

## Rom 5.18–19 and Universal Salvation\*

RICHARD H. BELL

*Dept of Theology, University of Nottingham, Nottingham NG7 2RD, UK*

Rom 5.18–19 summarises Paul's view of condemnation in Adam and salvation in Christ. Since Paul believes that all human beings participate in Adam's sin and in Christ's 'righteous act', a universal salvation is affirmed. This view is clearly at variance with other parts of Romans (not to mention his other extant works). The difference in view could be explained by the fact that Paul in Rom 5.18–19 is using the mythical concept of participation and that he is focusing on the effects of Christ's reconciling act rather than on how the reconciling word is brought to human beings.

### 1. Introduction

One of the major issues commentators face in discussing Rom 5.18–19 is universal salvation. 'So as one man's trespass led to condemnation for all, so one man's righteous act leads to acquittal and life for all' (Rom 5.18). But how can Paul seemingly support a universal salvation here when the rest of the letter to the Romans assumes that only a certain number will come to faith in Christ and will thereby be saved? Could it not be that Paul merely *appears* to support a universal salvation but closer examination of the text proves he does not?<sup>1</sup> In this article I argue that Paul does in fact support a universal salvation in Rom 5.18–19. Such an understanding is supported by both the context and by a detailed study of these verses.

\* This is a revised version of a paper given to the 'Romans' seminar of the SNTS 2000 conference in Tel Aviv. I thank the members of the seminar and my PhD student Matthew Howey for a number of helpful comments.

<sup>1</sup> So, for example, although Rom 11.32 ('God has consigned all to disobedience that he may have mercy on all') may at first sight support a universal salvation, detailed exegesis suggests that 'all' refers to two groups, Jews and Gentiles, and does not necessarily support a universal salvation. In fact the context is definitely against a universal salvation for Gentiles. See R. H. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy* (WUNT 2.63; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994) 151–3.

## 2. Rom 5.18–19 in the context of Romans

Rom 5.18–19 is part of the section Rom 5.12–21 which is introduced by the words διὰ τοῦτο, ‘therefore’.<sup>2</sup> Many commentators believe that διὰ τοῦτο introduces a conclusion. Cranfield, for example, thinks it is a conclusion drawn from 5.1–11.<sup>3</sup> This though is only going to work if the ‘all’ on Christ’s side (Rom 5.18) corresponds to the ‘us’ of Rom 5.1–11. But if ‘all’ means ‘all’ – and I will argue that there are compelling reasons to take this view – then how can the universal effects of Jesus’ righteous act be deduced from Rom 5.1–11 (or from any earlier section of Romans)?<sup>4</sup> It is therefore better to understand 5.12–21 as establishing some earlier train of thought in Paul’s letter. If one were to take the central idea in Rom 3.23–4 (23 πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον καὶ ὑστεροῦνται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, 24 δικαιούμενοι δωρεὰν τῆ αὐτοῦ χάριτι διὰ τῆς ἀπολυτρώσεως τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ), then it is significant that in Rom 1.18–3.20 the universal nature of sin has been established<sup>5</sup> but the idea that all have been justified (3.24) has not yet been established. Further, although Rom 3.22–4 is certainly clear that ‘all’, Jews and Gentiles, are justified, it is unclear whether every single person is justified.<sup>6</sup> So Paul must now argue in 5.12–21 that the universal sin and universal condemnation as outlined in 1.18–3.20 has now been overcome.<sup>7</sup> Rom 5.12–21 is therefore not so much concerned with how sin and death affect humankind; it is more concerned with the overwhelming power of the grace of God seen in Jesus Christ.<sup>8</sup>

2 Although many commentators translate διὰ τοῦτο in such a way, some give it a weak sense. For example, H. Schlier, translating διὰ τοῦτο as ‘darum’ (*Der Römerbrief* [HTKNT 6; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1977] 158), writes: ‘Sie ist nicht begründend, sondern fortführend, etwa in dem Sinn: man muß ja bedenken . . .’ (*Römerbrief*, 159).

3 C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Volume I* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1977 [1975]) 271.

4 O. Hofius, ‘Die Adam-Christus-Antithese und das Gesetz: Erwägungen zu Röm 5,12–21’, in J. D. G. Dunn, ed., *Paul and the Mosaic Law* (WUNT 89; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996) 165–206, 177.

5 On this text see R. H. Bell, *No one seeks for God: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Romans 1.18–3.20* (WUNT 106; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1998).

6 On the way Rom 3.24 is to be related to its context, see Cranfield, *Romans I*, 205.

7 Cf. Hofius, ‘Adam-Christus-Antithese’, 178.

8 Hence B. Byrne, “‘The Type of the One to Come’” (Rom 5:14): Fate and Responsibility in Romans 5:12–21’, *ABR* 36 (1988) 19–30, 22–3, thinks that in 5.12–21 Paul picks up the πολλῶ μᾶλλον of 5.1–11 (see esp. 5.8–10). Note, however, that the sense of πολλῶ μᾶλλον in 5.9, 10 is somewhat different to that in 5.15, 17. In the latter we have *a minori ad maius*. But in the former we have *a maiori ad minus* since Paul is actually arguing that if God has done the difficult thing (having justified us by Christ’s blood/reconciled us), he can do the easier (save us from the coming wrath). Note that the Rabbinic קל והורבר can include both *a minori ad maius* and *a maiori ad minus* (see P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, 3. Band* [München: C.H. Beck, 1926] 223–6).

One of the striking aspects of Rom 5.12–21 is that the first person plural of 5.1–11 is replaced by ‘a quite general third person plural’,<sup>9</sup> suggesting that Paul is concerned with the whole of humanity. As Hofius points out, Rom 5.12–21 is related to 5.1–11 as 2 Cor 5.19a, b (ὡς ὅτι θεὸς ἦν ἐν Χριστῷ κόσμον καταλλάσσων ἑαυτῷ, μὴ λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν) is related to 2 Cor 5.18b (τοῦ καταλλάξαντος ἡμᾶς ἑαυτῷ διὰ Χριστοῦ)<sup>10</sup> and διὰ τοῦτο (Rom 5.12) corresponds to ὡς ὅτι of 2 Cor 5.19a.

Rom 5.12 is obviously crucial for an understanding of Rom 5.18–19. Paul opens with a protasis but, as I read it, this is not followed by an apodosis.<sup>11</sup> Rather, Paul engages in a lengthy digression (5.13–17). Then 5.18–19 is introduced by ἄρα οὖν which acts as a summary of what has already been said. The substance of the original protasis of 5.12 is therefore repeated in 5.18a and he then gives the apodosis, thereby introducing new ideas. The two parts of both v. 18 and v. 19 are syntactically parallel:

18 ἄρα οὖν		
ὡς	δι' ἐνὸς παραπτώματος	εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα,
οὕτως καὶ	δι' ἐνὸς δικαιώματος	εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς·
19 ὥσπερ γάρ		
διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς	τοῦ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου	ἁμαρτωλοὶ καταστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί,
οὕτως καὶ		
διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς	τοῦ ἐνὸς	δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί.
18 So then		
as	through the trespass of the one man	for all men unto condemnation
so also	through the good deed of the one man	for all men unto acquittal leading to life.
19 For as		
through the disobedience of the one man		the many were made sinners
so also		
through the obedience of the one man		the many will be made righteous.

I turn now to consider 5.18–19.

9 See K. Barth, *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5* (SJTOP 5; Edinburgh/London: Oliver and Boyd, 1956) 42. The exception, as Barth points out, is the very end of 5.21 where there is merely the use of a first person plural possessive adjective (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν).

10 Hofius, ‘Adam-Christus-Antithese’, 178 n. 91.

11 Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1966) 79 n. 13, believes that καὶ οὕτως in 5.12b has the same function as οὕτως καὶ. See also C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (BNTC; London: A. & C. Black, 1991 [1957]), 103; J. T. Kirby, ‘The Syntax of Romans 5.12: A Rhetorical Approach’, *NTS* 33 (1987) 283–6; L. Cerfaux, *Le Christ dans la théologie de Saint Paul* (LD 6; Paris: Cerf, 1958 [1951]) 178.

### 3. Rom 5.18

Rom 5.18a (ὡς δι' ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα) repeats the substance of the original protasis of v. 12. The term ἑνός refers to man (cf. vv. 17 and 19), i.e. it is a pronoun<sup>12</sup> and is not an adjective going with παραπτώματος.<sup>13</sup> This is suggested by the fact that ἑνός is used three times in v. 17 and twice in v. 19, in all cases referring to either Adam or Christ.<sup>14</sup>

Rom 5.18a points to Adam's trespass, παράπτωμα being synonymous with ἁμαρτία as 5.20 makes clear. It does not mean 'transgression', i.e. it is not synonymous with παράβασις (see v. 14).<sup>15</sup> The term παράβασις in v. 14 refers to a clear contravention of God's will as expressed in the law.<sup>16</sup> As Hofius writes: 'Von παράβασις kann demnach erst dann und nur dann gesprochen werden, wenn der Gotteswille ausdrücklich erklärt und die Grenze expressis verbis aufgezeigt ist.'<sup>17</sup> Further, παράπτωμα does not mean 'fall'.<sup>18</sup> Adam's παράπτωμα then is his concrete sin against God as found in Gen 3. Paul does not elaborate on the nature of Adam's sin. But however Paul understood this sin, he clearly believed it to have universal consequences,<sup>19</sup> for it issues in κατάκριμα<sup>20</sup> for all.

12 See J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (Berlin: Gust. Schwab, 1855 [repr.] [31773]) 360; E. Käsemann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980 [1973]) 148; U. Wilckens, *Der Brief an die Römer* (EKK 6/1; Zürich/Einsiedeln/Köln: Benziger Verlag/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1978) 326.

13 Contra W. Sanday and H. C. Headlam, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1896) 141–2; J. Denney, 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans', in W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Expositor's Greek Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976 [repr]) 555–725, 630; H. W. Schmidt, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THNT 6; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1972) 102; E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Römer 5,12–21 (I. Kor. 15)* (WMANT 7; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1962) 232–3.

14 So, for example, adding ἀνθρώπου to ἑνός in 19a we see explicitly that Paul is referring to two persons rather than two acts.

15 Contra C. Spicq, *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament* (ET; 3 vols; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994) 3.28.

16 So in Rom 2 Paul speaks of the παράβασις τοῦ νόμου (v. 23) and παραβάτης νόμου (vv. 25, 27).

17 Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 192–3.

18 Cf. Käsemann, *Römer*, 131, who translates v. 15a as 'Freilich (geht es) beim Gnadenwerk (χάρισμα) nicht so zu wie beim Fall (παράπτωμα)'. He comments: 'In 15a bezeichnen παράπτωμα und χάρισμα, rhetorisch entgegengestellt (Barrett), schwerlich bloß konkrete Taten . . . Der Zusammenhang zwischen Handeln und Wirkung wird betont . . .' (*Römer*, 145).

19 This is a point already hinted at in Rom 1.18ff. (see Bell, *No one seeks for God*, 21–131).

20 This term is only used elsewhere in the NT in Rom 5.16; 8.1. According to Cranfield, *Romans I*, 287 n. 1, κατάκριμα refers 'probably not just to the sentence of condemnation pronounced on all men by God but also to the far-reaching consequences arising from it'. Cf. F. Büchsel, in F. Büchsel and V. Hertrich, 'κρίνω κτλ.', *TNDT* 3.921–54, 952, who believes that Rom 8.1 'refers not merely to the divine sentence but also to its actual results'.

The expression οὕτως καί then introduces the apodosis, which refers to Christ's δικαίωμα (cf. Christ's χάρισμα in vv. 15–16).<sup>21</sup> 5.18b is therefore the long-awaited apodosis of v. 12.<sup>22</sup> For, as I have argued, 5.12 opens with a protasis which is then followed by a long digression (vv. 13–17).

The word δικαίωμα in v. 18 is best understood as 'righteous act'.<sup>23</sup> The term δικαίωμα therefore has a different sense to that in v. 16b where it means justification, acquittal (δικαίωμα in v. 16 therefore being a synonym of δικαίωσις in v. 18b). This change in meaning of δικαίωμα, however, is not a problem since in v. 16 δικαίωμα is chosen for rhetorical reasons.<sup>24</sup>

But what is the precise nature of this 'righteous act'? It parallels ὑπακοή of 19b. The meaning of ὑπακοή can be elucidated by Phil 2.8, where Christ became ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ. So just as Adam's παράπτωμα (v. 18a) and παρακοή (v. 19a) refer to his sin in Gen 3, so Christ's righteous act refers to his death on the cross.<sup>25</sup> Further, δικαίωμα can be illuminated by χάρισμα of 5.15, 16, the gracious act. There is therefore some weight in Hofius's view when he rejects the view of Wilckens that Christ's ὑπακοή is to be understood as 'Gehorsam gegenüber der rechtfertigenden Gnade Gottes'.<sup>26</sup> Rather, 'Christi ὑπακοή ist die heilschaffende Tat seiner freiwilligen Selbsthingabe in den Tod und eben damit das Ereignis der Gnade Gottes (V. 15bβ, 17b) und der Erweis seiner Liebe (Röm 5,8) selbst'.<sup>27</sup> The stress is therefore on what Christ does for us as God. Christ represents God before human beings. Wilckens rightly argues: 'Christus als Ursprung der Gerechtigkeit aller Menschen ist also gerade *nicht Repräsentant der Menschen vor Gott*, wie es Adam ist – in dem Sinne, daß er repräsentiert, was sie tun und sind – , sondern *Repräsentant Gottes vor den Menschen*'.<sup>28</sup> But although Christ represents God before human beings, Paul

21 On the meaning of χάρισμα see Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 187.

22 See B. Byrne, *Romans* (SPS 6; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1996) 180; Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 169.

23 The use of δικαίωμα for righteous act is well established. See Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1.3.9 (1359a25), where δικαίωμα is contrasted to ἀδικηµα (cf. 1.13.1 (1373b1); *Nicomachean Ethics* 5.7.7 (1135a9–10). See also Bar 2.19; Rev 15.4b; 19.8b.

24 Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 174 n. 55. Note the use of the words δόρημα, κρίμα, κατάκριμα, χάρισμα, δικαίωμα in 5.16.

25 Cf. *ibid.*, 188. One may ask what place the resurrection has in Paul's scheme here. Strictly speaking it does not belong to the 'righteous act' since for Paul God raises Christ from the dead. However, W. Grundmann, 'Die Übermacht der Gnade: Eine Studie zur Theologie des Paulus', *NovT* 2 (1958) 50–72, 53, discussing 'die gerechte Tat Jesu' in Rom. 5.12–21, writes: 'So ist Kreuz und Auferstehung die eigentliche Äonenwende, in ihr vollzieht sich die Ablösung des bestehenden durch den kommenden Äon. Darum konzentriert Paulus das Christusereignis in Kreuz und Auferstehung.'

26 Wilckens, *Römer*, 1.328 (Wilckens's emphasis).

27 Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 188.

28 Wilckens, *Römer*, 1.327 (Wilckens's emphasis).

refers to Christ as ἄνθρωπος.<sup>29</sup> Whatever may be said of Barth's exegesis of Rom 5.12–21<sup>30</sup> he is right in these comments: 'In Paul, therefore, Christ is man, not in contrast to the fact that elsewhere He is termed the Son of God, but because He is Son of God, and expresses and demonstrates Himself as such in the fact that He is man.'<sup>31</sup>

Returning to δικαίωμα, there are strong grounds for understanding Christ's 'righteous act' as his death. More specifically the reference is probably to his sacrificial death being understood in terms of the levitical sin-offering and the servant of the Lord of Isa 52.13–53.12. As we will see, there are allusions to Isa 53.11 in Rom 5.19. Furthermore, as Lang argues, the pre-Pauline tradition of 1 Cor 15.3ff., Rom 3.25 and 4.25 have decisively influenced Paul's thought. 'Diese Formeln sind für ihn nicht nur juden-christliche Relikte, sondern grundlegende Elemente seiner Christologie.'<sup>32</sup> Rom 3.24–6 is central. The διὰ formulae of 5.18 and 19, those of 5.17b (διὰ τοῦ ἐνός Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) and 5.21b (διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) and the earlier ones in Rom 5 (5.1–2, 9, 10, 11) all point back to Rom 3.24–5 which concerns Christ's saving act seen in sacrificial terms.<sup>33</sup> Likewise the justification terminology of Rom 5.1, 9–11, 15–21 points back to Rom 3.21–6. Therefore in Rom 5.18–19 (as in Rom 3.24–6) we have the bringing together of atonement and justification.<sup>34</sup>

Christ's righteous act therefore refers solely to his atoning death on the cross. Cranfield is therefore wrong to think that it refers to 'not just His atoning death but the obedience of His life as a whole'.<sup>35</sup> Also it is completely misleading to speak of Christ keeping the law and thereby earning some sort of merit. So Lietzmann speaks of 'die stellvertretende Erfüllung der gesetzlichen Forderungen'.<sup>36</sup> This line of thinking is not only out of place in Rom 5.18–19 but also out of place in Paul's whole extant works. For it is difficult to find a text which suggests that Christ's

29 See v. 15: ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἐνός ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. The word ἄνθρωπος is also implied in v. 18 (δι' ἐνός δικαίωματος) and in v. 19 (διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἐνός).

30 See Bultmann's famous criticism in 'Adam and Christ'. See also the special excursuses of Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 267–78, and J. Murray, *The Epistle to the Romans: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (NICNT; 2 vols; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982 [repr.] [1 1959; 2 1965]) 1.384–90. Even Jüngel describes Barth's interpretation of Rom 5 as 'eigenwillig': E. Jüngel, 'Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus', in *Unterwegs zur Sache: Theologische Bemerkungen* (BEvTh 61; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1988 [1972]) 145–72, 147.

31 K. Barth, *CD* 3.2, 46.

32 F. Lang, 'Das Verständnis der Taufe bei Paulus', in J. Ådna, S. J. Hafemann and O. Hofius, eds, *Evangelium-Schriftauslegung-Kirche* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997) 253–68, 267.

33 See D. P. Bailey, *Jesus as Mercy Seat* (PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge, 1999); R. H. Bell, 'Sacrifice and Christology in Paul', *JTS* 53 (2002) 1–27.

34 Cf. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 235.

35 Cranfield, *Romans I*, 289. Cf. G. Bornkamm, 'Paulinische Anakoluthe', in *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien* (BET 16; München: Chr. Kaiser, 1952) 76–92, 88.

36 H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer* (HNT 8; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1971) 64.

obedience in keeping the law contributes to his saving work.<sup>37</sup> Further, if we were to view Jesus as ‘sinless’, we cannot discover this ‘in this man’s excellences of character, virtues or good works’.<sup>38</sup>

Paul then argues that Christ’s righteous act leads to justification (acquittal) which results in life.<sup>39</sup> We have therefore a genitive of result.<sup>40</sup> In δικαίωσις<sup>41</sup> Paul is probably referring to the act of justifying and the condition resulting from it.<sup>42</sup> The ‘life’ Paul refers to is ‘eternal life’ (cf. Rom 5.17, 21).

#### 4. Rom 5.19

As in 5.18, there is again a clear parallelism between the two halves of this verse:

19 ὥσπερ γὰρ	διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς	τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου	ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν
			οἱ πολλοί,
οὕτως καὶ	διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς	τοῦ ἑνὸς	δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται
			οἱ πολλοί.
19 For as	through the disobedience of the one man	so also	through the obedience of the one man
		the many were made sinners	the many will be made righteous.

37 C. E. B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, Volume II* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979) 521, has a rather idiosyncratic understanding of Rom 10.5. He suggests that Paul here applied Lev 18.5 to ‘the achievement of the one Man who has done the righteousness which is of the law in His life and, above all, in His death, in the sense of fulfilling the law’s requirements perfectly and so earning as His right a righteous status before God’ (*Romans II*, 521). For my understanding of Rom 10.5, see *Provoked to Jealousy*, 189–90.

38 Barth, *CD* 1.2, 156. One element of Barth’s thinking here is that one cannot judge Jesus by some preconceived idea of what sinlessness actually is. Hence Barth’s view that one cannot speak of ‘law and gospel’ but only ‘gospel and law’. See E. Jüngel, *Karl Barth: A Theological Legacy* (ET; Philadelphia: Westminster, 186) 114–16. My own way of understanding Jesus’ sinlessness in ‘Sacrifice and Christology in Paul’ is that Jesus has to be viewed in one sense as a sinner since sin is inevitable in the sphere of humanity (cf. Rom 8.3). This gives some confirmation to the view that Jesus’ ‘righteous act’ in Rom 5.18 refers to his sacrificial death.

39 Cf. Rom 1.17: ὁ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται.

40 See D. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) 341; Cranfield, *Romans I*, 289; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, 142; Murray, *Romans*, 1.202. On the genitive of result see *BDF* §166. The other possibility is an epexegetic genitive. See N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III: Syntax* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963) 214, who understands δικαίωσις ζωῆς as ‘justification which is life’, and M. Zerwick, *Graecitas biblica* (SPIB 92; Rome: Pontificio instituto biblico, 1955) §33. However, Paul seems to draw a distinction between justification and life in 5.21.

41 Paul has previously used δικαίωσις in Rom 4.25 (its only other occurrence in the NT).

42 Cranfield, *Romans I*, 289. The same sense is given to δικαίωμα in Rom 5.16 (see *ibid.*, 287 n. 2).



According to Calvin v. 19 does not repeat v. 18 but is a necessary explanation of it: 'He had previously said that we are condemned, but to prevent anyone from laying claim to innocence, he desired also to add that everyone is condemned, because he is a sinner.'<sup>43</sup> So, as Cranfield explains, the many are condemned because they were sinners themselves – i.e. they were not condemned because of someone else.<sup>44</sup> However, we will have to examine in closer detail below how the sin of Adam<sup>45</sup> is related to the sin of human beings.

Regarding *δικαιοὶ κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί*, the future verb *κατασταθήσονται* could either be a real future or a logical future. I believe the logical future is the most probable<sup>46</sup> since justification for Paul is something which is enjoyed in this life, a point seen earlier in Romans (see especially Rom 5.1, 9). I believe Paul never supports a justification of believers at the final judgment.<sup>47</sup> He does, however, have the idea of people coming to faith at the parousia and thereby being justified. We see this in Rom 11.26 where all Israel comes to faith in the coming Christ, and we see universal salvation at the eschaton in Phil 2.10–11. One *possible* reason for taking the eschatological future in Rom 5.19 is that if Paul does envisage a universal salvation, then the obvious point when *all* will be made righteous is at the eschaton, as in Phil 2.10–11. This idea of a universal eschatological salvation has perhaps pushed Schlatter<sup>48</sup> and Käsemann<sup>49</sup> into accepting the real future in Rom 5.19.<sup>50</sup> But if the mythical nature of Rom 5.12–21 is taken seriously we are deal-

43 J. Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul The Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians* (Calvin's Commentaries 8; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976 [repr.], [1960]) 118.

44 Cranfield, *Romans I*, 290.

45 Whereas v. 18 refers to Adam's *παράπτωμα* v. 19 uses the term *παρακοή*. Spicq, *Lexicon*, 3.29, believes *παρακοή* 'expresses above all a refusal to listen, turning a deaf ear'. He compares the ideas found in Jer 11.10; 35.17; Acts 7.57; Matt 18.17. Such an etymological nuance is retained in Heb 2.2. Note that the term *παρακοή* is rare, being unknown in LXX and in papyri before the eighth century (see Spicq, *Lexicon*, 3.28; Bauer-Aland, 1250).

46 See Cranfield, *Romans I*, 291; Wilckens, *Römer*, 1.328; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 421; Moo, *Romans*, 345; Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 189.

47 See R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 235. Many point to the future gift of *δικαιοσύνη* in Gal 5.5 (e.g. Käsemann, *Römer*, 149; *Romans*, p. 157). However, the genitive *ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης* is best taken as a subjective genitive and interpreted as 'the hope to which the justification of believers points them forward' (F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* [NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1982] 41). Also Hofius, 'Adam-Christus-Antithese', 189–90 n. 161, points out that the genitive as in Col 1.23; Eph 1.18; 4.4; Barn 4.8, refers to the 'Fundament der ἐλπίς'. Other texts taken to support a future justification are Rom 2.13; 3.20, 30; 8.33–4 and 1 Cor 4.4. Rom 2.13 and 3.20 concern justification according to works (which Paul later rejects in Rom 3.21ff.). Rom 3.30 is best taken as a logical future (Cranfield, *Romans I*, 222). Rom 8.33–4 does not have to refer to the last judgment (contra G. Schrenk, 'ἴκη κτλ.', *TDNT* 2.174–225, 218, and 1 Cor 4.4 certainly does not (again contra Schrenk, 'ἴκη', 217).

48 A. Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1975 [1935]) 192.

49 Käsemann, *Römer*, 149 (*Romans*, 157).

50 Others who accept the real future include Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 175, and Schrenk, 'ἴκη', 191.



ing with what can be called a relativistic view of time<sup>51</sup> and therefore we do not have to be pushed in the direction of accepting the real future. I therefore believe the logical future is the most probable since justification is associated with the present when one comes to faith. In contrast, life or eternal life is something which can refer to the future.<sup>52</sup>

The other issue regarding *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί* is whether Paul is saying ‘the many’ are *made* righteous or *declared* righteous. Schlier believes that just as the many through Adam were made sinners, so the many through Christ will be made righteous.<sup>53</sup> However, it is a false alternative whether they are *made* righteous or *declared* righteous for the person declared righteous is in fact made righteous. God’s verdict is a creative verdict and makes sinners righteous.<sup>54</sup> Another way of looking at it is to say that the righteous are those who have received the righteousness of 5.17.<sup>55</sup>

### 5. Universal salvation

We now deal with the central issue of this essay. Does the text support a universal salvation? Four approaches have been adopted regarding *εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς*.

The first is the universalistic stance. This is found in scholars such as Michaelis,<sup>56</sup> Grundmann,<sup>57</sup> Käsemann<sup>58</sup> and Hultgren.<sup>59</sup> Universalism appears to

51 So in the case of the myth of Adam, human beings have participated in a primeval event which had occurred long before they were even born. In the case of the myth of Christ, human beings have participated in an event which occurred before they came to believe in Christ. Even though many will not come to faith until the last day, they have participated in Christ’s righteous act.

52 Hofius, ‘Adam-Christus-Antithese’, 189, although seeing *κατασταθήσονται* as a logical future, believes that *βασιλεύσουσιν* (Rom 5.17) is a real future. Denney, ‘Romans’, 630, thinks both *βασιλεύσουσιν* and *κατασταθήσονται* are logical futures but nevertheless believes *βασιλεύσουσιν* refers to the consummation of the kingdom. Regarding *δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται* he writes: ‘A reference to the Judgment Day (Meyer) is forced: it is not then, but when they believe in Christ, that men are constituted *δίκαιοι*’ (‘Romans’, 630–1).

53 Schlier, *Römerbrief*, 174: ‘So werden “die Vielen”, also die Menschen insgesamt, durch Christi Gehorsam nicht zu Gerechten erklärt, sondern Gerechte werden.’

54 O. Hofius, ‘“Rechtfertigung des Gottlosen” als Thema biblischer Theologie’, *Paulusstudien* (WUNT 51; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989) 121–47, 130.

55 Cf. Hofius, ‘Adam-Christus-Antithese’, 175 n. 69.

56 W. Michaelis, *Versöhnung des Alls: Die frohe Botschaft von der Gnade Gottes* (Gümligen bei Bern: Siloah, 1950) 137–9.

57 W. Grundmann, ‘Übermacht’, 54, 71–2.

58 Käsemann, *Römer*, 149 (*Romans*, 157) on 5.18–19 (and 1 Cor 15.22; Rom 11.32) writes: ‘Gemeinsam ist all diesen Stellen, daß nach ihnen allmächtige Gnade ohne eschatologischen Universalismus nicht denkbar ist (Schlatter, Barrett) und Kosmologie die Anthropologie als ihre Projection in den Schatten rückt’. On Schlatter, see nn. 60, 62 below.

59 A. J. Hultgren, *Paul’s Gospel and Mission* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 86–92; *Christ and His Benefits* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 53–4.

be found in Schlatter<sup>60</sup> and in Barth.<sup>61</sup> However, on closer scrutiny they do not in fact support universalism.<sup>62</sup>

The second is that Christ won the basis for justification, but such justification is only a reality if the condition of faith is fulfilled.<sup>63</sup> Paul, however, does not say this either here or anywhere else in his extant works. Further, the whole idea that Christ gained the possibility of justification which is then only a reality for those who receive it seems alien to his thinking.<sup>64</sup>

A third view is that 'all' means 'all in Christ'. Only those 'in Christ' are justified. Such a view can be found in Augustine<sup>65</sup> and frequently in the work of conservative commentators who wish to avoid a universalist conclusion.<sup>66</sup> However, there is nothing in the text that suggests such a limitation. As I will argue below, οἱ τῆν

60 Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, 192, writes: 'die universale Herrschermacht des Christus bewirkt, daß diese [die Zuteilung der Gerechtigkeit] nicht nur einzelnen Gruppen der Menschheit, sondern allen zuteil werden wird. Aus dem eschatologischen Universalismus ergibt sich die Berufung aller zum Glauben.'

61 Barth, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ET; Oxford: OUP, 1933) 182, who, commenting on 5.18–19, writes: 'In the light of this act of obedience there is no one who is not – in Christ.'

62 Schlatter's apparently universalist statement is qualified in this way: 'Er hat aber die Bezeugung der allmächtigen Gnade, die den Christus zum Herrn aller macht, nie als einen Widerruf jener Verkündigung verstanden, die den Tag Gottes als den seines Zornes beschreibt, 5,9; 2,5, an dem Gott die aus der Menschheit ausscheiden wird, die für die allmächtige Güte des Schöpfers und für die ebenso allmächtige Gnade des Christus durch ihre eigensüchtige Begier verschlossen geblieben sind' (*Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, 194). As far as Barth is concerned, whilst he did not rule out that all may ultimately be saved, he continually denied universalism as a doctrine because he wished to affirm God's freedom. See J. Colwell, 'The Contemporaneity of the Divine Decision: Reflections on Barth's Denial of "Universalism"', in N. M. de S. Cameron, ed., *Universalism and the Doctrine of Hell* (Carlisle: Paternoster/Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991) 139–60.

63 F. L. Godet, *Commentary on Romans* (ET; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977 [repr.] [1883]) 225: 'The apostle does not say that all *shall be* individually justified; but he declares that, in virtue of the one grand sentence which has been passed, all *may be* so, on condition of faith'. R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1961 [repr.] [1936]) 383: 'What Christ obtained for all men, all men do not receive.'

64 Contrast C. Breytenbach, *Versöhnung. Eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie* (WMANT 60; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1989) 158–9, 165, 169, 215, 221, 223, who speaks of Christ's death as the 'Ermöglichung' or 'Ermöglichungsgrund' of reconciliation. Reconciliation can then only take place when someone comes to faith in Christ. For critical responses to Breytenbach's work, see O. Hofius (review in *TLZ* 115 [1990] 741–5) and P. Stuhlmacher ('Cilliers Breytenbachs Sicht von Sühne und Versöhnung', *JBT* 6 [1991] 339–54).

65 *De natura et gratia* 41.48 (*NPNF* 5:137–8).

66 Murray, *Romans*, 1.202–3; H. Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (ET; London: SPCK, 1977) 340–1; Moo, *Romans*, 343–4; L. Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Leicester: IVP/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 239. An exception is C. Hodge, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977 [repr.]) 26–7, in that he believes that the passage supports a universal salvation for infants. However, he believes it does not support a universal salvation for adults.

περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες (5.17) in no way limits the πάντες of 5.18.

A fourth view is that ‘all’ means Jews and Gentiles.<sup>67</sup> However, whereas Paul in 11.32 is referring to two groups, i.e. ‘Jews and Gentiles’,<sup>68</sup> there are no grounds for believing this here in Rom 5.18–19. First, the context, unlike that of Rom 9–11, does not suggest Paul is concerned with two groups, ‘Jews and Gentiles’. Secondly, there are no linguistic reasons to suggest that Paul is referring to two groups, and had he wished to do this he could have written εἰς τοὺς πάντας (cf. Rom 11.32).

Of these four views I find the first to be the correct understanding, i.e. Paul has a universalist view in Rom 5.18–19. This is the natural reading of the text and the context supports it. As suggested above, Paul is arguing in Rom 5.12–21 that the universal sin and universal condemnation of 1.18–3.20 has been overcome. Further, Rom 5.15–21 concerns the triumph of grace.<sup>69</sup> In Rom 5.15b Paul declares: ‘For if many died through one man’s trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift in the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many.’ It would indeed be odd if Paul speaks here of ‘much more’ if the effect of grace was less universal than that of sin.<sup>70</sup> However, a number of objections have been raised to this understanding of universal salvation and I now consider these.

The first is that although Paul writes πάντες, ‘all’, in v. 18, he moderates this in v. 19 by writing οἱ πολλοί, ‘many’.<sup>71</sup> However, as has often been pointed out, οἱ πολλοί is simply a Hebraic way of saying ‘all’,<sup>72</sup> something seen especially clearly in the Fourth Servant Song of Deutero-Isaiah.<sup>73</sup> This is clearly the meaning

67 See N. T. Wright, ‘Towards a Biblical View of Universalism’, *Themelios* 4.2 (1979) 54–8, 56; I. H. Marshall, ‘Does The New Testament Teach Universal Salvation?’, in T. A. Hart and D. P. Thimell, eds, *Christ in Our Place. The Humanity of God in Christ for the Reconciliation of the World* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1989) 313–28, 317: ‘I suggest that “all” in Rom. 5 really has primarily in view “both Jews and Gentiles and not just Jews”.’

68 See Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 151–3.

69 Michaelis, *Versöhnung*, 136, describes this section as ‘ein Triumphlied auf die Übermacht der Gnade über die Sünde’.

70 Cf. J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans* (WBC 38; 2 vols; Dallas: Word Books, 1988) 1.297. However, I disagree with Dunn in contrasting what he calls the ‘logic of love’ of 5.18–19 with a ‘more hard-headed analysis’ in 2.8–9. On how 2.8–9 is to be understood within the context of 1.18–3.20, see Bell, *No one seeks for God*, 253–5.

71 E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (London: SCM, 1977) 473.

72 J. Jeremias, ‘πολλοί’, *TDNT* 6.536–45, 540–5; H. Müller, ‘Der rabbinische Qal-Wachomer-Schluß in paulinischer Typologie’, *ZNW* 58 (1967) 73–92, 82 n. 49. Sanders, *Palestinian Judaism*, 473, questions this semitic use of πολλοί. He follows H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (NTL; ET; London: SCM, 1969) 187–8, in believing that ‘at the decisive point the analogy [Adam/Christ] does not work: left to itself it does not take faith into account’. Implicitly it does though in the sense that to participate in Christ one has to believe.

73 Jeremias, ‘πολλοί’, 537–8, 544–5. However, J. A. Motyer, *The Prophecy of Isaiah* (Leicester: IVP, 1993) 442, believes that many is ‘a precise company, numerous but not all-inclusive’.

of οἱ πολλοί in 5.15. Further, in Rom 5.19 there is an allusion to Isa 53.11c: ׀ַרְבִּים יַצְדִּיק צְדִיק עֲבָדִי לְרַבִּים.<sup>74</sup> This may be translated as ‘my (perfectly) righteous servant will make many righteous’.<sup>75</sup> Perhaps Paul actually chose the words οἱ πολλοί to bring in this allusion. Although Christ as second Adam is the predominant idea, I see no problem in there being in addition an allusion to the suffering servant.<sup>76</sup> Therefore to conclude on this first objection, Paul is clearly not modifying in Rom 5.19 what he has written in 5.18. The ideas in the two verses are clearly in parallel.<sup>77</sup>

The second objection is that the parallel in 1 Cor 15.22 (ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῷ Ἀδὰμ πάντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν, οὕτως καὶ ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ πάντες ζωοποιηθήσονται) shows that Paul simply means ‘all in Christ’ in Rom 5.18. The πάντες in 1 Cor 15.22 is indeed qualified by the expression οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 15.23, and in view of this and of 15.24–8 one must conclude that the second ‘all’ in 15.22 refers to those who belong to Christ.<sup>78</sup> But, as Hofius points out, such a limitation is not there in Rom 5.12–21, and in fact the text appears to stress the πάντες both on the side of Adam and on the side of Christ. Further, I have argued earlier that Paul’s purpose in 5.12–21 is to establish the universality of the effects of Christ’s ‘righteous act’, so that Christians may know that the universal sinfulness leading to condemnation of all has in fact been overcome.

The third argument is that the participle λαμβάνοντες in 5.17 (οἱ τὴν περισσεΐαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες) limits the universality of Rom 5.15–16 and 18–19.<sup>79</sup> So Bultmann writes:

74 Note that the LXX differs: δικαιοῦσαι δίκαιον εὐδουλεύοντα πολλοῖς.

75 The rendering ‘my (perfectly) righteous servant’ for ׀ַרְבִּים יַצְדִּיק was suggested to me by C. R. North, *The Second Isaiah: Introduction, Translation and Commentary to Chapters XL–LV* (Oxford: OUP, 1964) 232–3. C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40–66: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1969) 255, has: ‘As a righteous one my servant shall justify many.’

76 See, for example, O. Betz, ‘Jesus und Jesaja 53’, in H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, P. Schäfer, eds, *Geschichte–Tradition–Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag. III* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1996) 3–19, 9–10. Contrast Käsemann, *Römer*, 149, who denies any link with the suffering servant: ‘Es besteht also nicht der mindeste Anlaß, das Motiv vom leidenden Gottesknecht in unsern Text einzutragen. Hier ist allein die Antithese zu Adams Ungehorsam und damit nochmals die gegensätzliche Entsprechung von Urzeit und Endzeit wichtig.’

77 M. E. Boring, ‘The Language of Universal Salvation in Paul’, *JBL* 105 (1986) 269–92, 284–5.

78 F. Lang, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986) 223, commenting on 15.22, writes: ‘Die formale Entsprechung zum Todesschicksal aller Menschen wäre eine allgemeine Totenaufstehung. Nun wird aber in V.23 von Dan 7,13.27 her nur von der Auferstehung derer gesprochen, die zum Menschensohn Christus gehören, und in V.24–28 läuft der Gedankengang auf den Sieg Christi über alle gottfeindlichen Mächte und auf die Übergabe der Herrschaft an den Vater zu, während Totenaufstehung der Nichtchristen und Weltgericht nicht erwähnt werden. Deshalb muß “alle” in V.22 auf alle bezogen werden, die an Christus glauben.’

79 See R. Bultmann, ‘Adam und Christus nach Römer 5’, in *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1967) 424–44, 437 (‘Adam and

Since in mankind after Adam there was no choice but to be like Adam fallen under the power of sin and death, the logical consequence would be that after Christ, the second Adam, there is also no choice but to be like him under the power of ‘obedience’ and ‘life’. In point of fact, however, after Christ the necessity to decide between the two possibilities exists – and the reservation ‘those who receive’ (v. 17) in the Christ-aeon has and can have no correlative limitation in the Adam-aeon (for the participle λαμβάνοντες implies a condition; if, or so far as, they receive).<sup>80</sup>

Such an argument has been rightly refuted by Wilckens who argues that the λαμβάνοντες are the Christians who ‘als “Empfangende” repräsentieren hier vielmehr die Gesamtheit der durch Christus von Sünde und Tod befreiten Menschen, denen “durch Jesus Christus” die Zukunft des endzeitlichen Lebens offensteht, ja, die anstelle des jetzt erledigten Herrschers Tod selbst die Herrschaft im Leben antreten werden’.<sup>81</sup> Whereas Wilckens argues that those of v. 17 who receive the gift are representatives, Hultgren believes that οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες refers to all people.<sup>82</sup> Strictly speaking Wilckens is correct, but, as I will argue below, Hultgren is correct in that on the last day all will in fact have come to faith and be in receipt of the gift of righteousness.

In response to Bultmann’s stress on free choice one can also consider Boring’s point that in Paul λαμβάνω has its passive meaning ‘receive’, not its active meaning ‘take’.<sup>83</sup> Boring argues that in the 31 instances of λαμβάνειν in the seven undisputed letters of Paul, all are to be taken in a passive sense except 1 Cor 11.23–4 and Phil 2.7 (both containing pre-Pauline tradition) and 2 Cor 11.20; 12.16 where the word has the bad sense of ‘take’ (someone). In particular he points out that all usages with πνεῦμα, τὸ βραβεῖον, χάρις, etc. are clearly passive. One may add that Phil 2.7 is rather unusual since the subject is the pre-existent Christ.

Having found these three objections to be wanting, I conclude that Paul does in fact envisage a universal salvation in Rom 5.18–19. But this is not an isolated occurrence. 2 Cor 5.19 speaks of God being in Christ, reconciling the world to himself. Phil 2.11 says every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord.<sup>84</sup> And Rom 11.25–32, although not speaking of a universal salvation of Gentiles, does, as I

---

Christ According to Romans 5’, in W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder, eds, *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation: Essays in Honor of O.A. Piper* (London: SCM, 1962) 143–65, 158).

80 R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament, Volume 1* (ET London: SCM 1952) 302–3; *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (UTB 630; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1984 [1948]) 302 (cf. *Theologie*, 253).

81 Wilckens, *Römer*, 1.325. Käsemann, *Römer*, 147, also argues against Bultmann.

82 Hultgren, *Paul’s Gospel*, 92.

83 Boring, ‘Universal Salvation’, 287.

84 O. Hofius, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6–11: Untersuchungen zu Gestalt und Aussage eines urchristlichen Psalms* (WUNT 17; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1991) 37–8, I

understand it, speak of a universal salvation of Jews.<sup>85</sup> Further, in the deutero-Pauline texts Eph 1.10; Col 1.20 a universal salvation is implied.

But having said this, one fundamental problem remains: elsewhere Paul assumes the necessity of faith in Christ for salvation (faith is the *mode* of salvation);<sup>86</sup> and when he discusses the salvation of Jews and Gentiles in Rom 11.25–32 from a historical perspective (i.e. considering the mission to the Gentiles and their pilgrimage to Jerusalem), he does not think that every Gentile will come to faith (although he believes every Jew will come to faith<sup>87</sup>). For in Rom 11.25 he merely writes that τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν will have come in. The expression τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν refers to the predestined number of Gentiles and clearly does not refer to every single Gentile. Then in 11.32 (συνέκλεισεν γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τοὺς πάντας εἰς ἀπειθειαν, ἵνα τοὺς πάντας ἐλεήσῃ) Paul speaks of the salvation of two groups, Jews and Gentiles. According to the context (see especially 11.23) the individuals who make up such groups (τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν and πᾶς Ἰσραήλ) will come to believe in Christ either through the Church's mission or, for those Jews who have remained in unbelief, at the parousia.

How, then, is a text like Rom 5.18–19 to be related to Rom 11.25–32? The answer may be that 11.25–32 has a stronger historical perspective than 5.18–19 in that 11.25–7, 30–1 concern a series of events which Paul believed will take place in the finale of world history. So Rom 11.25 is related to Paul taking the gospel to Spain and bringing in the full number of the Gentiles<sup>88</sup> and 11.26–7 is related to Israel receiving the gospel from the coming Christ.<sup>89</sup> Paul therefore in Rom 11.25–32 has a historical framework. In Rom 5.18–19, on the other hand, he works more with ideas of participation (in Adam and in Christ). One could say it has a mythical perspective (although there are some mythical elements in Rom

---

believe correctly argues that calling Jesus κύριος, as in Rom 10.9 and 1 Cor 12.3, is a confession of faith in the exalted Jesus. The use of the verb ἐξομολογεῖσθαι also suggests a confession of faith (*Christushymnus*, 38). Such an approach is questioned by P. T. O'Brien, *Commentary on Philippians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 246–50. He points to Isa 45.24: 'All who have raged against him will come to him and be put to shame.' This, according to O'Brien, suggests that the enemies of Christ will have to bow the knee, the enemies including unbelievers and the demons (i.e. those under the earth). Further, O'Brien thinks that confessing that Jesus is κύριος simply means acknowledging him and does not imply faith in Christ (and therefore salvation for all). Therefore unbelievers will unwillingly acknowledge Jesus as κύριος and be forced to bow the knee. In view of Rom 10.9 and 1 Cor 12.3 I disagree with O'Brien and side with Hofius.

85 See Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 136–9.

86 See O. Hofius, 'Wort Gottes und Glaube bei Paulus', *Paulusstudien*, 148–74, 158.

87 See Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 139–44.

88 See *ibid.*, 131.

89 See *ibid.*, 143–5.

11.25–32 also).<sup>90</sup> My approach of highlighting the specific mythical aspects of Rom 5.12–21 parallels Bultmann's view to a certain extent. As Boring writes, Bultmann 'does not deny that the universalistic affirmations are really *there* in Romans 5; he argues that they are there only because Paul has taken up a Gnostic idea, the Adam/Christ parallel, and the analogy has proved to be too powerful for him, temporarily obscuring his "real" view . . .'<sup>91</sup> But in opposition to Bultmann, I believe that such a universal salvation was Paul's 'real' view in Rom 5.18–19. Further, the mythical background to Paul's thought is not to be found in Gnosticism<sup>92</sup> but rather in his understanding of participation in Adam and in Christ.<sup>93</sup>

Another and related way of comparing the two passages is to say that Rom 9–11 is concerned with the bringing of the reconciling word to human beings through the mission of the Church: Rom 10.8 speaks of the word which creates faith (τὸ ῥῆμα τῆς πίστεως), and 10.14–18 is about the necessity of bringing the gospel to Jews and Gentiles.<sup>94</sup> Rom 5.18–19, on the other hand, has as its central focus the reconciling act of Christ (and the act of Adam which brought enmity between God and man).<sup>95</sup> And Paul in speaking of this reconciling act of Christ which brings justification for all does not trouble himself here with the problem as to how the reconciling word is actually brought to human beings.<sup>96</sup> Again his perspective is mythical rather than historical.<sup>97</sup>

90 See especially the idea of the deliverer coming from Zion, i.e. the exalted Zion. See *ibid.*, 142 n. 195.

91 Boring, 'Universal Salvation', 284, referring to Bultmann, 'Romans 5', 154.

92 I agree with A. J. M. Wedderburn, 'The Theological Structure of Romans V.12', *NTS* 19 (1972–3) 339–54, 344, that 'Rom. v.12a does not demand a gnostic background for it to be intelligible and that indeed there are very weighty arguments against such a hypothesis'. Both Bultmann, 'Adam and Christ According to Romans 5', 154, and Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, 168–80, believe Rom 5.12a–c reflects gnostic cosmological mythology.

93 I have examined the fundamental role myth plays in theology in 'Myths, Metaphors and Models: An Enquiry into the Role of the Person as Subject in Natural Science and Theology', *Studies in Science and Theology* (Yearbook of the European Society for the Study of Science and Theology, 1999–2000; Aarhus: University of Aarhus, 2000) 115–36.

94 See Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 83–95.

95 Rom 5.18–19 also implicitly has the idea of the reconciling word because 5.17 speaks of 'those receiving the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness'.

96 Note that other universalism passages also focus on the reconciling act (see 2 Cor 5.19; Eph 1.10; Col 1.20).

97 Boring, 'Universal Salvation', tries to account for the universalist passages by saying they are concerned with God-as-king rather than God-as-judge (where the double exit idea predominates). I wonder though whether this actually works. It is true that Rom 5.12–21 has ideas of God's kingship (forms of the verb βασιλεύω occurring five times [Boring, 'Universal Salvation', 283] but note that the subjects of the verbs include death [vv. 14, 17] and sin [v. 21] as well as grace [v. 21] and Christians [v. 17]). But there are juridical terms also as Boring



## 6. Conclusions

The most natural reading of Rom 5.18–19 is therefore that just as all have participated in the sin of Adam, so all have participated in the ‘righteous act’ of Christ, i.e. his sacrificial death. Therefore, as Paul writes in Rom 5.18, acquittal which leads to life comes to all. Paul may elsewhere have the view of a ‘double exit’, some being saved and others being damned, but his clear statement in Rom 5 is to be taken with the utmost seriousness. He did not simply get carried away by his own logic. His mythical concept that all have participated in Christ’s death led him to the view that all will come through to salvation.

---

himself admits (284). In fact in Rom 5.18–19 the juridical terms are central. Note also that in the universal salvation of Israel (Rom 11.26) we have here precisely the justification (acquittal) of the ungodly (cf. Bell, *Provoked to Jealousy*, 153).