A. Potgieter

Dr. desig. A. Potgieter,
Research associate,
Dept New Testament
and Related Literature,
University of Pretoria.
E-mail:
annettepotgieter1@
gmail.com
ORCID: http://orcid.
org/0000-0002-5987-
4912

SPATIAL METAPHORS AS A MEANS OF PERSUASION IN ROMANS 5:12-21

ABSTRACT

George Lakoff and Mark Johnson's seminal book *Metaphors we live by* (1980) makes us realise that a metaphor is not merely a linguistic phenomenon, but also a conceptual, socio-historical, neural, and bodily phenomenon establishing mental models. Romans 5:12-21 abounds with with rich imagery. The rhetorical impetus of pericope is often highlighted and the imagery of persuasion is often overlooked. The value that spatial metaphors, in particular, add to Paul's argument also have a rhetorical function. This article investigates persuasion in Romans 5:12-21, drawing on spatial metaphors.

1. INTRODUCTION

It is easy to forget that believers did, in fact, live in real time and space (Breytenbach 2002:248). Paul engages a Roman audience already habituated to the gospel. He draws on a myriad of images, with which the audience would have been *au fait*, and stacks these images to make his argument convincing. The rhetorical impetus of Romans 5:12-21 is often highlighted (Snyman 2016:1-6; Cosby 1991:209-226). Noted rhetorical devices include the anaphora (5:15,16); the antonomasia (5:14); the homoioteleuten (-μα endings); the symploke (5:16); the chiasmus (ἐβασίλευσεν (5:14); ὁ θάνατος (5:14); ὁ θάνατος (5:17); ἐβασίλευσεν (5:17) and ἐβασίλευσεν; ἡ ἁμαρτία; ἡ χάρις; βασιλεύσῃ (5:21); the antithetical parallelism

(5:18, 19); the repetition of the one; the contrast between the one and the many, as well as the comparison between Jesus Christ and Adam.

However, metaphors as a persuasive tool are often overlooked,[1] especially, the value that spatial metaphors add to an argument. I will posit that spatial metaphors heighten the argument in Romans 5:12-21, drawing on the container metaphor as a heuristic tool to help elucidate Paul's argument and reimagine the imagery Paul initially intended in order to captivate his audience. First, I will define spatial metaphors, provide a brief overview of the argument of Romans 5:12-21, and highlight metaphors in the argument. I will then conclude with remarks on the container metaphor proffered.

2.   DEFINING SPATIAL METAPHORS

With their seminal book *Metaphors we live by*, Lakoff and Johnson (1980) played an instrumental role in overturning the misconception that metaphors are mere poetic tropes, giving rise to the "cognitive turn". They cogently argue that metaphors pervade everyday life expressed in thought and actions (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:3). 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). Human beings think in terms of metaphors. It has become such a part of our world that we do it without even being actively aware thereof. It is not surprising that metaphors and metonymies are central notions that reflect how people cope with the world around them (Raible 2016:40). This is relevant as space may be understood as "an active milieu that both influences and is influenced by social interactions" (Thate 2014:282).

A conceptual metaphor consists of two conceptual domains, one of which 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).

This brings us closer to an understanding of spatial metaphors. There are two categories of spatial metaphors, namely orientational and ontological. Orientational metaphors derive from our perception of our body within a physical environment, thus providing a frame for spatial orientation (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:14). Determining our position within the frame of spatial orientation is crucial. To comprehend our experience

---

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

in terms of physical objects and substances enriches the framework even more (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:25). Ontological metaphors, like orientational metaphors, are transmitted from the experiences with physical objects, especially our own body (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:25).

Two types of ontological metaphors can be deduced in Romans 5:12-21, namely personification and container metaphors. Personification involves human attributes being distributed to nonhuman entities (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:33; Kövecses 2005:39). Kövecses (2005:39) rightly remarks that personification utilises the best source domain, namely "ourselves". Container metaphors function on the same premise as orientational metaphors, as an in-out orientation projection in established entities (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:29). Human beings are containers with the surface of their skins functioning as the boundary to define the inside and outside entities that help us comprehend events, actions, activities, and states of being (Lakoff & Johnson 1980:29-30).

Metaphors as a means of persuasion are often overlooked, especially spatial metaphors. Di Biase-Dyson (2016:45-68) makes a convincing case that spatial metaphors have a rhetorical function. She focuses her research especially on Egyptian wisdom literature. Elucidating spatial metaphors concerned with movement, particularly along a path, enhances the argumentative value of a text. The source domain, "life is a journey", prevails in Di-Biase Dyson's examples, indicating that spatial metaphors are instrumental in education. They play a role in delineating good or bad behaviour and elicit good or bad life choices. A similar case that spatial metaphors heighten the argument can be made in Romans 5:12-21 as the human body becomes the place that can be dominated by either sin or Christ. This leads to either death or life, thus depicting a clear picture to believers as to whom they should be obedient.

3.   ARGUMENT OVERVIEW

Romans 5:12-21 forms part of a larger argument (Romans 5 to 8), framed by 5:1-11 and 8:31-39, after the introductory passage in Romans 5:1-11, in which Paul establishes that believers change from being God's enemies to being God's friends. In his first section of the argument, Paul compares the grace of God, in which the believers now stand firmly, with the power of sin. Paul develops a comparison between the power of Christ and the power of sin embodied in the analogy between Christ and Adam. The superior power is illustrated as Christ. In fact, Paul portrays the believers' previous situation and their current one, becoming reconciled with God. Since the grace of God that leads to justification exceeds sin, Paul poses the

question as to whether this would allow those who believe in Christ to continue sinning.

4. SPATIAL METAPHORS IN ROMANS 5:12-21

4.1 Romans 5:12-14

Paul personifies both sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία)[2] and death (ὁ θάνατος) in Romans 5:12. The definite article with the noun in ἡ ἁμαρτία and ὁ θάνατος indicates both sin and death as forces (Smyth 1956:1122). However, Paul often deviates from this formula as in the next verse.[3] Just as sin came into the human world through one human being (ὥσπερ δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν [5:12a]) and death through sin (καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος [5:12b]), death spread to all human beings (καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν [5:12c]). These powers are proffered as the cause that all sinned (ἐφ᾽ ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον [5:12d]). Paul elucidates the state of the human world affected by these forces. He describes how, until the law, sin prevailed in the human world (ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου ἁμαρτία ἦν ἐν κόσμῳ [5:13a]. By contrast, sin is not charged where there is no law (ἁμαρτία δὲ οὐκ ἐλλογεῖται μὴ ὄντος νόμου (5:13b-c)). However, death reigned from Adam until Moses (ἀλλὰ ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος ἀπὸ Ἀδὰμ μέχρι Μωϋσέως [5:14a]) and on those who did not sin, on the basis of Adam's transgression (καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς μὴ ἁμαρτήσαντας ἐπὶ τῷ ὁμοιώματι τῆς παραβάσεως Ἀδὰμ [5:14]), who is the mould for the one to come (ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος [5:14c]).

Paul's use of the phrase δι᾽ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ("through one human") in Romans 5:12a is significant on two levels.[4] First, the instrumentality evoked by the preposition διά reminds the audience of διὰ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστου in Romans 5:11 (Wolter 2014:341). Secondly, the noun ἄνθρωπος

---

2   This is the first time that sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) appears in this chapter and 23 times in Romans 5-8. It is interesting to note that sin appears 5 times in Romans 5 (5:12, 13*2, 20, 21); 8 times in Romans 6 (6:1, 2, 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14), and 10 times in Romans 7 (7:7, 8*2, 9, 11, 13*3, 17, 20). The word does not occur in Romans 8.

3   Zahn (1925:263) remarks that sin with the article provides a familiarity that all human beings already know of this ruling force.

4   Jewett (2007:373) mentions that δι᾽ ἑνὸς 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 numerous examples indicating that this phrase is also used in battles (for example, Isocratus, Oracles, 24.6; Polybius, Histories, 3.107.14.2). However, Zahn (1925:263) notes that it is evident that Genesis 2:16; 3:1-19 has the phrase "through the one". Paul deviates from this Jewish tradition. See also Wolter (2014:342); Wilckens (1978:314).

is used in a generic sense as "humanity", emphasising that all human beings are affected by the actions of one human being (Schlier 1977:161; Lohse 2003:174; *contra* Michel 1966:186). The human being in question can be inferred as Adam.[5] 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).[6] In addition, the phrase διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας (5:12b) is parallel with δι᾿ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου (5:12a) (Wilckens 1978:315).

Adam is not portrayed as inherently evil[7] or as the root of the problem (*contra* Wolter 2014:342).[8] There is no mention of Adam's trespass or misstep in Romans 5:12. Rather, Adam is the vehicle of the problem.[9] Sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) enters the human world (εἰς τὸν κόσμον) through Adam. In this sense, Adam may be perceived as a victim who needs to be saved. However, with Romans 5:1-11 as frame of reference, Jesus Christ will save humanity. Moreover, the turmoil of the human world is obvious in the phrase εἰς τὸν κόσμον that implies earth, with a special focus on its human inhabitants,[10] and mirrors εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους in Romans 5:12c, emphasising human beings as the topic of Paul's current argument (Wilckens 1978:315).[11] The contrast between one human being (ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου) and all human beings (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους) causes the predominance of death that spreads

---

5   Even though ἄνθρωπος is used in a generic sense, it may infer Adam, as is explicit in Romans 5:14 (Schlier 1977:160; Wolter 2014:342; Byrne 1996:173; Fitzmyer 1993:411; Zahn 1925:267).

6   The traditional understanding of Genesis 1-3 did not yet exist in Paul's time (Stowers 1994:86-87). The Adam tradition, deriving from Genesis 3:16, occurs in a wide range of post-biblical Jewish literature (4 Ezra 3:7; 2 Apoc. Bar. 17:2-3; 23:4; 48:42-43; Bib. Ant. 13:8; 2 Enoch 30:16). Some forms of the tradition place the blame solely on Eve (Sir 25:24; Apoc. Mos. 14) or the devil (Wis 2:23-24 (Byrne 1996:174; Zeller 1985:115-116).

7   Some passages, among which Adam and Eve 44:2; 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).

8   In post-biblical Judaism, sin derives from either Adam or Eve and is viewed as having spread from them to establish its dominion over the entire human race (Stowers 1994:86).

9   Zeller (1985:114-115) also makes this point clear, indicating that Paul is not referring to the sin of Adam, but to present sin as a power that comes into the world to control people's life space (*Lebensraum*).

10   See Bauer *et al.* (2000:561). Morris (1988:229) maintains that human beings and not the earth specifically are intended. However, the emphasis might be on humanity, but the whole of creation is still implied. Consequently, I translate this as "human world".

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

to all human beings. This is an important motif, as all human beings are continually implied throughout the argument of Romans 5:12-21. The verbs εἰσέρχομαι ("come into") and διέρχομαι ("go through") suggest the movement of entering a space.

Drawing on Lakoff and Johnson's container metaphor as a heuristic tool, it may be postulated that, in this instance, the human world is envisioned as the container. Adam forms part of this container and functions as the instrument whereby sin and death enter and pass through this container (εἰς τὸν κόσμον).[12] In addition, on a conceptual level, Adam is a reference point for all human beings (Raible 2016:26).[13] The container metaphor helps us visualise the entrance of sin and death that impacts on all human beings as the impetus for a structural change of the entire cosmic *raison d'être*. Sin and death are now forces in the container that is tainted and there is no way in or out. Human beings are the container in which these forces prevail. Paul does not enquire about the origin of sin and death, but he merely states that these forces are within the human world.[14] The problem is that human beings are in the container with these negative forces.

At this point of the argument, sin is depicted as a force, through which another force, death in Romans 5:12b (διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος), has entered the human world. Lakoff and Johnson (1980:72-73) describe this as "the substance goes into the object" that functions as a metaphorical extension for the container metaphor, illustrating the concept of

---

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

13 *Contra* Michel (1966:186) views Adam as the one through whom the rank of mankind goes. This view derives 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.

14 In Greek, the idea is that even evil influences are within and not outside the world (for example, Plato, Soph.219b: εἰς ὑσίαν ἄγειν (Stauffer, "εἰς," Kittel & Friedrich, TDNT 2:423). 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 human beings belong (Stowers 1994:87).

"causation". Nonetheless, the verb εἰσέρχομαι ("come into") might be construed as a metaphor of dominion in Romans 5:12a.[15] On the contrary, Bauer *et al.* (2000:293-294) interpret εἰσέρχομαι as having no negative connotation in Romans 5:12. The verb denotes "to move into a geographical space or any other type of localities as a goal" (Bauer *et al.* 2000:293-294). However, *LSJ*[16] and the *EWNT*[17] suggest that εἰσέρχομαι ("come into") draws on the source domain of contestation, meaning "to invade, to force", and that, particularly when used for people, its meaning is "to occupy". Accordingly, ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθεν signals a metaphor of dominion. Space is intrinsically linked with dominion, just as a dominator always has a specific location that is dominated. The notion of occupation is mapped onto the target domain depicting sin as a force that occupies the human world.

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 that the implication of sin entering the human world, namely death, spreads through it in all human beings. The universality of sin is assumed (Zahn 1925:262; Fitzmyer 1993:417). The concept that sin leads to death is pre-Pauline and appears in Jewish sources prior to, and contemporaneoulsy with Paul (Wis. 2:24; 1 Enoch 5:9; 4 Ezra 7:62-131; Philo, Mos. 2:147) (Hultgren 2011:221; Cranfield 1975:281; Fitzmyer 1993:408). However, in Romans 5:14, Paul personifies death as a force in its own right,[18] not merely as a punishment for sin, but also as a king who rules. The source domain βασιλεύω ("to be a king") conveys to have royal power, to dominate and to have an absolute personal power, or to be a dominating influence (Spicq 1994: *TNLT* 1:256; *LSJ* 309).

The fact that both sin and death occupy the human world as hostile forces ineluctably calls for God's saving action. In addition, as sin is a hostile force, the implication is that human beings are also hostile towards God. Sin is not a private matter, but a collective universal problem in human beings (Wilckens 1978:315). Referring to the argument in Romans

---

15 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 (Michel 1966:186; Kuss 1957:227; Wilckens 1978:314; *Contra* Wolter 2014:342).

16 For example, εἰς τὸν πόλεμον v.l. in X. *An.*7.1.27; εἰ. εἰς τοὺς ἐφήβους "enter the ranks of the Ephebi", Id. *Cyr.*1.5.1.

17 The verb εἰσέρχομαι in conjunction with people delineates the nuance "in Besitz nehmen" (Mk. 9:25; Mt. 12:45). In Romans 5:12, Paul uses εἰσέρχομαι as "das Eindringen der Sündenmacht" (Weder "εἰσέρχομαι," Balz & Schneider 2011, *EWNT* 972-975).

18 Death is also a cosmic force (Rom. 8:38; 5:14, 17; 7:5; 1 Cor. 15, 21, 22, 26; 15:54; 2 Cor. 4:12, and especially 1 Cor. 3:22) (Schlier 1977:160). Death is the manifestation of God's wrath (Rom. 2:5, 8; 3:5; 5:9; Eph. 5:6; Col. 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:10; 5:9).

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 human beings to him.

4.2   Romans 5:15-17

In Romans 5:15-17, the argument continues as the difference between the reign of Christ and the reign of sin crystallises. Paul negates that the grace-gift is not like the trespass (ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς τὸ παράπτωμα, οὕτως καὶ τὸ χάρισμα [5:15a]). Paul argues in *a typical a minori ad maius style* that, if many died through the trespass of one (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι οἱ πολλοὶ ἀπέθανον [5:15b]), how much more has the favour of God and the gift in beneficence through the one human Jesus Christ abounded to the many (πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι τῇ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐπερίσσευσεν [5:15c]). Paul clearly draws on the source domain of benefaction language onto which he maps the Jewish-Israelite belief that God is merciful and compassionate towards humanity (Breytenbach 2010:226).[19] The focus in Paul's argument remains the believers' relationship with God and the extrapolating importance of salvation. The action of Adam in the many (5:15b) is supplanted by the action of Christ, as the phrase εἰς τοὺς πολλούς designates (Michel 1966:188). The preposition εἰς denotes a result indicating the abundance found in Christ when human beings have a relationship with God.

Paul continues that the gift is not through the one who sinned (καὶ οὐχ ὡς δι ἑνὸς ἁμαρτήσαντος τὸ δώρημα [5:16a]). A verdict from one results in condemnation (τὸ μὲν γὰρ κρίμα ἐξ ἑνὸς εἰς κατάκριμα [5:16b]), but a favour from many trespasses results in justification (τὸ δὲ χάρισμα ἐκ πολλῶν παραπτωμάτων εἰς δικαίωμα [5:16c]). The trespass of one causes death to reign through the one (εἰ γὰρ τῷ τοῦ ἑνὸς παραπτώματι ὁ θάνατος ἐβασίλευσεν διὰ τοῦ ἑνός [5:17a]). How much more will they who receive the abundance of the favour and gift of righteousness in life (πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης λαμβάνοντες ἐν ζωῇ [5:17b]) reign through the one Jesus Christ (βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ [5:17c]).

The implications of the action of one are significant. The metaphor of dominion emerges again, as death is personified as a ruler who manages his rule through the one (διὰ τοῦ ἑνός). The reign of believers through Christ shall be superior to the rule of death (15:17b). The abundance motif is even

---

19 Harrison (2003:234) argues that Paul formulates his understanding of the eschatological fullness of grace within a Jewish matrix, and that his 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.

enhanced as Paul stacks images of the abundance of favour (τὴν περισσείαν τῆς χάριτος) with the gift of righteousness (καὶ τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης) to describe the new state of life for believers.

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). Believers can be in the locative space ἐν ζωῇ ("in life"), because a change in status occurred.[20] This life contrasts with the dominion of death and sin, which is in death (Rom. 5:21). Just as death ruled, now life becomes a place ruled by the recipients of the gift of favour (Michel 1966:190). The passive of λαμβάνω ("to receive favour, which is like a special reward") illustrates God's activity (Bauer *et al.* 2000:585). The verb indicates a transfer of kings, as the abundance of favour drawing on the source domain of benefaction indicates that believers are no longer in death, but are now in life. This space of being in life is made possible through διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, as the preposition διά is employed instrumentally. The phrase τοῦ ἑνός adds extra emphasis on the one real likeness between Christ and Adam, namely that one man's actions determine the existence of many (Cranfield 1975:287).

The apodosis in Romans 5:17c (βασιλεύσουσιν διὰ τοῦ ἑνὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) explicitly states that these recipients of favour, associated with Christ's saving power, will rule in this life through Jesus Christ. The domination of Rome brought a new culture with the Roman civic cult that celebrates the rule of a single Caesar. Moreover, Paul turns this notion around: believers will share in the dominion as kings through Jesus Christ. The temporal change of βασιλεύω also signifies the change of Lords taking place, as believers transferred from the reign of death will participate in the triumph of favour (Lohse 2003:181; Byrne 1996:180). The contaminated container is cleared of all contamination.

4.3   Romans 5:18-21

The inference drawn on the dissimilarity between the grace-gift and the trespass on account of the actions of either one unfolds in Romans 5:18-21.

---

20 There is an inversion of the structure of the protasis and apodosis. Instead of ἥ ζωὴ βασιλεύσει correlating to ὁ θάνατος ἐβασσ the wealthy become kings themselves, that will not only replace the reign of death with the reign of life, but also make the wealthy become kings themselves. It will not only replace the reign of death with the reign of life, but also make ἴλευσεν. 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).

The elliptically formulated Romans 5:18[21] essentially sums up the results of the actions of the one. Just as the one trespass led all human beings to condemnation (ἄρα οὖν ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα [5:18a]), so too the one righteous deed led all human beings to justification of life (οὕτως καὶ δι᾽ ἑνὸς δικαιώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς [5:18b]).

The result of the action through one δι᾽ ἑνός[22] in all human beings (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους)[23] is underscored.[24] The preposition εἰς ("into") indicates motion towards a place, *i.e.* all human beings (πάντας ἀνθρώπους) (Bauer *et al.* 2000:288). Accordingly, the phrase εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους may be viewed as a container metaphor identical to Romans 5:14b. Romans 5:18 mimics Romans 5:16.[25] Just as the one leads to condemnation (εἰς κατάκριμα), so too the other leads to the justification of life (εἰς δικαίωσιν ζωῆς).

Paul elaborates on the contrasting results of the actions of the one. Just as, through the disobedience of the one, many were made sinners (ὥσπερ γὰρ διὰ τῆς παρακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἁμαρτωλοὶ κατεστάθησαν οἱ πολλοί [5:19a]), so too through the one's obedience many will be made righteous (οὕτως καὶ διὰ τῆς ὑπακοῆς τοῦ ἑνὸς δίκαιοι κατασταθήσονται οἱ πολλοί [5:19b]). But the law slipped in (νόμος δὲ παρεισῆλθεν [5:20a]). The purpose of the law slipping in is that there might be more violations (ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα [5:20b]), but where sin increased (οὗ δὲ ἐπλεόνασεν ἡ ἁμαρτία [5:20c]), favour overflowed (ὑπερεπερίσσευσεν ἡ χάρις [5:20d]). The reason why favour overflows becomes clear in Romans 5:21. Just as sin reigned in death (ὥσπερ ἐβασίλευσεν ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ [5:21a]), so too favour might reign through righteousness in

21   Authors, especially of letters, have their own style and use freer ellipses. See BDF, §481. Romans 5:18 ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς κατάκριμα, οὕτως would be unintelligible without the preceding clause.

22   The word ἑνός should be taken as masculine and not as neutral, agreeing with παραπτώματος, as this section is concerned with the relationship between Adam and Christ (Cranfield 1975:289; *contra* Longenecker 2016:597). Longenecker (2016:597) argues that ἑνός must be neuter, as it refers to παραπτώματος . The comparison in Romans 5:18 is with δικαιωματος.

23   Interpreters often understand Romans 5:18-19 as envisioning redemption universally, although some view Romans 5:17 as restricting the scope with faith (Hultgren 2011:230).

24   Paul emphasises two contrasting causes with διά and an ultimate end with εἰς and in-between their equivalent extension in εἰς (BDF §481).

25   *BDAG* (2000:198) notes 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. This preposition can be used to refer to a directed action and can also describe the purpose of the result of that action ὡς δι᾽ ἑνὸς παραπτώματος ... εἰς κατάκριμα (Rom. 5:18) (Porter 1992:152).

eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord (οὕτως καὶ ἡ χάρις βασιλεύσῃ διὰ δικαιοσύνης εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν **[5:21b]**).

The principal clause in 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) **that specifically rules in** εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ("in eternal life"). Instead of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη)[26] 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"). This emphasises the effect of Jesus Christ in the human world and the occurrences in Romans 5:17, 18, 19 and 21 form part of a pattern that repeats διὰ Χριστοῦ. This highlights the instrumentality of Christ or the Son.[27]

5. SPATIALITY IN ROMANS 5:12-21

Paul introduces two forces that have affected the container in such a way that God's saving action was necessary. The verbs of movement in Romans 5:12 (εἰσέρχομαι and διέρχομαι) are bound to two forces sin (ἡ ἁμαρτία) and death (ὁ θάνατος), which gain access to the container through the figure of Adam. Throughout the argument, Paul develops the container metaphor that filters into the description of the two forces.

Paul's creativity in generating new metaphors prevails with his use of the personifications of 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.[28] Sin does not draw on the Greek notion of ἁμαρτία, denoting "a mistake, error".[29] In addition, from a Jewish point of view, sin is usually deciphered from the perspective of the Mosaic Law. In Romans 5:13, however, sin is already present in the world before the law. Sin is perceived as an invading force, just as εἰσέρχομαι may be interpreted as a metaphor of dominion in Romans 5:12.

On the other hand, death is also personified. This personification is less unfamiliar to the first-century world,[30] but Paul adds a twist. He introduces death as a force that came through sin. This idea is not pertinent in the traditions found in Genesis. Death is portrayed as a ruler who reigns

---

26   In the pericope Romans 6:15-23, righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is personified.

27   See Romans 5:1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10 (twice), 11 (twice).

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

29   *LSJ*: ἁμαρτία.

30   For example, Euripides, *Alcestis* (5th century BC).

from the time of Adam to the time of 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 gifts"); ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ("the favour of God"); ἡ δωρεὰ ἐν χάριτι ("the gift in favour"), and ultimately the rule of believers in life with Christ to indicate Christ as the superior force.

Paul's development of the container metaphor evokes two possible outcomes for people. The metaphor is repeated in Romans 5:18 (εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους), highlighting all human beings; it draws attention to the consequences of Adam in contrast to Jesus Christ. The effect of Adam's trespass in Romans 5:18 is applicable to all human beings and leads to condemnation. On the other hand, the effect of Christ, which also applies to all human beings, leads to life and justification.

Coherent with the container being associated with these two possible outcomes, the first outcome based on sin as an invasive force, the rule of death as well as the repeating trespass all lead to condemnation. The envisioned container in Romans 5:19 has enveloped human beings in a rebellious state. The disobedience of one caused human beings to be sinners. This openly indicates subversiveness. Within the context of first-century Rome, the audience would have been aware of the importance of obedience. For the Roman military, obedience to a general could determine life or death, as the success of the military depended on their discipline (Rankov 2007:64). However, the second outcome refers to the obedience of Jesus Christ, which makes the container righteous. This is reminiscent of God's saving action.

If the audience has not understood God's saving action and still view the law as a way to curb sin, Romans 5:20 frustrates 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.[31] 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 that sin as a force used to be a king.

---

31   Lakoff & Johnson (1980:41) remark that metaphors are seldom haphazard, but often configure coherent systems, thus reflecting conceptualisations of experiences.

Sin is compared to favour as another force that is also personified, but 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 maps it onto the Jewish notion of the abundance of God's mercy (Breytenbach 2010:238).

Paul's illustration of the ruling forces of sin and death is continually surpassed and supplanted by favour through "Jesus Christ our Lord". In addition, unlike these forces, believers are under the life-bringing rule of favour through Jesus Christ their Lord. Within the rule of kings, Paul illustrates the good rule and the bad rule. Consequently, the metaphors proffer two possibilities for human beings, namely be under God's favour through "Jesus Christ our Lord" or under sin. This choice is clearly described in Romans 6, where human beings' relationship with these kings/forces becomes relevant.

6.   CONCLUSION

Paul's language in Romans 5:12-21 abounds in imagery, which his initial audience would have picked up in following his discourse. The rhetorical impetus of Romans 5:12-21 is often highlighted, as it should be. Nonetheless, Paul also draws on spatial metaphors that underscore his argument and contribute to its persuasiveness. The body of a believer is illustrated as the pivotal place where forces are at work. Human beings, their bodies, become the space that is dominated by either sin or Christ. Accordingly, a believer needs to be obedient to either "Jesus Christ our Lord" or to "sin". Paul's play on this spatial metaphor forms an integral part of the persuasiveness in his argument that believers should continually orientate themselves towards God by being obedient to Jesus Christ. In addition, his use of the container metaphor highlights the basis of his argument, namely urging his audence to choose to submit to Jesus Christ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BALZ, H. & SCHNEIDER, G., EDS.
2011. Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. (Teil 1–3) W. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2011.

BLACK, M.
1973. *The New Century Bible Commentary Romans*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans.

BLASS, F., A. DEBRUNNER & R.W. FUNK
1961. *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian literature*. Chicago, ILL: The University of Chicago Press.

BAUER, W., DANKER, F.W., ARNDT, W.F. & F.W. GINGRICH
2000. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian literature*. 3rd edition. Chicago, ILL: The University of Chicago Press. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226028958.001.0001

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* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.), pp. 245-256.

2010. 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 (Leiden*:* Brill), pp. 171-186*.*

BYRNE, B.S.J.
1996. *Romans.* Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press. Sacra Pagina Series. Volume 6.

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* (Sheffield: JSOT Press), pp. 209-226.

CRANFIELD, C.E.B.
1975. *A critical and exegetical commentary on The Epistle to the Romans*. The International Critical Commentary, Volume 1. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

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. (Berlin: Edition Topoi), pp. 45-68.

FITZMYER, J.A.
1993. *Romans*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday.

GARLINGTON, D.B.
> 1993. The obedience of faith in the letter to the Romans. *Westminister Theological Journal* 55:87-112.

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

HARRISON, J.R.
> 2003. *Paul's language of grace in its Graeco-Roman context*. Reihe 172. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. WUNT 2.

HULTGREN, A.J.
> 2011. *Paul's letter to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans.

JEWETT, R.
> 2007. *Romans*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

KITTEL, G., & G. FRIEDRICH, EDS.
> 1964–1976. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

KÖVECSES, Z.
> 2005. *Metaphor in culture – Universality and variation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408

> 2010. *Metaphor – A practical introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KUSS, O.
> 1957. *Der Römerbrief. Erste lieferung (Röm. 1,1 bis 6,11)*. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

LAKOFF, G. & JOHNSON, M.
> 1980. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, ILL: The University of Chicago Press.

LOHSE, E.
> 2003. *Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

LONGENECKER, R.N.
> 2016. *The Epistle to the Romans – A commentary on the Greek text.* The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans.

MICHEL, O.
> 1966. *Der Brief an die Römer. Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar under das Neue Testament Band IV – 14 Auflage*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

MORAN, R.
> 1996. Artifice and persuasion: The work of metaphor in the rhetoric. In: A. Oksenberg Rorty (ed.), *Essays on Aristotle's rhetoric* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), pp. 385-398.

Morris, L.
1988. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm B. Eerdmans.

Porter, S.E.
1992. *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

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 (Berlin: Edition Topoi), pp. 21-43.

Rankov, B.
2007. Military forces. In: P. Sabin, H. Van Wees & M. Whitby (eds), *The Cambridge history of Greek and Roman warfare* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 30-75. https://doi.org/10.1017/CHOL9780521782746.003

Schlier, H.
1977. *Der Römerbrief.* Herdes Theologischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament Band VI. Freiburg: Herder*.*

Semino, E.
2008. *Metaphor in discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smyth, H.W.
1956. *Greek grammar.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Snyman, A.
2016. Persuasion in Romans 5:12-21. *Hervormde Teologiese Studies*:1-6. https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v72i3.3076

Spicq, C.
1994. *Theological lexicon of the New Testament.* Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 volumes. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Southall, D.J.
2008. *Rediscovering righteousness in Romans – Personified dikaiosyné within Metaphoric and Narrational settings*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, WUNT 240. https://doi.org/10.1628/978-3-16-151583-5

Stowers, S.K.
1994. *A rereading of Romans – Justice, Jews and Gentiles*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

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), Paul's theology of union and participation (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, WUNT 384), pp. 281-327.

Wɪʟᴄᴋᴇɴs, U.
    1978. *Der Brief an die Römer*, *Teilband 1: Röm. 1-5*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Zürich: Benziger Verlag.

Wᴏʟᴛᴇʀ, M.
    2014. *Der Brief an die Römer*, *Teilband 1: Röm. 1-8*. Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Göttingen: Neukirchener Theologie Patmos Verlag.

Zᴀʜɴ, T.
    1925. *Der Brief des Paulus and die Römer*. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung Dr. Werner Scholl.

Zᴇʟʟᴇʀ, D.
    1985. *Der Brief an die Römer*. Regensburger Neues Testament. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet Regensburg.