric*, pp. 385–398, University of California Press, Berkeley, CA.

Morris, L., 1988, *The epistle to the Romans*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Morris, L., 1993a, 'Faith', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 285–291, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Morris, L., 1993b, 'Sin, guilt', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 877–881, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Morris, M.J., 2012, 'Fruits of infertility: Paul and the rhetoric of a fertile Empire', *Wesleyan Theological Journal* 47(1), 107–115.

Moule, C.F.D., 1953, *An idiom book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Moulton, J.H., 1963, *A grammar of New Testament Greek: Sintax,* vol. III, T&T Clark, Edinburgh.

Mounce, R.H., 1995, *Romans*, *The New American Commentary – An exegetical and theological exposition of holy scripture,* NIV Text, vol. 27*,* Broadman & Holman Publishers, Nashville, TN.

Mussies, G., 1983, 'Greek as the vehicle of early Christianity', *New Testament Studies* 29, 356–369. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500006056

Nasrallah, L.S., 2010, 'You were bought with a price', in S.J. Friesen, D.N. Schowalter & J.C. Walters (eds.), *Corinth in context – Comparative studies on religion and society*, *supplements to Novum Testamentum 134*, pp. 54–73, Brill, Leiden.

Nasrallah, L.S., 2012, 'Spatial perspectives: Space and archaeology in Roman Philippi', in J.A. Marchal (ed.), *Studying Paul's letters: Contemporary perspectives and methods*, pp. 53–74, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Neschke, A.B., 1998, 'Gerechtigkeit/Recht', in H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 4, pp. 951–953, J.B. Metzler Verlag, Stuttgart.

Nestle, E., Aland, K., Aland, B., Karavidopoulos, J., Martini, C.M. & Metzger, B.M., 2012, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th edn., Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart.

Newton, C.T., 1863, *A history of discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus, and Branchidae*, vol. 2., part 2, no. 81, pp. 725–727, Day & Son, London.

Nolland, J., 1986, 'Grace as power', *Novum Testamentum* XXVIII(1), 26–31. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853686X00066

Nongbri, B., 2013, *Before religion – A history of a modern concept*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Obadia, L., 2015, 'Spatial turn, beyond geography: A new agenda for sciences of religion?', *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* 25(2), 200–217. https://doi.org/10.1080/03906701.2015.1039269

Oepke, A., 1964a, 'διά', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 2, pp. 65–70, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Oepke, A., 1964b, 'εἰς', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 2, pp. 420–433, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Oepke, A., 1964c, 'ἐγείρω', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 2, pp. 333–338, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Ogereau, J., 2012, 'The Jerusalem collection as Koivωνία: Paul's global politics of socio-economic equality and solidarity', *New Testament Studies* 58(3), 360–378. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688512000033

Onesti, K.I. & Brauch, M.T., 1993, 'Righteousness, righteousness of God', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 827–837, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Oswald, S. & Rihs, A., 2014, 'Metaphor as argument: Rhetorical and epistemic advantages of extended metaphors', *Argumentation* 28(2), 133–159. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10503-013-9304-0

Paige, T., 1993, 'Holy Spirit', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 679–982, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Painter, J., 1993, 'World, cosmology', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 404–413, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Peachin, M., 2006, 'Rome the super power 96–235 CE', in D.S. Porter (ed.), *The Blackwell companion to the Roman Empire*, pp. 126–153, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Peterson, D.G., 2017, *Commentary on Romans (Biblical Theology for Christian Proclamation)*, B&H Publishing, Nashville, TN.

Pitta, A., 2015, 'The poetics of Aristotle and the hermeneutics of Rom 7,7–25: Towards a new interpretation?', in C. Breytenbach (ed.), *Paul's Graeco-Roman context*, *Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium*, pp. 301–329, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Pollard, N., 2006, 'The Roman army', in D.S. Porter (ed.), *The Blackwell companion to the Roman Empire*, pp. 206–227, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Popkes, W., 2011, 'παραδίδωμι', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), Exegetisches *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 42–48, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Porter, S.E., 1992, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, JSOT Press, Sheffield.

Porter, S.E., 1993, 'Peace, reconciliation', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 695–699, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Porter, S.E., 2001, 'Paul of Tarsus and his letters', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of classical rhetoric in the Hellenistic period 330 B.C.–AD 400*, pp. 533–587, Brill, Leiden.

Porter, S.E., 2011, 'Paul confronts Caesar with the Good News', in S.E. Porter & C.L. Westfall (eds.), *Empire in the New Testament*, pp. 164–196, Pickwick Publications, Eugene, OR.

Porter, S.E., 2013, 'Not only that (οὐ μόνον δέ) but it has been said before: A response to Verlyn Verbrugge, or why reading previous scholarship can avoid certain misunderstandings', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 56(3), 577–583.

Pragglejaz Group, 2007, 'MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse', *Metaphor and Symbol* 22(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752

Punt, J., 2005, 'Paul, body theology, and morality: Parameters for a discussion', *Neotestamentica* 39(2), 359–388.

Punt, J., 2016, 'Paul, military imagery and social disadvantage', *Acta Theologica* 36(Suppl. 23), 201–224. https://doi.org/10.4314/actat.v23i1S.10

Raafland, K., 1998, 'Freiheit', in H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 4, pp. 650–652, J.B. Metzler, Stuttgart.

Radl, W., 2011, 'ὑπομονή', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 969–971, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Raible, W., 2016, 'Metaphors as models of thinking', in F. Horn & C. Breytenbach (eds.), *Spatial metaphors: Ancient texts and transformations,* Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 39, pp. 21–43, Topoi, Berlin.

Räisänen, H., 1980, 'Das "Gesetz des Gaubens" (Röm 3:27) und das "Gesetz des Geistes" (Röm 8:2) [`The" law of believing "(Rom 3:27) and the" law of the Spirit "(Rom 8: 2)]', *New Testament Studies* 26(2), 101–117. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500008699

Räisänen, H., 1987, *Paul and the Law*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 29*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Rankov, B., 2007, 'Military forces', in P. Sabin, H. Van Wees & M. Whitby (eds.), *The Cambridge history of Greek and Roman warfare, Volume I: Greece, the Hellenistic world and the rise of Rome*, pp. 30–75, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Reasoner, M., 1993, 'Rome and Roman Christianity', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 850–855, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Reid, D.G., 1993, 'Principalities and powers', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 746–752, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Richards, I.A., 1936, *The philosophy of rhetoric*, University Press, New York, NY.

Ricoeur, P., 1977, *The rule of metaphor: Multi-disciplinary studies of the creation of meaning in language*, transl. R. Czerny, K. McLaughlin & J. Costello, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, ON.

Rohrer, T., 2007, 'Embodiment and experientialism', in D. Geeraerts & H. Cuyckens (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of cognitive linguistics*, pp. 25–47, Oxford Publishers, Oxford.

Röhser, G., 2012, 'Paulus und die Herrschaft die Sünde [Paul and the rulership of sin]', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 103, 84–110. https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2012-0005

Runge, S.E., 2010, *Discourse grammar of the Greek New Testament – A practical introduction for teaching and exegesis,* Lexham Bible Reference Series, Hendrickson Publishers, Peabody, MA.

Rüpke, J., 2001, *Die Religion der Römer – Eine Einführung*, Verlag C.H. Beck, München.

Rupprecht, A.A., 1993, 'Slave, slavery', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 881–883, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Sabou, S., 2004, 'A note on Romans 6:5: The representation (ομοίωμα) of his death', *Tyndale Bulletin* 55(2), 219–229.

Sacks, D. & Brody, L.R., 2005, 'Rome', in D. Sacks & L.R. Brody (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Ancient Greek world*, pp. 295–296, Facts on File, New York, NY.

Sanday, W. & Headlam, D.D., 1960, *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (The International Critical Commentary Volume 36), T&T Clark, Edinburgh.

Scheidel, W., 2011, 'Roman slave supply', in K. Bradley & P. Cartledge (eds.), *The Cambridge world history of slavery: The ancient Mediterranean world*, pp. 287–310, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Schellenberg, R.S., 2014, 'Does Paul call Adam a "type" of Christ? – An exegetical note on Rom 5:14', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 105(1), 54–63. https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2014-0003

Schlier, H., 1964, 'ἐλεύθερος, ἐλευθερόω, ἐλευθερια, ἀπελεύθερος', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 487–502, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schlier, H., 1977, *Der Römerbrief. (Herdes Theologischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament Band VI)*, Herder, Freiburg.

Schmidt, K.L., 1964, 'βασιλεύω', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 564–593, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schmithals, W., 1975, 'Death (θάνατος)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 1, pp. 430–441, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schmitt, M.K., 2014, 'Peace and wrath in Paul's Epistle to the Romans', *The Conrad Grebel Review* 32(1), 67–79.

Schneider, G., 2011, 'περισσεύω', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 180–183, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Schneider, J., 1968, 'παράβασις', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 5, pp. 739–740, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schnelle, U., 1996, *The human condition – Anthropology in the teachings of Jesus, Paul, and John,* transl. O.C. Dean Jr., Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Schnelle, U., 2003, *Paulus – Leben und Denken*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

Schottroff, L., 1979, 'Die Schreckensherrschaft der Sünde und die Befreiung durch Christus nach dem Römerbrief des Paulus [The reign of terror of sin and the liberation through Christ according to the letter to the Romans of Paul]', *Evangelische Theologie* 39(1–6), 497–510. https://doi.org/10.14315/evth-1979-1-636

Schrenk, G., 1964, 'ἐντέλλομαι, ἐντολή', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 2, pp. 544–555, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schröter, J., 2013, 'Der Mensch zwischen Wollen und Tun Paulus – Erwägungen zu Römer 7 im Licht der "New perspective on Paul"', in P. Klumbies & D.S. Du Toit (eds.), *Werk und Wirkung. Festschrift für Andreas Lindemann zum 70. Geburtstag*, pp. 195–223, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Schwarz-Friesel, M., 2015, 'Metaphern und ihr persuasives Inferenzpotenzial. Konzeptualisierungen des islamistischen Terrorismus nach 9/11 im massenmedialen Diskurs', in C. Spieß & K. Köpcke (eds.), *Metapher und metonymie: Theoretische, methodische und empirische Zugänge*, pp.143–160, de Gruyter, Berlin.

Schweizer, E., 1971a, 'σῶμα', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 7, pp. 1024–1094, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Schweizer, E., 1971b, 'σάρξ, σαρκικός, σάρκινος', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 7, pp. 98–151, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Scott, J.J., 1993, 'Life and death', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 553–555, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Semino, E., 2008, *Metaphor in discourse*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Shaw, D.A., 2013, 'Apocalyptic and covenant: Perspectives on Paul, or antinomies at war?', *Journal of the Study of New Testament* 36(2), 155–177. https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X13506168

Shogren, G.S., 1992, 'Grace', in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol. 2, pp. 1086–1088, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Smyth, H.W., 1956, *Greek grammar*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Snyman, A., 2016, 'Persuasion in Romans 5:12–21', *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 72(3), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i3.3076

Sopory, P. & Dillard, J.P., 2002, 'The persuasive effects of metaphor, a meta-analysis', *Human Communication Research* 28(3), 382–419. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.2002.tb00813.x

Southall, D.J., 2008, *Rediscovering righteousness in Romans – Personified dikaiosyné within metaphoric and narrational settings*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 240*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Spicq, C., 1994a, 'ἀγάπη', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 8–22, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994b, 'ἀδύνατον', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 35–38, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994c, 'ἅπαξ, ἐφάπαξ', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 139–142, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994d, 'βασιλεία, βασίλειος, βασιλεύς, βασιλεύω, βασιλικός, βασίλισσα', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 256–271, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994e, 'δοκιμάζω, δοκιμασία, δοκιμή, δοκίμιον, δόκιμος, ἀδόκιμος', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 353–361, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994f, 'δόξα, δοξάζω, συνδοξάζω', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 362–379, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994g, 'δοῦλος, οἰκέτης, οἰκεῖος, μίσθιος, μισθωτός', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 380–386, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994h, 'ἅπαξ, ἐφάπαξ', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 139–142, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994i, 'εἰρηνεύω, εἰρήνη, εἰρηνικός, εἰρηνοποιέω, εἰρηνοποιός', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 424–438, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994j, 'ἐλπίζω, ἐλπίς', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 1, pp. 480–492, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994k, 'ἐντολή', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 2, pp. 11–13, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994l, 'καυχάομαι, καύχημα, καύχησις', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 2, pp. 295–302, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994m, 'κύριος', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 2, pp. 341–352, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994n, 'ὀψώνιον', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 2, pp. 600–603, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994o, 'παραδίδωμι', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 13–23, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994p, 'παρακοή', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 28–29, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994q, 'πίστις', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 110–116, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994r, 'σάρξ, σαρκικός, σάρκινος', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 231–241, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994s, 'σῴζω, σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριος', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 344–357, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994t, 'τύπος,' in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 384–387, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994u, 'ὑπομονή', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 414–420, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994v, 'ὑποτάσσω', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp. 424–426, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spicq, C., 1994w, 'Χάρις', in *Theological lexicon of the New Testament*, transl. J.D. Ernest, vol. 3, pp.500–506, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Spitaler, P., 2006, 'Analogical reasoning in Romans 7:2–4: A woman and the believers in Rome', *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125(4), 715–747. https://doi.org/10.2307/27638402

Stählin, G. & Grundmann, W., 1964, 'ἁμαρτάνω, ἁμάρτημα, ἁμαρτία', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 267–316, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MA.

Stauffer, E., 1964, 'εἷς', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 2, pp. 434–442, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Steen, G.J., 2007, *Finding metaphor in grammar and usage*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

Steen, G.J., Dorst, A.G., Herrmann, J.B., Kaal, A.A., Krennmayr, T. & Pasma, T., 2010, *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Stowers, S.K., 1981, *The diatribe and Paul's letter to the Romans*, Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 57, Scholars Press, CA.

Stowers, S.K., 1994, *A rereading of Romans – Justice, Jews and gentiles*, Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Stowers, S.K., 1995, 'Romans 7:7–25 as speech in character (προσωποποιία)', in T. Engberg-Pedersen (ed.), *Paul in his Hellenistic context*, pp. 180–202, Augsburg Fortress, Minneapolis, MN.

Stuhlmacher, P., 1998, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Das Neue Testament Deutch Band 6), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen.

Talbert, C.H., 2003, 'Tracing Paul's train of thought in Romans 6–8', *Review and Expositor* 100(2), 53–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/003463730310000104

Tataranni, F., 2013, 'Hope and leadership in Ancient Rome', *Teoria Rivista di filosofia fondata da Vittorio Sainati* XXXIII(2), 65–78.

Thate, M.J., 2014, 'Paul, Φρόνησις, and participation – The shape of space and the reconfiguration of place in Paul's letter to the Philippians', in M.J. Thate, K.J. Vanhoozer & C.R. Campbell (eds.), *'In Christ' in Paul: Explorations in Paul's theology of union and participation*,

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 384, pp. 281–327, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Theobald, M., 1982, *Die überströmende Gnade: Studien zu einem paulinische Motivfeld, Forschung zur Bibel 22*, Echter, Würzburg.

Tiedtke, E. & Link, H.G., 1975, 'Empty (κενός)', in C. Brown (ed.), *New international dictionary of New Testament theology*, vol. 1, pp. 546–548, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, MI.

Tolmie, F., 2005, *Persuading the Galatians: A text-centred rhetorical analysis of a Pauline letter, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 190,* Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Van Bruggen, J.H., 2006, *Romeinen, Commentaar op het Nieuwe Testament*, Uitgeversmij Kok, Kampen.

Van Dijk, T.A., 2008, *Discourse and context – A socio-cognitive approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Van Kooten, G.H., 2003, *Cosmic Christology in Paul and the Pauline School (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2 Reihe 171)*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Van Leeuwen, J.A.C. & Jacobs, D., 1974, *De brief aan de Romeinen, Korte Verklaring der Heilige Schrift met nieuwe vertaling*, Uitgeversmij Kok, Kampen.

Van Soden, H., 1964, 'ἀδελφός', in G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (eds.), *Theological dictionary of the New Testament*, transl. G.W. Bromiley, vol. 1, pp. 144–146, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Venter, D., 2014a, 'Romans 8:3–4 and God's resolution of the threefold problems of sin, the incapability of the law and the weakness of the flesh', *In Luce Verbi* 48(1), a1687. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v48i1.1687

Venter, D., 2014b, 'The requirement of the law fulfilled in Romans 8:4', *In Luce Verbi* 48(1), a1688. https://doi.org/10.4102/ids.v48i1.1688

Venter, D., 2015, 'Die Gees (πνεῦμα) en vrede (εἰρήνη) met God teenoor die Vlees (σάρξ) en vyandskap (ἔχθρα) met God in Romeine 8:6–8', *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 71(1), a2993. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v71i1.2993

Verbrugge, V.D., 2011, 'The grammatical internal evidence for Ἔχομεν in Romans 5:1', *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 54(3), 559–572.

Von Lips, H., 1985, 'Der Apostolat des Paulus – ein Charisma? Semantische Aspekte zu χάρις–χάρισμα und anderen Wortpaaren im Sprachgebrauch des Paulus [The Apostolate Paul - a charism? Semantic aspects of χάρις – χάρισμα and other word pairs in Paul's usage]', *Biblica* 66(3), 305–343.

Vorster, J.N., 1997, 'The body as strategy of power in religious discourse', *Neotestamentica* 31(2), 389–411.

Vorster, J.N., 2002, 'Bodily parts vying for power: Hierarchies and bodies in early Christianity', *Scriptura* 80(1), 287–306. https://doi.org/10.7833/80-0-762

Vorster, J.N., 2005, 'Reflecting on Rethoric(s) of body politics and religious discourse', *Scriptura* 90(3), 575–594. https://doi.org/10.7833/90-0-1050

Vorster, J.N., 2009, 'Rhetorical criticism', in A. Du Toit (ed.), *Focusing on the message – New Testament hermeneutics, exegesis and methods*, pp. 505–578, Protea Boekhandel, Pretoria.

Wagner-Hasel, B., 1998, 'Geschenke', in H. Cancik & H. Schneider (eds.), *Der Neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike*, vol. 4, pp. 984–988, J.B. Metzler, Stuttgart.

Wallace, H.N., 1992, 'Adam', in D.N. Freedman (ed.), *The Anchor Bible dictionary*, vol. 1, pp. 62–64, Doubleday, New York, NY.

Wasserman, E., 2008a, 'Paul among the philosophers: The case of Sin in Romans 6–8', *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30(4), 387–415. https://doi.org/10.1177/0142064X08091441

Wasserman, E., 2008b, *The death of the soul in Romans 7: Sin, death and the law in light of Hellenistic Moral psychology*, *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2 Reihe 256*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Watson, D.F., 1993, 'Diatribe', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 213–214, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Wedderburn, A.J.M., 1983, 'Hellenistic Christian traditions in Romans 6?', *New Testament Studies* 29(3), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500006044

Wedderburn, A.J.M., 1987, 'The soteriology of the mysteries and Pauline baptismal theology', *Novum Testamentum* 29(1), 53–72. https://doi.org/10.1163/156853687X00182

Weder, H., 2011, 'εἰσέρχομαι', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 672–675, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Weindt, P., 2011, 'οἰκέω', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, p. 1210, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Wetter, G.P., 1913, *Charis: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des ältesten Christentums*, Oscar Brandsetter, Leipzig.

Wilckens, U., 1978, *Der Brief an die Römer, Teilband 1: Röm 1–5, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Benziger Verlag, Zürich.

Wilckens, U., 1993, *Der Brief an die Römer, Teilband 2: Röm 6–11, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Benziger Verlag, Zürich.

Williams, D.J., 1999, *Paul's metaphors – Their context and character*, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Wischmeyer, O., 2015, *Liebe als Agape: Das frühchristliche Konzept und der moderne Diskurs*, Mohr Siebeck Verlag, Tübingen.

Witherington, B., 1993, 'Christ', in G.F. Hawthorne, R.P. Martin & D.G. Reid (eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and his letters*, pp. 95–100, InterVarsity, Downers Grove, IL.

Witherington, B., III. & Hyatt, D., 2004, *Paul's letter to the Romans – A socio-rhetorical commentary*, William B. Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, MI.

Wold, B., 2015, '"Flesh" and "Spirit" in Qumran sapiential literature as the background to use in Pauline epistles', *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 106(2), 262–279. https://doi.org/10.1515/znw-2015-0016

Wolter, M., 2011, 'ἵστημι', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 503–509, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Wolter, M., 2014, *Der Brief an die Römer. Teilband 1: Röm 1–8, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Neukirchener Theologie Patmos Verlag, Göttingen.

Wolter, M., 2019, 'Die Leiblichkeit des Heils im Römerbrief', in D.S. Du Toit, C. Gerber & C. Zimmermann (eds.), *Soteria: Salvation in early Christianity and antiquity: Festschrift in honour of Cilliers Breytenbach on the occasion of his 65th birthday, Supplements to Novum Testamentum*, pp. 287–306, Brill, Leiden.

Wright, N.T., 2002, 'Romans', in L.E. Keck (ed.), *The New Interpreter's Bible Volume X*, pp. 393–770, Abingdon Press, Nashville, TN.

Wuellner, W., [1977] 1991, 'Paul's rhetoric of argumentation in Romans: An alternative to the Donfried-Karris debate over Romans', in K.P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans debate: Revised and expanded edition*, pp. 128–146, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Yonge, C.D., 2008, *The works of Philo – Complete and unabridged*, Hendrickson, Peabody, MA.

Zahn, T., 1925, *Der Brief des Paulus and die Römer, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr Werner Scholl, Leipzig.

Zeitlin, F., 1996, *Playing the other: Gender and society in classical Greek literature*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.

Zeller, D., 1985, *Der Brief an die Römer, Regensburger Neues Testament*, Verlag Friedrich Pustet, Regensburg.

Zetzel, J.E.G., 1996, 'Natural law and poetic justice: A Carneadean Debate in Cicero and Virgil', *Classical Philology* 91(4), 297–319. https://doi.org/10.1086/367522

Ziesler, J., 1989, *Paul's letter to the Romans*, SCM Press, London.

Zimmermann, C., 2007, *Die Namen des Vaters – Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbeziehungen vor ihrem frühjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont, Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity Volume 69*, Brill, Leiden.

Zimmermann, C., 2009, 'Leben aus dem Tod: Ein Spezifikum in der Gottesrede des Römerbriefs', in U. Schnelle (ed.), *The letter to the Romans, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CCXXVI*, 226, Peeters Publishers, Leuven.

Zimmermann, R., 2000, 'Metapherntheorie und biblische Bildersprache – Ein methodologischer Versuch', *Theologische Zeitschrift* 56, 108–133.

Zmijewski, J., 2011, 'καυχάομαι', in H. Balz & G. Schneider (eds.), *Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, pp. 680–690, Kohlhammer, Stuttgart.

Index

A
accept, 2, 204
age, 29, 32, 96, 133, 163, 192
agency, 37, 42, 84, 161, 167, 211, 233
AIDS, 9, 130, 199, 220, 228, 232
analogy, 6, 33–34, 36, 64, 87, 103, 122, 127–128, 130–132, 136, 156, 217, 220, 229–230, 232–233, 237–238
apocalyptic, 7–9, 61, 75, 190–193, 197
Aristotle, 2, 10, 30, 52, 65, 98, 111, 149, 188
Augustine, 1, 3, 69
awareness, 56, 93, 144, 212, 232

B
behaviour, 2, 14, 59, 84, 88, 91, 118, 124, 171, 193
Bible, 42, 46, 49, 138, 159–160, 186, 202
birth, 7, 50, 196–197, 204

C
care, 21, 237
change, 12–13, 15, 18, 21, 32, 38, 41, 46, 57, 61, 64, 68, 76–78, 80, 83, 87, 89, 99–100, 104–106, 110, 112, 116–117, 121–122, 127, 131–133, 161, 174–175, 183, 185, 188–189, 200, 203, 209, 214, 227–228, 230, 233, 235–236, 239
character, 6, 8, 22, 24, 37, 42, 51–52, 75, 80, 89, 120, 174
characteristics, 24, 187
child, 5, 49, 186–187, 195–196
childbirth, 15, 196–197, 228
children, 3, 33, 36, 58, 73, 123, 133, 153, 180–181, 186–189, 192–193, 195, 197–200, 203–204, 207, 214, 222, 226, 228, 238
Christ, 3, 6–8, 13–16, 19, 22–23, 26–27, 29, 33, 36–37, 39, 41–45, 48–50, 54–61, 63–67, 69–70, 72–81, 83–88, 90–106, 108, 111–113, 115–116, 118–122, 124, 127–128, 130–139, 144–145, 147–148, 156–157, 159–166, 168–169, 171–173, 175–181, 183, 186, 188–191, 194, 197–199, 202–206, 208–214, 216–230, 232–239
Christian, 4, 6, 28, 48, 51, 53, 55, 58, 91–93, 100, 102, 107, 119–120, 129, 139, 144, 157, 170, 173–174, 178, 188, 201, 220
Christological, 42–43, 61, 81, 168
church, 2, 6, 43, 122, 129, 132, 187, 208
citizen, 29, 117, 152
citizenship, 22, 152
city, 2, 20–22, 29, 41–42, 46, 50, 92, 158, 172, 207
community, 1–2, 4, 40, 44, 93, 129, 151, 164, 170, 172, 183, 202, 208, 220
concept, 4, 6, 19, 23, 25, 30, 41, 45, 48–49, 53, 55, 62, 68–69, 71, 81, 98, 101, 106, 124, 139, 149, 158, 165, 179, 186, 191, 197–198, 200, 206
conception, 29, 52, 83
conceptions, 15, 63, 235
context, 3, 8, 13, 18, 39, 42, 44–45, 47, 49, 52–53, 55, 58, 83, 86, 89, 109, 111, 116, 125–127, 139, 151, 164, 168, 173, 177, 185, 198, 200, 207, 212, 227, 231
conventional, 13–14, 18, 138, 146
court, 38, 45, 63, 102, 205, 207, 209
create, 2, 10, 12, 14, 21, 62, 130
creating, 41, 52, 58, 64, 119, 128–129, 166, 178, 203, 218, 228, 236–237
creation, 7–8, 24, 49, 67–68, 93, 189, 191–200, 204, 222, 228, 238
crucified, 8, 15, 55, 97, 99–101, 103, 108, 112, 118, 121, 128, 132, 188, 218, 220, 226, 236
crucifixion, 15, 60, 63, 100–101, 112, 179, 182, 209, 235, 239
culture, 3–4, 21–22, 27–28, 32, 40, 58, 78, 83, 109, 229, 237–238

D
death, 6, 8, 12, 17, 19, 24–28, 34, 36, 49, 52, 55–61, 64–71, 73–80, 82–88, 90–106, 108–110, 112–115, 118, 122, 125–133, 135–138, 140, 144–147, 152, 155–157, 159–164, 166–173, 176–184, 186, 188, 190–191, 194, 198–199, 204–207, 209–214, 216–219, 221–224, 227–230, 232–234, 236–239
defined, 7, 18, 25, 30, 33, 47, 49, 108, 141, 185, 202, 205
determination, 18, 91, 156
development, 13, 20, 24–25, 29, 85, 136, 225
dominion and space, 3, 17, 22, 231–232

E
economic, 4, 20, 33, 40
embodiment, 74, 225
enemies, 36–37, 39, 41, 43, 52, 58–59, 61, 63, 73–74, 81, 84, 174, 211, 216, 233, 235
enemy, 40, 45, 69, 159, 173, 207, 234
environment, 15, 18, 26, 123, 154
eschatological, 7, 29, 61, 75, 81, 96, 125, 145, 163, 183, 190, 203, 212
ethical, 4, 21, 26, 91, 99, 110, 169, 182
ethics, 31, 53, 230

F
family, 22, 58, 129, 152, 186, 189, 203, 230
father, 15, 50, 56, 88, 95–96, 133, 152, 168, 180, 184, 186, 188, 195, 203, 214, 218, 236
fear, 180, 185–186

G
Genesis, 25, 66, 72, 85, 144, 146, 192–193, 195, 199, 206
God, 3, 5–10, 12–16, 19, 25–30, 33–39, 41–44, 46–67, 69, 71–77, 80–87, 89–90, 95–96, 99–100, 102–111, 113–128, 132–133, 135, 137, 139–141, 145–146, 148–149, 151, 153–154, 156–158, 160–164, 166–239
gospel, 2–3, 187, 202, 205, 217
grace, 28–29, 45, 47, 52, 65, 75, 96, 216
Greek, 3–4, 9, 21–22, 25, 28–30, 33, 39–40, 42, 46, 49, 52, 55–56, 58–63, 65, 68–69, 72, 74, 78–79, 85, 92, 96, 98, 100, 103, 107–109, 111, 120, 138–140, 142, 152–153, 164, 168–170, 186–187, 190–191, 212

H
hegemony, 2, 16, 18, 41, 147, 149–150, 152, 159, 179, 215, 231–232, 234, 236, 238–239
Holy Spirit, 37, 49, 53–54, 63, 179, 191, 216
hope, 27, 37, 48–52, 54–55, 61, 63, 107, 180, 182, 189, 193–196, 198–199, 206
human, 1, 7, 24–26, 28–29, 34, 37, 48, 55, 58, 64–69, 72–73, 76, 81–82, 84, 89, 91, 100, 102, 104, 111, 114, 117, 120, 122–123, 127, 133, 136, 138–139, 141–142, 144, 149, 155, 157, 159–160, 162, 167–168, 172, 175, 183–184, 191–192, 199–200, 210, 212–213, 217–218, 221, 224–225, 233, 235–236, 238
humanity, 26, 36–37, 60, 66–67, 70, 72, 74–76, 168, 173, 203, 206, 208

I
Identity, 2, 4, 20, 112, 124, 168, 185, 220
imminent, 17, 213
implications of, 64–65, 75, 77, 91, 99, 113, 137, 188
importance, 8, 18, 23, 30, 33, 41, 56, 72, 86, 175, 180, 207, 217, 225, 232
inclusive, 109, 129, 184, 187
influence, 2, 4, 19, 22, 42, 47, 63, 75, 82, 92–93, 101, 105–106, 116, 127, 134, 139, 165, 171–172, 176, 178–179, 182, 193, 197, 200, 219, 234–238
inside, 31, 49, 67, 82, 120, 158, 224
interests, 109, 150
interpret, 35, 38, 43, 48, 67–69, 116, 120, 157, 183, 217, 226, 229
interpretation, 3, 8, 35, 38, 44–45, 48, 58, 69, 72, 91, 93, 97–98, 101, 109, 111, 120–121, 126, 132, 136–137, 143, 165–166, 168, 176, 191, 193, 200, 206, 212, 226, 233
investigation, 4, 7, 10, 39, 82, 231
Israel, 35, 48, 62, 150, 183–184, 186, 206, 208

J
Jerusalem, 2, 6, 32, 92–93
Jesus, 2–4, 8, 14–16, 23, 26–30, 33, 36–37, 39, 41–45, 48, 50, 55, 58, 60–67, 70, 72–81, 83–88, 91–97, 99, 101–102, 105, 108, 112, 115–116, 125, 127–133, 137–138, 144–145, 147, 149, 157, 161–163, 165–170, 176–181, 183, 185–187, 190–191, 195, 199, 202–206, 208–211, 213, 216–224, 226–228, 230, 232–238
Jewish, 2, 4, 6–7, 25, 29, 32, 34, 44, 47–49, 51, 53–56, 63, 66, 69–70, 72, 75, 83, 85–86, 93, 95–96, 100, 102–104, 111, 120, 129, 136, 138–139, 141–142, 144, 150, 160, 164, 170, 178, 183–185, 190, 192–194, 197, 200–201, 210, 212, 231

L
language, 2, 6, 8–15, 18, 23, 29, 43, 45, 56, 60–61, 63–64, 70–71, 74–75, 83, 85, 87, 92, 95, 107, 122–123, 138, 152, 159, 168, 172, 177, 184, 186, 190, 193, 201, 206, 208, 230–231, 235
laws, 30, 32–33, 72, 78, 98, 129, 143, 158, 170, 188, 201
liberation, 36, 122, 160, 189, 192, 195, 203–204, 230, 238
love, 13–15, 27, 29, 31, 37, 47, 52–54, 56–59, 61, 63–64, 93, 107, 170, 172, 183, 201–202, 204–206, 208–214, 216–217, 222–223, 227, 229–232, 234–235, 238–239
Luke, 59, 92, 104, 120, 148, 167

M
Mark, 11, 20, 48, 68, 72, 74, 92, 95, 112, 120, 122, 125, 132, 149, 167, 181, 208, 210
mercy, 40, 47, 52–53, 86, 207
Messiah, 2, 6, 55, 72, 192, 197
metaphor, 2, 10–13, 15, 18–19, 26, 28–31, 41–42, 44–46, 49, 52–54, 56, 62–64, 67–68, 71–73, 77, 80–81, 83–89, 91, 93–94, 96–102, 104–110, 112–124, 126–129, 131–136, 144, 146, 148, 150–151, 153–156, 159, 162, 164–165, 167–174, 176–180, 182–189, 191, 193–194, 196–200, 202, 216, 218–227, 230, 232–239
moral, 9, 30, 55, 59, 72, 109, 120, 139, 142, 144, 152, 160, 170, 184, 199

N
narrative, 25, 51, 71, 192
nature, 25, 29, 38, 43, 57, 134, 138–139, 153, 160–161, 164, 168, 187, 196, 199, 212
need, 23, 39, 61, 67, 72, 92, 122, 157, 160, 165, 180, 198–199, 217, 221, 225, 228, 230, 234
New Testament, 5–6, 21, 25, 28, 42, 53, 74, 98, 103, 107, 118, 120, 122, 131, 140, 159–160, 163, 167, 187, 206

P
participation, 9, 36, 88, 93–94, 99, 101, 132, 202–203, 238
Pauline letters, 107, 151, 172
peace, 23, 36–37, 39–46, 50, 55, 60–63, 171, 173, 180, 206, 216–217, 233, 235
people, 1–2, 4–5, 12, 21, 23–25, 28, 30, 34, 40, 42, 49–50, 52, 54–59, 64, 67–68, 70–71, 76–77, 80, 82, 85, 91, 93, 107, 122, 129, 153, 165, 171–172, 174, 179, 181, 186, 198, 201–203, 206, 214, 216–218, 223, 230–232, 237–239
persuasion, 1–2, 4, 6–8, 10, 12, 14–16, 62, 84, 112, 127, 136, 147, 155, 162, 179, 188, 204, 213, 226, 229–230, 235
philosophy, 5, 22, 58
politics, 4, 40, 98
population, 21, 124
power, 2, 8, 12, 15, 18–20, 22–27, 29–31, 35–36, 39, 42, 47, 49, 54, 64, 67, 69–71, 78, 82, 87–91, 93, 95–96, 99–106, 108, 110, 112–113, 116–118, 123–124, 127–128, 130–133, 136, 141, 144, 147–148, 150, 152–155, 159–162, 165–166, 168–169, 172, 174, 176–183, 191–192, 199, 208–209, 212–213, 216–217, 219, 223–230, 232–233, 235–236, 239
prayer, 41, 118, 160, 170, 186
process, 12, 15, 38, 61, 125, 139, 145, 212, 217, 224
protection, 13, 15, 40, 107, 124, 206, 213–214, 230
purpose, 3, 11–12, 24, 31, 43, 53, 57, 80, 82–84, 88, 91, 95, 97, 113, 117, 128, 132–134, 136, 139, 151, 157, 167, 169, 179, 182, 185, 192, 195, 201–203, 210, 218, 222, 228, 236

R
reciprocal, 47, 82, 181, 192
reciprocity, 29, 46, 82, 175, 177
reconciliation, 36, 39–40, 60–62, 64, 74, 216–217, 235
relation, 7, 9, 19, 28–29, 48, 79–80, 82, 105, 165, 199, 207, 212
relational, 38, 40, 124, 162, 187
relationship, 7–8, 13–19, 25–27, 34–41, 44, 48–49, 53–55, 63, 70, 75, 81, 84, 86–87, 89–90, 94, 97–99, 101, 105, 112, 116–117, 121–122, 124, 126–127, 134, 136, 138–141, 144–145, 147–150, 155–157, 162, 164–165, 172–174, 179, 184–185, 193, 200–203, 216, 224, 226–230, 233, 235, 237
representation, 9, 14, 73, 98, 192, 229–230
research, 1, 6, 15, 84
resurrection, 15, 49–50, 84–85, 93–95, 97, 99, 101, 103–106, 113, 132, 163, 169, 176, 178–180, 182, 190, 194, 197, 203–204, 209, 218–220, 223, 236, 239
rhetoric, 2–6, 8, 10, 21, 43, 48, 52, 60, 89, 95, 137, 139, 141, 164, 205, 238
rhetorical, 2, 4–5, 7, 10, 13, 26, 38, 51–52, 59–60, 63, 72–74, 76, 84, 88–89, 92, 115–116, 124, 128–129, 136–139, 160, 181, 187, 199, 205–206, 208, 210–211, 213, 232, 235
rights, 33, 124
risk, 22, 58, 180
Roman, 1–4, 6, 14, 20–23, 27–29, 31–34, 40–43, 46–50, 58, 61, 63, 70–71, 78, 86, 92, 100, 111, 117, 122, 125, 127–129, 133, 136, 138–139, 147, 156, 159, 164, 168, 181, 183–185, 190, 192–193, 206, 210–213, 231, 235, 237–238
Romans, 1–10, 12–13, 15, 17–26, 28–31, 33–40, 42–92, 94–239
Rome, 1–2, 4, 14, 20–23, 27, 31–33, 39–42, 47, 49, 55, 63, 71, 78, 83, 86, 124, 129–130, 138–139, 153, 156, 165, 190, 203, 227, 236

S
salvation, 7, 10, 26, 29, 37, 48–49, 55, 57, 60–61, 74, 93, 99, 107, 167, 173, 188, 192, 198, 202, 205, 217, 228
sending, 163, 168–169, 179
separate, 4, 35–36, 40, 204–205, 209–213, 223, 227, 229–230, 232, 235, 238–239
sin, 7–9, 12, 16–17, 19, 24–28, 30–31, 34, 36, 56, 59, 61, 63–74, 76–79, 82–83, 85–94, 96–97, 99–102, 104–119, 121–128, 130, 133–170, 172, 174–183, 185, 188, 190–191, 198–199, 201, 203, 213, 217–221, 223–230, 232–239
society, 1, 17, 21–22, 32, 35, 47, 58, 109, 127, 164–165, 215, 231
soul, 9, 25, 52, 93, 100, 142, 145, 149, 160, 178, 182, 195
space, 1, 3, 8, 10, 12, 16–20, 22, 31, 34, 44–45, 54, 67, 71, 77, 87, 95–96, 108, 110, 112, 120, 134–135, 143, 147–148, 150, 152, 154,

158–159, 161–162, 169–170, 179–180, 191, 204, 209–210, 213, 215–220, 222–224, 226–232, 234–239
status, 3–4, 12–13, 15–16, 18–19, 21–22, 26–27, 31–34, 38, 41, 47–48, 57, 59–61, 64, 76–77, 80, 89–94, 96–97, 99–100, 104–105, 110, 112–113, 115–117, 121–127, 132–133, 161, 172, 175, 180–181, 183, 185–186, 188–189, 200, 203, 209, 214, 222–225, 227–230, 232–233, 235–236, 238–239
stories, 68, 138
story, 49, 138, 152
suffer, 52, 156, 181, 188–189, 196, 210
suffering, 14–15, 28, 37–38, 51–52, 63, 81, 134, 167, 188–192, 194–197, 202, 204–206, 210, 228, 238

T
temple, 49–50, 73, 93, 153
theology, 7–8, 53, 195, 216–217, 223

V
value, 13, 18, 32, 58, 84, 146, 190, 193
violence, 8, 83, 92, 143, 207
virtue, 27, 52, 174
virtues, 21, 43, 110
vulnerable, 199, 201

W
wisdom, 52, 66, 69, 71, 84, 100, 154, 172, 174, 184, 200, 208
women, 123–124, 133, 153, 187
written, 7–8, 17, 34, 70, 107, 135, 142, 209–210

Within the plenitude of Pauline studies, Annette Potgieter's book, *Contested body: Metaphors of dominion in Romans 5–8*, provides a cohesive scholarly investigation of metaphors of dominion employed by Paul. This study uses conceptual metaphor theory as well as the historical research method to discern metaphors of dominion as well as and how these metaphors implied spatiality within the argument of the central section of Paul's letter to the Romans. The book advances the understanding that the body is the specific space where forces vie in Romans 5-8. Paul lived in a world where the perception prevailed that people where constantly under the dominion of someone, whether that be a conqueror, a lord, heavenly powers or gods. The modern idea of being autonomous is somewhat foreign when ancient mentality is purveyed. However, from Paul's vantage point, the idea of being dominated is not problematical, but rather who is the incumbent ruler. Paul employs a myriad of images to persuade his auditors that the body of a believers should be a space that is dominated by God.

This scholarly book resulted from research done at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin within the programme 'Ancient Languages and Texts, the Berlin Graduate School of Ancient Studies'.

In recent metaphor theory, metaphors are not considered as merely decorative devices, but are in fact pervasive to language. Humans think and speak in terms of metaphors, sometimes activating contemporary conceptual metaphors without even noting. Annette Potgieter demonstrates in this scholarly book that Paul employed in Romans 5-8 myriad images to persuade his auditors. Among Pauline studies, there has not yet been a coherent investigation into the role of these metaphors of dominion within Paul's strategy of persuasion in Romans 5–8. Potgieter fills this gap in her book. She argues that Paul drew on imagery from his time and situation in order to persuade his audience that in their bodies they have liberated from the dominion of Sin. He assured them that no force or power, not even death, can separate those who believe from the love of God. This book makes a significant contribution to the understanding of Paul's overall argument in Romans 5-8, focussing on the chains of metaphors in the argument and utilising the intra-textual relations between different sections of the discourse. In various ways, Annette Potgieter advances our understanding of a central section of Paul's letters and makes an important contribution to further discussion on Paul's anthropology.

Prof. Dr Cilliers Breytenbach, Professor Emeritus for New Testament, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Berlin, Germany

AOSIS
aosis.co.za

Open access at
https://doi.org/10.4102/aosis.2020.BK248

9 781928 523673
ISBN: 978-1-928523-67-3