

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

11-1-1969

A Study of ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ in Romans 6:5

John Bauer

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_bauerj@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>

Digital Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)
Commons

Network

Recommended Citation

Bauer, John, "A Study of ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ in Romans 6:5" (1969). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 768.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/768>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

A STUDY OF ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ IN ROMANS 6:5

A Research Paper Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Divinity

by

John A. Bauer

November 1969

73286

Approved by:

Victor Bartling

Advisor

Reader

12-18-69
research paper

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction: Objectives of the Study	1
Limitations of the Study	2
II. THE OCCURENCE OF <i>ἐμοίωνα</i> IN OTHER CONTEXTS	3
Classical Usage	3
Old Testament-Septuagint	3
New Testament References	4
Patristic References	5
III. THE LOCUS CLASSICUS - ROMANS 6:5	9
The Meaning of <i>ἐμοίωνα</i>	9
Grammatical Concerns	14
Relation to v. 5a	14
Relation to v. 5b	17
<i>ἐμοίωνα</i> and the Immediate Context	20
Linguistic Connections	20
Theological Relationship	21
IV. SUMMARY	30
Conclusions on the Basis of the Study	30
Related Questions for Future Study	32
Bibliography	35

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction: Objectives of the Study

Crucial to an understanding of Romans 6:5 is a determination of the meaning of the Greek word *ἐνοίωμα*, and of its relation to the rest of the sentence. A quick glance at any bibliography on Romans by the casual observer would reveal that, not only Romans 6:1-11, but this word alone has evoked much discussion from commentators. Such an investigation would also disclose another fact: there has not been much agreement about what the word means or what its relation is to the verse in question.

What gives this problem particular weight is the fact that *ἐνοίωμα* occurs here in a baptismal context. In fact, many theologians feel that this section (vss. 1-11) comprises the significant section of St. Paul's theology of baptism. Thus pressing questions arise. What does *ἐνοίωμα* mean? Is its force abstract or concrete? What is its relation to v. 5a? How does it fit into v. 5b, if at all? Does the immediate context have anything to say to its meaning and force?

It is the purpose of this paper to review some of the answers that theologians have proposed to these questions. A further objective, on the basis of the proposed solutions

to the problem, is an attempt to formulate a statement of what St. Paul did mean by this word (if this is possible!), and then to suggest some further areas of study which appear essential for a satisfactory determination of the meaning and force of *ἐνοίημα*.

Limitations of the Study

First, the discussion of the extra-biblical and biblical occurrences of *ἐνοίημα* is presented in cursory fashion to highlight the range of meaning that the term possesses. Problems that exist in the various references, e.g., Phil. 2:7, are not considered in depth. Second, while the obvious baptismal context cannot be ignored, it is discussed only within the framework of Romans 6:1-11. To delve into the full implications of baptismal theology in this section would involve the totality of St. Paul's theology of baptism, and would be beyond the scope of this study.

The procedure has already been intimated. First, there is a review of the extra-biblical and biblical occurrences of *ἐνοίημα*. The possible meanings of *ἐνοίημα* will be discussed, followed by an investigation of its relationship within v. 5 as a unit. Reference will then be made to the immediate context, considering both linguistic and theological connections. It is impossible to keep all these elements strictly separated in discussion, and hence they will be utilized from time to time where they clarify the issue at hand, e.g., context appears in grammatical aspects, etc.

CHAPTER II

THE OCCURRENCE OF ΟΜΟΙΩΜΑ IN OTHER CONTEXTS

Classical Usage

Surprisingly, *ὁμοίωμα* is rare in classical literature. It is used by Plato, Aristotle, and Epicurus¹ always in the concrete sense of "copy," rather than in the more abstract sense of "likeness" or "correspondence." Many times it is synonymous with *εἰκὼν*. In Plato's *Phaedrus* (250b) the terms are equivalent: *ὁμοιώματα* and *εἰκόνες* are in Plato the earthly copies of the heavenly prototypes.

But there is often a distinction between the two words. This may be formulated as follows: *εἰκὼν* represents the object, whereas *ὁμοίωμα* emphasizes the similarity, but with no need for an inner connection between the original and the copy.²

Old Testament-Septuagint

In the Septuagint, *ὁμοίωμα* is somewhat more common.³ The word is used to translate *תְּבַרְבְּרֵי*, *תְּבַרְבְּרֵי*, *תְּבַרְבְּרֵי*, and infrequently *מִצָּרְפָּה*.⁴ Several passages indicate that *ὁμοίωμα* means a "copy" made like something else and congruent with it. Ex. 20:4 illustrates this in the commandment, "You shall not make for yourself a carved image or any likeness of anything in heaven or on earth beneath or in the waters under the earth" (cf. also Deut. 4:16; Is. 40:19). This concept, however, leads to the sense of "form" with no

further thought of a "copy" as in Deut. 4:12, where Yahweh speaks from the midst of the fire: "you heard the sound of words but saw no shape, there was only a voice." The word also appears frequently in Ezekiel (cf. 1:26, 25:15). In sum, *εἰκόνα* is used in two senses in the Septuagint: (a) a "copy" ("image" in the sense of "similitude"); (b) "form."

New Testament References

In the New Testament, *εἰκόνα* occurs six times. Beside Rev. 9:7, the word appears exclusively in Paul. Schnackenburg discusses these references. He feels that Rom. 1:23 depends for its wording on Ps. 105:20 (LXX). What is surprising here, he notes, is the appearance of *εἰκόνα* with *εἰκόν*. Both expressions can signify the same thing, but here they are distinguished: *εἰκόνα* is a copy of a form (*εἰκόν*), namely of a perishable man or beasts.

Schnackenburg asserts that the second Old Testament meaning, "form," is clearly to be preferred in Rev. 9:7, as in Rom. 8:3 and Phil. 2:7. He sees "outer form" in distinction to "inner being" stressed in the latter passages. In Rom. 8:3 the Son of God is sent in the form of *ὄψις ἀνομιῶν*, but according to His inner being He is not affected by these ruinous powers. The "form of man" in Phil. 2:7 declares that Jesus was more than this according to His being. Schnackenburg, referring to the observation of Martin Dibelius, stresses the

importance of seeing *ἑμοίωμα* in this context as attaining to the same significance as *μορφή, εἶδος*, or *σχῆμα*.

Rom. 5:14 is instructive in that it displays how *ἑμοίωμα* can refer to an event. Hence, an event need not always concern a perceptible form; it can also have a "form". Men who lived between the sin of Adam and the Lawgiver at Sinai did not sin *ἐπὶ τῷ ἑμοιώματι* of Adam's sin, that is, they did not transgress a formal prohibition. Hence the expression is to be understood, "in a copy of the transgression of Adam" (modal), or "corresponding to Adam's sin" (*κατὰ* with the accusative).

Patristic References

10

Schnackenburg again provides a good review of how some of the church fathers used *ἑμοίωμα*. In one category, the term appears to be used with a reduced, more abstract meaning ("similarity"). So Ignatius of Antioch writes (Tr. ix,2), *οὕτως (scil. Χριστοῦ) καὶ κατὰ τὸ ἑμοίωμα ἡμᾶς τοὺς πιστεύοντες αὐτῷ οὕτως ἔγενετ' ὁ πατήρ*. The similarity or resemblance does not relate to the resurrected body but to the fact of the resurrection. The "Shepherd of Hermas" employs *ἑμοίωμα* for abstract instead of concrete things (m. IV,1,1; IV,1,9).

A second category concerns the possible influence of Plato on the fathers. Clement of Alexandria, Strom. VIII,23,1,

writes that the ὀνόματα are σύμβολα τῶν νοημάτων, τὰ νοήματα εἰκονήματα καὶ ἐκτυπώματα τῶν ἐποκειμένων.

The conceptual pair "pattern" and "copy" appear in the prayer to the Λόγος: Δὸς δι' ἡμῶν τοῖς σοῖς ἐπομένους παραγγέλμασιν τὸ εἰκονήματα πληρῶσαι τῆς εἰκόνος (Paed.

III,101,1). In Strom. VII, 52,3 σύμβολον and εἰκονήματα are used synonymously. Cyril of Jerusalem appears to have been influenced by this speech. It would seem he has taken over εἰκονήματα from Rom. 6:5, but interprets it in a Platonic sense through the concept μίμησις (Myst. cat. II,5,6).

"Nevertheless in his view baptism is not simply the εἰκονήματα; rather in baptism something happens that has a similarity to the event that took place in Christ's case (cf. III,2)."

Schnackenburg's summary conclusions lead us directly to the passage at hand, Rom. 6:5.

The result of this linguistic investigation may be summarized somewhat as follows: The Pauline εἰκονήματα - concept has its roots in Old Testament-Jewish thinking and suggests for Rom. vi 5 the two translations 'copy' or 'form'. Both of these have to do with something concrete, with a concrete occurrence. If 'copy' is preferred, the difficult question arises as to exactly of what it consists: the rite of baptism, in which the death of Christ is sacramentally realized through the rite, or our 'dying with' (him), in so far as it is bound up with the death of Christ. If, however, εἰκονήματα is simply represented by 'form', the possibility also remains of considering the death of Christ itself as a 'form' with which we are bound through baptism, even as we then also attain (or ought to attain) a share in the 'form' of His resurrection.¹¹

FOOTNOTES

¹Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, revised and augmented by Henry Stuart, Roderick McKenzie and others (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958, sub *ἰσοίωνα*, p. 1225. Liddell-Scott lists the following: Plato, Farm. 132d, 133d; Phaedr. 250a, 250b; Soph. 266d; Aristotle, Rhet. I, 2, p. 1356a, 31; Epicurus, Nat. 11:6; Ep. 1p.10 U.; Ditt. Or. 669, 52.

²Johannes Schneider, "*ἰσοίωνα*," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, c. 1967), V, 191.

³Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, et al., A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck- u. Verlagsanstalt, 1954), II, sub *ἰσοίωνα*, p. 993.

Hatch-Redpath give the following list of Hebrew words for which *ἰσοίωνα* is rendered the equivalent: *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - 2 Kings 16:10; 2 Chron. 4:3; Is. 40:18, 19; Ezek. 1:5, 16, 22, 26; 2:1; 8:2; 10:1, 10, 21, 22; 23:15. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Dan. 3:25. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Ezek. 8:2; 10:1. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Ezek. 1:4. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - 1 Sam. 6:5 (x2). *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Judg. 8:18. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Deut. 4:16, 17 (x2), 18 (x2); Joshua 22:28; Ps. 105:20; 143:12; Ezek. 8:3; 10:8. *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* - Ex. 20:4; Deut. 4:12, 15, 16, 23, 25; 5:8.

⁴Schneider, V, p. 191, observes that: (a) *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* is seldom translated by *ἰσοίωνα*; once each by *ἰσοίωσις*, *ἰσοίωσις*, *ἰσοίωσις*; (b) *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* is rendered by *ἰσοίωνα* ten times; occasionally by *παράδειγμα* and once each by *τύπος*, *ἰσοίωσις*, and *μορφή*; (c) *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* is translated twice as *ἰσοίωσις* and once by *μορφή*; (d) *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* is designated for the most part by *ἰσοίωσις*.

⁵Ibid., V, p. 191.

⁶Rudolf Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964), p. 50, also observes, "A certain vacillation in linguistic usage, however, is already perceptible in the LXX. The Hebrew *יְהוֹמִיּוֹת* is often translated by *ἰσοίωνα*: . . . yet it is often rendered by *ἰσοίωσις*: Gen. 1:26; Ps. lvii, 5 (LXX); Ez. 1:10; Dan. x.16. . . In profane Greek *ἰσοίωσις* (literally=making like) is already felt to be more strongly abstract and = 'resemblance'. He apparently sees more significance in this than does Schneider.

⁷Niklaus Gäumann, Taufe und Ethik; Studien zu Römer 6, (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, c. 1967), p. 50, also concludes, "Das Wort *ἰσοίωνα* hat folgende mögliche Bedeutungen: Gleichheit, Bild, Abbild, Gestalt. In der Septuaginta heisst es entweder Abbild oder Gestalt."

⁷W.F. Moulton and A.S. Geden, editors, A Concordance to the Greek Testament, 4th edition revised by H.K. Moulton (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1963).

⁸Schnackenburg, pp. 51-52.

Gäumann, p. 50, summarizes the New Testament usages thus: "Abgesehen von Apk 9,7 kommt *εἰκόνη* im Neuen Testament nur bei Paulus vor, und zwar an folgenden fünf Stellen: Röm 1,23; 5,14; 6,5; 8,3; Phil 2,7. Röm 1,23 ist in Anlehnung an Ps 104,20 (LXX) formuliert; *εἰκόνη* heisst hier Abbild oder Gestalt. Ebenfalls durch eine Vorlage ist die Verwendung des Wortes in Phil 2,7 bestimmt, wo Paulus auf einen urchristlichen Psalm zurückgreift. *εἰκόνη* dient hier ebenso wie in Röm 8,3 zur Umschreibung von Christi Wesen; an beiden Stellen passt die Bedeutung "Gestalt" am besten. Röm 5,14 bezieht sich das Wort auf die *ἑπίβασις* Adams und ist mit "Abbild" oder "gleiche Gestalt" wiederzugeben. Jedenfalls dürfte deutlich sein, dass an den genannten Stellen die abstrakte Bedeutung "Gleichheit, Ähnlichkeit" nicht zu belegen ist.

cf. also Schneider, V, pp. 192,195 for his discussion.

⁹Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c. 1957), sub *εἰκόνη*, p.510.

"The mng. is not clear in the two related passages in which Paul uses our word in speaking of Christ's earthly life. The expressions *ἐν εἰκόνι κατὰ εἶδος* . . . Phil 2:7 and *ἐν εἰκόνι κατὰ εἶδος ἀναπτύχας* Ro 8:3 could mean that the Lord in his earthly ministry possessed a completely human form, that his body was capable of sinning as human bodies are, or that he had only the form of a man and was looked upon as a human being. . .whereas in reality he remained a Divine Being even in this world. In the light of what Paul says about Jesus in general it is safe to assert that his use of our word is to bring out both that Jesus in his earthly career was similar to sinful men and yet not so absolutely like them."

¹⁰Schnackenburg, pp. 50-53.

¹¹Ibid., p. 53.

CHAPTER III

THE LOCUS CLASSICUS - ROMANS 6:5

The Meaning of *εμοίωμα*

When the question is asked, "What is the meaning of *εμοίωμα* by itself?" several answers suggest themselves: "copy," "likeness," "form," or as Gäumann writes, "Gleichheit, Bild, Abbild, Gestalt."¹ Schnackenburg² has already proposed the meanings "copy" or "form" for Rom. 6:5 on the basis of the Old Testament-Jewish background. Otto Kuss seems to arrive at a similar conclusion:

Nimmt man zu diesen Beobachtung¹ innerhalb des NT hinzu, dass das in Frage stehende griechische Wort (*εμοίωμα*) in der Septuaginta immer "Abbild", "Gestalt" heisst, so wird es ganz unmöglich, in Röm 6,5 an die Übersetzung "in der Gleichheit seines Todes" (= "durch den gleichen Tod wie er", mit der Ergänzung *αὐτῶν* zu *οὐρανῶν*: Bauer Wb 1030) o. ä. für zutreffend zu halten; es kommen lediglich die Bedeutung "Bild" und "Gestalt" in Betracht.³

It becomes rapidly clear that the translation of *εμοίωμα* cannot be determined apart from that to which the word itself refers. In light of the baptismal context, this has particular importance because of the concrete or abstract connotations that might inhere in this word.

⁴
Schneider provides a good overview of this problem by asking, "Does *εμοίωμα* mean baptism, or does it mean Christ's death sacramentally present? In other words, is baptism a representation of the death of Christ, or is it the likeness which contains the original?" He divides the pro-

posed answers to these questions into roughly four categories.

The first category considers *ἐμσίμωμα* as referring to our baptism. The rite is said to represent the death of Christ; so Cremer (Wörterbuch, 795), concludes, "The experience which in the eyes of the apostle is equivalent to Christ's death is baptism." Wikenhauser writes, "Baptism is for the apostle a reproduction or similitude of the death and resurrection of Christ." Barth relates *ἐμσίμωμα* to our baptism, thereby describing it as an image of Christ's death.⁵

A second view relates *ἐμσίμωματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* to our death in baptism. We have grown together with the death we have experienced in baptism, which is like the death of Christ. Schlatter (R 206) writes:

The likeness of the death of Jesus is that by baptism the believer is put in a position which is like the death of Jesus, the position of one on whom the divine judgment on sin has been visited, with the result that entrance into life is opened up for him. Hence Paul says that the likeness of Jesus does not adhere to the baptized externally, but that they have grown together with it.

Zahn (R 300) comments, "Not the act of baptism, but the *ὅμοιωμα τῆς ἀμαρτίας* (v. 10) effected by baptism, is the likeness of the death of Christ." (cf. 299). Zahn also notes that Christ's death is a "type" whose reflection is the death experienced by us in baptism.⁶

A third position is that of Roman Catholic theology which has traditionally espoused the "mystical" view.

S. Stricker says that the person dies mystically the death

of Christ.

Baptism is *ἐνώνυμα τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ*, i.e. of Christ, not of the subject of baptism; and because Christ's death was the death on the cross, the person baptized dies this death (v. 6: *συνεσταυρωθή*). The death of Christ is present, not naturally, but sacramentally.

And so in the first instance it is the candidate's death, but indirectly Christ's death is also represented. Stricker's conclusion is that in the "similitude" of baptism, the once-for-all crucifixion is brought so close to the subject of baptism, that the latter dies the death of Christ with Him. O. Casel (Jrbch. f. Liturgie-Wissenschaft, 1932) makes an even stronger case for this view. He would see *βαπτισθῆναι εἰς Χριστόν* and *βαπτισθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ* as equal, and understand *βαπτισθῆναι* as being baptized in the sphere of Christ. Hence baptism becomes a spiritual process which takes place in the sphere of Christ, and specifically in that of His death. We have "the immediate presence of the death of Christ in the sacrament."⁷

The fourth and final position is the Protestant version of Roman Catholic mysticism. The chief exponent of this view is H. Schlier (ThLZ, 72(1947),324). He proposes a sacramental, rather than a mystical understanding. The reference to baptism is not to the experience of the person baptized, whose death is understood as a likeness of the death of Christ. It is Christ's death that is present in baptism, and hence sacramentally.

It appears that other commentators reflect these themes

with their own variations. Kuss comments:

Es ist ganz klar vom Tode als Geschehen die Rede, und man muss entweder verstehen: "zusammengewachsen mit dem Bilde seines Todes", d.h. in innigste Verbindung gebracht mit dem im Ritus gegenwärtig gesetzten Tode Jesu Christi, oder: "zusammengewachsen mit der Gestalt seines Todes", d.h. mit jener Gestalt des Todes Jesu Christi als Ereignis, die im Taufvorgang Wirklichkeit wird, und so wohl bei der einem wie bei der andren Auffassung ist das gleichbedeutend mit einem Zusammenwachsen mit dem in der sakramentalen Repräsentation wirksam werdenden Heil, d.h. - letzten Endes - mit Christus.⁸

9

10

Gäumann and Beasley-Murray, commenting on Bornkamm's position, also seem to prefer the stance that *ἐμοίωμα* does not refer to the baptismal rite in itself, but to the death of Christ in relation to the believer. Leenhardt would seem to have a similar view as he alludes to the force of *αὐτῷ* in v. 4:

It is more difficult to know exactly how the apostle understood the matter. The expression "a death like his" has been referred to baptism itself which is thought of as reproducing the death of Christ and thus associated the believer with it. "We have been assimilated to, brought into conformity with, naturalized into, the image of his death. . ." But we may also understand it as follows: "We have become one single plant with him (*αὐτῷ* is understood after *σύνφυτοι* as after *συντάφημεν* in v. 4) by means of an imitation of his death, a death like his own." Baptism is presupposed, but the thought centers not on the external fact of baptism but on the inner fact of the sharing of the death of Christ, a death of the believer assimilating him to the death of Christ.

In a similar way, Langevin comments that *ἐμοίωμα* can infer identity or distinction. Here we have two opinions: (a) one sees in *τῷ ἐμοιούμενῳ* the same reality as Christ's death present in baptism; (b) or in *ἐμοίωμα* the

ritual symbol of baptism as a figure of Christ's death.

Langevin¹² opts for the former view ("The one [view] accentuating identity sees in τὸ ἑμοίουματι the very reality of a death similar to that of Christ. . . presented sacramentally in Christian baptism.") for the following reasons: (a) ἑμοίουμα in Paul connotes more the idea of identity than distinction; (b) identity is also the more prevalent connotation in the LXX; (c) by a comparison of v. 5 with v. 4; γινώσκωμεν with σὺντάφηνον; (d) Paul's juridicial thought of having died with Christ, and yet being subject to the moral imperative since we live in this present life, i.e. we have been united (σύνφυτοι γεγονάμεν) to a death similar to Christ's in a "growing, increasing union" against the power of sin, a union which begins for each believer in his baptism.

This discussion began with Schneider's overview of the proposed solutions to the question, "What does ἑμοίουμα mean and to what does it refer?" We conclude with his summary. (1) Paul does not say that we have grown together with the death and resurrection of Christ, but with the "likeness. . ." Hence the term ἑμοίουμα rules out any idea of mystical relation to the historical saving acts. (2) But since Paul expressly emphasizes that we are organically linked with the likeness of the death and resurrection, we fail to do justice to his thought if we say that they are mere copies of the death and resurrection of Christ. (3) What Paul has in view is the death and resurrection of Christ present in baptism:

The sacramentally present death and resurrection of Christ are the *ἐνοίωμα* of His historical death and resurrection. This means that we are very closely linked with the saving realities of Christ's death and resurrection as these are present in baptism. This is a further development or more precise formulation of the thought of v. 3, namely, that we are baptized into Christ and His death. For in v. 3, too, the death of Christ is for Paul a present saving reality.¹³

Grammatical Concerns

Relation to v. 5a

As the various solutions to the problem of what *ἐνοίωμα* means have been offered, it is obvious that the answer cannot be gotten by considering the phrase *ἐνοίωμα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* in and of itself. There have been several allusions by the various commentators to other parts of verse five, to the immediate context, and to the wider context of Paul's theology. This is, of course, to obtain a degree of intelligibility. It is the purpose of this section to investigate the relationship of *ἐνοίωμα* to the first part of verse 5, a relationship which most commentators feel is the crucial element to the understanding of the term *ἐνοίωμα* as it appears here.

14

Schneider summarizes the question at hand. There are two views: (a) "to grow with the copy (or imitation) of His death" (Lietzmann, Althaus, Sanday-Headlam). Here it is thought that Paul is using an abbreviated and imprecise formulation. What is meant is: "By imitation of His death we have grown together with His death" (Wikenhauser,

Die Kirche als der my. Leib Christi, 124) or "We have grown together with a death like His death"; or (b) there is the position that sees $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\alpha$ is to be filled out by $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$ (on analogy of v. 4 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$) and $\tau\eta\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\tau\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\omicron\upsilon$ taken instrumentally (so J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum; Lagrange, 145f.). Hence, "we have grown together with Him by imitation of His death" (or "by the same death as He"). Schneider prefers the former view for the simple reason that the $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$ is just not there.

Kühl (cited by Kuss) observes that one of the major problems in v. 5a relates to the term $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. He argues that we as persons cannot "grow together" with an abstraction, but only with a similarly organized being, i.e. like to like. While displaying appreciation for this insight, Kuss counters that Kühl's observation is not conclusive. A study of $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in its various usages (cf. Liddell-Scott) shows that the word can indicate the binding together of objects of different size and make-up: "similarity" is not necessary, but only a "belonging together" in a most general sense. If nothing else, Kuss concludes, a complete study of the term as it is used in Plato, Aristotle and Galen, shows how elastic words are. In the end, Kuss decides against the addition of $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$:

Von der Verwendung des "zusammengewachsen" ($\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\mu\phi\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$) her lässt sich die Einfügung eines ergänzten "mit ihm" ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$) also nicht begründen; man wird daher die Konstruktion von v. 5a zunächst einmal als vollständig ansehen (auch im Hinblick auf v. 4a: dort steht das zu dem $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\nu$ gehörige $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\tau\acute{\eta}$ genau an der Stelle,

an der v. 5a *ἑνωίματε* steht). Wenn Paulus hier im Gegensatz zu vv. 2,3,4, eine perfektische Verbalform bildet (*σύνφωτοι γέγοναμεν*), so wird er damit ausdrücken wollen, dass jenes Zusammengewachsen einmal geschehen ist, aber zugleich eine fortdauernde Wirkung hat (BD #342): wir sind damals in der Taufe zusammengewachsen und sind es immer noch; das Perfektum vereinigt gleichsam Aorist und Präsens in sich (BD #340).¹⁶

For much the same reasons, Gäumann and Schmidt also reject the addition of *αὐτῷ*.^{17,18}

Blass-Debrunner, while not advocating the addition of *αὐτῷ*, discuss the possibility of *σύνφωτοι* going with *τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*.

R 6:5 *σύνφωτοι τῷ ἑνωίματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* is doubtful: perhaps *τῷ οὐμ.* is instr., the gen. going with *οὐμφ.* (cf. the following *ἄλλα καὶ τῆς ἀμ-σάρεως ἐσόμεθα [οὐμφ. to be supplied, hardly τῷ οὐμ.]*); yet taking the gen. with the preceding word is more natural and *ἑνωίμα* elsewhere takes the gen. in Paul.¹⁹

On the other side of the debate, there are those who would add the *αὐτῷ* to v. 5a. Walter Keller accepts the argumentation that *σύνφωτος* requires an organic relationship. He also refers to v. 4 (*συντάφημεν αὐτῷ*) as supporting the addition, and would translate, "For if we have become such as have grown together with Christ through the likeness of His death (namely, our sacramental dying with Him). . . ." Beasley-Murray refers to the force of *σύν* on verbs:

It will be seen that all these verbs denote the unity between the baptized believer and the person of Christ Himself in His redemptive action and do not envisage the possibility of a middle term between. For this reason it is illegitimate to regard *ἑνωίματε* as a dative of instrument and interpret it as a synonym for baptism: "We have become united with Him by the like-

ness of His death,' taking baptism as an image of the death of Christ; rather it would seem that Paul speaks of our being involved directly with Christ in His death and resurrection through baptism.

Langevin sums up this position:

For our part, we prefer to add the pronoun αὐτῷ to the order of σὺμφυτοὶ γενόμεναι. Let us point out first that the text parallel to v. 5a contains a similar pronoun: συντεθέμεν αὐτῷ (v. 4a). In the second place, we note it is more normal, if not necessary, that a person should be united in an essential manner (σὺμφυτοὶ) to another person (αὐτῷ) rather than to an abstract reality such as θεοῦ ἕνεκα. Finally, it is remarkable that the Pauline uses of the prefix συν- refer very often to Christ. For these various reasons, we render the beginning of Rm 6,5a in this manner: "For if we have been united to Christ (αὐτῷ) in order to grow like Him (σὺμφυτοὶ). . ."22

Relation to v. 5b

The first problem concerning this half-verse is summarized by Schmidt thus: "Umstritten ist auch, ob in der zweiten Satzhälfte vor τῆς ἀναστάσεως ebenfalls ein τῷ θεοῦ ἕνεκα zu ergänzen ist oder ob hier σὺμφυτοὶ mit dem Genetiv zu konstruieren ist."²³ The question then is, "How does this relate to τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἑσόμεθα."²⁴

Schnackenburg sees v. 5b as an ellipse of (σὺμφυτοὶ) τῷ θεοῦ ἕνεκα. He regards the sentences before and after this one as already closely bound because of v. 4, and he feels that they are also formed linguistically in this way.²⁵ Langevin develops this idea of parallelism further:

We believe, rather, that Rm 6,5 reproduces a perfect verbal parallelism in elliptical fashion. "If we have been united to the likeness of His death, we will also be [united] to that of His resurrection." United to a death similar to that of Christ, we will be [united] to a resurrection similar to His.

Paul is extremely fond of these direct and close manners [of expression] (cf. 2 Co 1,11; 5,2), these elliptical parallelisms (cf. 2 Co 3,11; 5,13), where the members are sometimes very much uneven in length (cf. 1 Co 1,24). Let us note especially that within Rm 6,5 the pair *θάνατος* and *ἀνάστασις*, as well as the series of conjunctions *εἰ γὰρ* and *ἀλλὰ καὶ*, strongly dispose us to establish a strict parallelism between the two parts of this verse. Verse 5 would thus include two perfectly parallel members.

Kuss would appear to have like ideas about this solution:

Für die Erklärung des v. 5b ist zunächst einmal grundlegend, dass er dem v. 5a entsprechend verstanden werden muss; die Worte "zusammengewachsen" und "mit dem Abbild, bzw. der Gestalt" müssen aus v. 5a in v. 5b ergänzt werden, so dass die einzig mögliche Übersetzung lautet: "so werden wir erst recht (zusammengewachsen mit dem Bilde, bzw. der Gestalt) der Aufstehung (des Christus) sein."²⁶

The answer to this question, as mentioned above, effects how we are to interpret *τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα*.²⁷ Schneider again summarizes the problem. Does this phrase refer to the mystical-sacramental resurrection of Christ in the act of baptism, or to the future resurrection of the baptized. Both views are possible. In light of v. 11 (*ζῶντας*. . .) Schneider adopts a reference to a present event. If Christians have died to sin and are alive to God in Jesus Christ, then they have passed through a resurrection which has awakened them from death to life. "They have indeed so grown together with this resurrection which is like that of Christ that this event lays its impress on their lives from now on."

Schneider, in the same section as above, cites two other ways in which scholars have attempted to answer this question. (a) *τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα* is considered the

"likeness" of the resurrection of Christ in the sense that the candidate who comes up out of the watery tomb experiences a spiritual or mystical resurrection corresponding to that of Christ. Zahn (R 301) speaks of the process in the life of the believer as a "type" of the actual event. Schlatter (R 206) says that "a likeness of the life now enjoyed by the risen Lord will grow together with us." (b) The Roman Catholic position which is exemplified by Stricker, sees the candidate as participating sacramentally in Christ's resurrection. τῆς ἀναστάσεως is considered a genitive of relationship and as not depending on ἐμοῦμαρτυροῦμαι. Casel writes:

When we grow together with the likeness of His death, it follows that we are (mystically) dead. But things cannot stop here. Since death is only a transition to a new (mystical) life, we shall also partake of the resurrection.

Part of the problem revolves around the word ἐροῦμεθα.

28

Leenhardt comments:

Participation in the resurrection life of Christ is indicated by a verb in the future; is this future chronological or logical? Is it an allusion to the general resurrection, or to the present participation of the believer in the life of the Risen Lord which should flow logically from his participation in the death of the Crucified? The second meaning is preferable both because of the indissoluble unity constituted by the cross and resurrection as also because of the parallel thought expressed in Col 2:12. Further on, Paul will make another allusion to the new life of the believer which cannot be understood except on the basis of his sharing in the life of the Risen Lord (v. 11).

29

Again, Kuss appears to lean in the same direction:

Es ist sofort klar, dass sich aus dem Futurum (ἐροῦμεθα), wenn es nicht als bloss "logisches" Futur (wie etwa

Kühl will), sondern - wohl zutreffender - zeitlich verstanden wird, für die Beziehung von v. 5b auf die Taufe eine Schwierigkeit ergibt: die Taufe ist ein Ereignis der Vergangenheit (vgl. 5a: *γεγόναμεν*), nicht der Zukunft. . . sie verdankt ihren Ursprung in erster Linie wohl dem Bestreben, einer "Entwertung" des für das Verständnis des Taufsgeschehen nach Paulus wichtigen Begriffes "Bild", "Abbild", "Gestalt" (*ὁμοίωμα*) vorzubeugen.

ὁμοίωμα and the Immediate Context

Linguistic Connections

Commentators have already referred to the context for linguistic and grammatical patterns and parallels that might help in determining the use and meaning of *ὁμοίωμα* in v. 5. Here several of those suggestions are presented for consideration. First, mention must be made of the balanced sentence structure. Verses 5,6,7 appear to be purposely offset by verses 8,9,10. The first set affirms of the believer what the second affirms of Christ. Second, a variation of this concerns the word order of vv. 4 and 5: *συνετάφημεν σὺν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον*

/ εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ ὁμοιώματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ; ἵνα ὡς περ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἐσόμεθα. Here we also note the conceptual parallelism and the tense of the verbs. Third, we recall the particular appeal to *συνετάφημεν αὐτῷ* in v. 4 as calling for the addition of *αὐτῷ* in v. 5. A fourth consideration extends beyond this by observing the use of *σὺν* within the context: v. 6 *συνεσταυρίθη*; v. 8 *ἀπεθάνομεν*

ἐν Χριστῷ. . . καὶ οὕτως αὐτῷ . Conversely,
 Schnackenburg ³⁰ points out that although ἐν -compounds
 usually have the dative with them, yet if an αὐτῷ is
 added and ἐμοίματι is considered instrumental, one would
 expect rather ἐν (τῷ) ἐμοίματι . Regardless of where
 one stands on these individual issues, it is clear that they
 are not accidental and must be given careful consideration
 when dealing with ἐμοίματι in v. 5.

Theological Relationship

This brief section actually looks ahead to questions
 for future study, for as we seek an answer to this problem,
 possible solutions beyond the scope of this paper begin to
 force themselves upon us. Here the totality of St. Paul's
 theology comes to the fore. Here, too, the ethical over-
 tones come into consideration. ³¹ Beasley-Murray, after
 reviewing various views on Rom. 6:1-11, sums up his own posi-
 tion. In St. Paul's theology he sees the baptized as related
 to the death and resurrection of Christ, involving the can-
 didate in the actual dying and rising of Christ Himself.
 Secondly, there is a corresponding event in the life of the
 baptized believer, whereby an end is put to his old, God-
 estranged life and a new one begins in Christ and His
 kingdom and His Spirit. Finally, a corresponding "cruci-
 fixation" of the flesh and a new life in the power of the
 Spirit that is in accord with the grace received is invoked.
 This is the "dying" and "rising" that begins in the baptismal

event.

32

Cullmann refers to the connection between the "then and now." He compares baptism and the eucharist. Both are not a repetition of that once-for-all event, but are ever-new events, so that whenever a new member is "added" or communed, we are reminded that salvation history continues to the present time. Conversely, it is evident that this present event is conditioned and effected by that once-for-all event at Golgotha, "the $\epsilon\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ of the centre of time."

33

Again and again, commentators seem to insist on a certain "sacramental realism" indicating that in baptism the candidate's relationship with the Crucified and Risen Christ is not something symbolical, but concrete and real.

Scholars also emphasize the second aspect identified with the events of Golgotha and the empty tomb, i.e. that something happens to the believer as he is identified with those saving events when all things become new for him.

34

Flemington refers to baptism as "a sacrament of realized eschatology."

Thus at the heart of one of his most characteristic Epistles St. Paul gives expression to the vivid significance of baptism. Once again we can scarcely state the truth better than by saying that for St. Paul, as for those who were before him in the Gospel, baptism is a sacrament of realized eschatology. St. Paul looks back to baptism as that which marked for each Christian the inauguration of the New Age, the transition from the old life to the new.

And so in another passage, Flemington draws the connection of what it means to be baptized "into Christ Jesus." As the convert is plunged into the water, remains there for a

moment, and then emerges, so here stands in the background the fact that he has died, been buried, and raised with Christ. Through that rite of baptism, all the benefits of that death and resurrection are mediated to the believer.

35

36

Cullmann again comments:

We must distinguish very carefully between the reality of reception in the Church at the moment of the baptismal act, which represents a real grace independent of any perseverance, and the reality of the further working out of this incorporation, which represents a grace just as real but one dependent on perseverance.

It is here that the final contextual emphasis, the ethical, is considered. As Lohse and others point out, baptism is not only the transmission of divine power, but a dying to the dominion of sin, coming under the Lordship of Christ to a life of total obedience. It is an action of God on the baptized, but not something that can be considered the safe possession of salvation; there can be no magical interpretation of the sacrament.

37

Finally, Eduard Schweizer writes on this "paradox" of the "mystical" and "juridicial" aspects of "dying and rising with Christ" by investigating the implications of the phrase *σύν φυτόι τῷ ἐμνήματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ*.

In baptism we have already entered into the new life of the parousia, and yet a change in our life style is in order now. We have life in a paradoxical way: this life that we have must validate itself in our obedience. The fact that Christ died for us does not spring from our repentance. Nor does the fact that we "die" with Him or are "united" with Him lie

in our ethical achievement. Salvation is exclusively the work of God. Yet in the death and resurrection, which puts the world under a new Lordship, we see the power of the Spirit calling the baptized to obedience. All the fruits and benefits of this divine mystery and relationship are the believer's in his baptism, and are expressed in the words of St. Paul:

εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγονάμεν τῷ ἁμαρτωλίῳ
τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως
ἔσομεθα.

FOOTNOTES

¹Gäumann, Taufe und Ethik; Studien zu Römer 6, supra, p. 6.

²Schnackenburg, Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul, supra, p. 5.

³Otto Kuss, Der Römer Brief (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1963), I, 301.

⁴Schneider, "ἑνωίωμα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, pp. 192-194.

⁵Handley C.G. Moule, The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans in The Expositor's Bible, edited by W. Robertson Nicoll (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894), XXXVI, p. 164, comments in a note, "We must paraphrase a difficult sentence. It seems to us that the ἑνωίωμα τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ must refer to the baptismal rite."

Gäumann, pp. 51-52, has the interesting comment that ἑνωίωμα not referring to baptism has consequences for Catholic and Lutheran baptismal sacramentalism since this sacramentalism depends on the equation of baptism and ἑνωίωμα. To defend this theology, however, on the basis of Romans 6 only leads to difficulties, and one must stand with the insight of Bornkamm. Gäumann sees three difficulties in having ἑνωίωμα equal baptism: "(a) es wird v 5 der Einschub von αὐτοῦ notwendig; (b) ἐσόμεθα v 5b kann nicht als echtes Futurum verstanden werden; (c) der Begriff ἑνωίωμα kann bei Paulus nicht mehr überall gleich verstanden werden."

⁶Hans Wilhelm Schmidt, Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer, in Theologischen Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), VI, 110, comments on Zahn's position: "Wichtig ist auch die Frage, wie hier ἑνωίωμα zu übersetzen ist (I, 23). Th. Zahn denkt an "Modell", "Vorbild", und versteht θανάτου als Gen. appos.: 'Verwachsen mit dem Vorbild welches Tod Christi ist.' ἑνωίωμα kann aber auch "Abbild", "Nachbild", oder "Gleichbild" bedeuten; dann wäre an die Taufe zu denken. Man verstand ἑνωίωμα auch so, dass es die Identität oder Gleichheit ausdrückt: 'Wenn wir mit ihm zusammengewachsen sind in der Gleichheit seines Todes.' Paulus will nun wohl nicht sagen, dass wir mit einem den Tod Christi nur abbildenden Vorgang oder Zustand zusammengewachsen sind. Denn nur in Christi Tod selbst sind wir der Sünde wirklich gestorben. Wenn er trotzdem nicht sagt: 'Wir sind mit dem Tod Christi zusammengewachsen,' sondern: 'mit dem Gleichbild des Todes Christi,' so will er damit zum Ausdruck bringen: nur die Taufe ist es, welche diese Verbundenheit mit Christi Tod verschafft und uns in diesen Tod hineinversetzt. 'Mit dem Gleichbild seines Todes' heisst also: 'sakramental mit seinem Tod' oder 'in der Taufe mit seinem Tod'. Die freie Über-

setzung: 'zusammengeschlossen mit ihm durch gleichen Tod' (A. Nygren) ist richtig; aber *ἐμοίωμα* will den Ort und das Mittel dieses Geschehens anzeigen: die Taufe."

⁷Schnackenburg, p. 25, seems to speak directly against this view: "The 'death of Christ' is nowhere considered in the Pauline writings as a sphere, but always as the event that took place on Golgotha. . . Christ is not a 'sphere' into which we are plunged, but the personal Christ with all that happened to Him; our baptism 'to Christ' has the goal of uniting us with this Christ and with everything that happened to him."

⁸Kuss, pp. 301-302.

⁹Gäumann, p. 51, also comments that, "Der Ausdruck *ἐμοίωμα τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ* bezeichnet also die Gestalt des Todes Christi oder des Sterben Christi, keinesfalls aber die Taufe." He then sets the line-ups of those for and against *ἐμοίωμα* equalling baptism. For: Kühl, Lagrange, Schwarzmann, Schnackenburg, Mussner, Althaus, Asmussen, K. Barth, Michel, J. Schneider, P. Brunner, Schmidt, and others. Against: Zahn, Schlatter, Matern, Stommel, further removed Bornkamm and Rissi and Wagner following him. It is questionable whether some of these men are still in the position in which Gäumann puts them. He concludes for himself: "Aus der Konstruktion von Röm 6:5. . . ist zwingend zu schliessen, dass *ἐμοίωμα τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ* nicht die Taufe bezeichnet. Nun so kann das zweifellos echte Futurum *ἐμοίωμα* v 5b als solches durchgehalten werden."

¹⁰G.R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament (London: MacMillan, c. 1962), p. 134, refers to Bornkamm's position: "There is also good reason for interpreting *ἐμοίωμα* in the sense of 'form' rather than 'likeness'. . . Bornkamm therefore urges that *ἐμοίωμα* brings to expression the nature of that which is imaged in itself and writes, '*ἐμοίωμα τοῦ Θανάτου αὐτοῦ* denotes the form of the Crucified. We have grown with it or with Him as the Crucified. Correspondingly we shall have the same relation with the form of His resurrection or with Him as the Resurrected.'" cf. pp. 131-132 for a further explication of Bornkamm's views.

Kuss, p. 301, does not agree that Bornkamm's interpretation is accurate.

¹¹Franz-J. Leenhardt, The Epistle to the Romans, translated by Harold Knight (Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, c. 1961), p. 160.

¹²P.-É. Langevin, "Le Baptême dans la Mort Resurrection. Exégèse de Rm 6 1-5," Sciences Ecclésiastiques, 17 (January, 1965), 58-60.

Kuss, p. 300, also picks up this idea of identity and distinction: "Es scheint, Paulus will mit der zweifellos

auffallenden Ausdrucksweise Identität und Unterschied zugleich fassen: in Taufgeschehen ist der Tod Jesu Christi "da", aber er ist naturgemäss in einer von dem Ereignis auf Golgotha verschiedenen Gestalt da; eine Abschwächung des Wirklichkeitgehaltes sollte man darin - wenigstens was die Formulierung angeht - freilich so lange nicht ausgedrückt sehen, als man für Röm 8,3 und Phil 2,7 eine solche abstreitet. Hier ist allerdings gleich hinzuzufügen: obwohl also kaum ein begründeter Zweifel daran möglich ist, dass der in Frage stehende Begriff (*ἐνωίωμα*) "konkret" verstanden werden muss. . ."

¹³Schneider, p. 195.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 196.

Kuss, p. 299, states the problem thus: "Was v. 5a angeht. . .so ist zunächst zu fragen, ob der Satz vollständig ist, so dass man übersetzen muss "verwachsen mit dem Abbild, bzw. der Gestalt seines Todes" (so oder ähnlich: Althaus, Gaugler, Lietzmann, Sanday-Headlam, Schlatter, Zahn; P. Gächter. . .G. Matern. . .) oder ob man zu dem "verwachsen" ein "mit ihm" ergänzen soll und den Dativ dann instrumental oder als Dativ der Beziehung auffasst (so oder ähnlich: Bardenhewer, Gutjahr, Jülicher, Kühl, Lagrange, Moe, B. Weiss; J. Weiss. . .)."

¹⁵Kuss, pp. 299-300.

Schnackenburg, pp. 47-49, presents a similar discussion, but with more emphasis on the church fathers.

¹⁶Kuss, p. 300.

¹⁷Gäumann, p. 79, writes: "Es stellt sich ferner die Frage, wie v 5a zu konstruieren sei. Wortlaut und Duktus des Satzes legen die Verbindung von *σύνφυτοί γεγόναμεν* mit *τῷ ἐνωίωματι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ* nahe. Darauf weist auch die Beobachtung hin, dass die Verbindung mit *σύν* alle auf die Person Christi gehen. Die Ergänzung des Satzes durch ein *αὐτῷ* (entsprechend dem *αὐτῷ* v 4) ist als durch nichts gerechtfertigt abzulehen."

¹⁸Schmidt, p. 110, observes, "Wenigen gut ist die vom vorliegenden Text abweichende Exegese, welche zu *σύνφυτοί* ein *αὐτῷ* ergänzt (dem *συνετέθημεν αὐτῷ* entsprechend) und *ἐνωίωματι* als Dat. instr. auffasst: 'Wenn wir mit ihm zusammengewachsen sind durch die Nachbildung seines Todes.'"

¹⁹F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated and revised by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), #194, p. 104.

William Sanday and Arthur C. Headlam, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the

International Critical Commentary, 5th edition (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1964), pp. 157-158, take σύνφωτος γεγονόμα with τῷ ὁμοιώματι (and would not add τῷ Χριστῷ) as being a simpler and more natural expression as far as construction is concerned, "though no doubt there is an ellipsis in meaning which would be more exactly represented by the fuller phrase."

Schmidt, pp. 109-110, while not allowing the addition of αὐτῷ, does admit "σύνφωτος kann mit Genitiv oder Dativ konstruiert werden," which appears to allow σύνφωτος with τῷ θανάτῳ.

²⁰Walter Keller, "Paul's Baptism Theology with Special Reference to Rom. 6," unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1956, pp. 54-55, 60.

²¹Beasley-Murray, pp. 134-135.

²²Langevin, p. 58. The translation is my own.

²³Schmidt, p. 110.

²⁴Schnackenburg, pp. 45-46. But cf. Blass-Debrunner, *supra*, p. 14.

²⁵Langevin, p. 62. The translation is my own.

Gäumann, p. 79, also notes, "v 5b ist analog zu v 5a zu verstehen; es muss also so wohl σύνφωτος wie τῷ ὁμοιώματι ergänzt werden."

²⁶Kuss, p. 303.

²⁷Schneider, p. 194.

²⁸Leenhardt, p. 161.

²⁹Kuss, p. 303.

Gäumann, p. 79, seems to deny this very point: "Das Futurum ἐσόμεθα ist nicht als logisches, sondern als echtes Futurum aufzufassen, wie sich aus dem entsprechend Futurum v 8 zweifelfrei ergibt. ἐσόμεθα bezieht sich also auf die zukünftige Auferstehung der Glaubenden, wobei ἀλλὰ καὶ eine gewisse Steigerung gegenüber v 5a zum Ausdruck bringt."

³⁰Schnackenburg, p. 30.

³¹Beasley-Murray, p. 132.

³²Oscar Cullmann, Baptism in the New Testament, translated by J.K.S. Reid (London: SCM Press, 1961), p. 35.

³³J.K Howard, "' . . . Into Christ': A Study of the Pauline

Concept of Baptismal Union," Expository Times, 79 (February, 1968), pp. 147-150, sees in Paul's thoughts of union with Christ the complete identification of the believer with the Passion events. Linking the death and baptism of Christ gives the ground for the Pauline connexion of the believer's baptism, death, and resurrection. "In the symbolic act of baptism the Christian enters into the death of Christ, and in a real sense that death becomes his death."

D.M. Stanley, "Baptism in the New Testament," Scripture, 8 (1956), 56, also sees baptism as uniting the Christian with Christ by uniting him with the redemptive acts - death and resurrection.

Berkley Collins, "The Sacrament of Baptism in the New Testament," Expository Times, 27 (October-December, 1915), 72, offers what seems to be a stronger position: "In baptism the believer actually enters into the death and resurrection. He dies with Christ and rises with Him. The language and argument of Ro 6 require an absolute identification of the baptized person with Christ. . . Not only ethically, but physically, the believer is one with the Risen Christ. Not figuratively, but actually, he shares His resurrection life."

Y.B. Tremel, "Baptism - the Incorporation of the Christian into Christ," in Baptism in the New Testament; A Symposium, translated by David Askew (Baltimore: Helicon, c. 1964), 189, seems to have similar feelings: "More precisely, baptism sets the sinner at the actual moment when this transition was effected - it makes him a contemporary of Christ's death and resurrection, and plunges him into the heart of the saving mystery."

³⁴W. Flemington, The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism (London: SPCK, c. 1953), 59.

³⁵Ibid., pp. 59,63.

³⁶Cullmann, p. 37.

³⁷E. Lohse, "Taufe und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus," Kerygma und Dogma, 11 (April, 1965), 308-324.

Tremel, p. 196, draws attention to the ethical dimension; "This moral perspective dominates the whole passage, but the demands of Christian life are based on an accepted fact - on what we might call an ontological reality: the Christian is "in Christ Jesus", his life and being belong to Christ. And this situation is the result of a past act from which this permanent state has derived: it springs from a unique event, which happened 'once for all.'"

³⁸Eduard Schweizer, "Dying and Rising with Christ," New Testament Studies, 14 (January, 1967), passim.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY

Conclusions on the Basis of the Study

This paper began by asking the question, "What does the Greek word *ἐπιείκεια* mean, and how does it relate to the whole of Romans 6:5?" The meaning of the word was then studied, and the various proposals for its place in v. 5 were reviewed. A brief study of the immediate context was made for possible contributions to the solution, and then allusions were made to the systematic studies which cover the whole of Pauline theology. Perhaps it sounds like an evasion after all this, especially in the light of the host of learned men whose theses, in many cases fürchtbar gelehrt, to say that I am not sure we can arrive at a satisfactory solution on the basis of this study alone. In short, it seems to me that all the proposed solutions are possible, and that it is really a question of which is the more probable, and (without dispensing with what objectivity we have) more edifying.

I suppose that book reviewers are expected to demur from the opinions and conclusions expressed by the authors in the works they review. Occasionally one wonders whether they do it on purpose! Be that as it may, I chanced across a review of Schnackenburg's work by John Bligh. Schnackenburg, whose work has formed a major basis for this study, sees

Paul's theology of baptism as thoroughly integrated into his epistles. Bligh disagrees for various reasons. Then he adds the obvious conclusion that really never occurred to me since I had labored under the considerable influence of Schnackenburg and others. It is this: Paul did not write all he thought about baptism. Whether one agrees with this statement or not is not the important thing. What is important is that this reminds us that no matter how learned any solution may be to a biblical question, it is none the less not conclusive. There may be something more that we do not know. We may be making more of the problem than we should, or perhaps less. For we do not know what was in Paul's mind when he put down those troublesome words: *εἰ γὰρ σύμφυτοι γεγόναμεν τῷ θουώματι*. . . Was the term new to his readers as he meant it? Did he plan to give it a twist of meaning? Indeed, how much of Rom. 6:1-11 can we assume was early Christian kerygma and how much bore Paul's own stamp? What thoughts were triggered in his mind as he wrote *σύμφυτοι*? Did he perhaps think unconsciously of how it was used classically? Did he wonder whether he should have added that *αὐτῷ* just for the sake of clarity? Did he appreciate the depth of meaning in these eleven verses, as he struggled for just one more word to make the divine mystery more clear. Did he struggle as all commentators seem to be, seeking just one more word that will make it a little plainer what they mean, and what they think St. Paul meant?

Having asked these precautionary questions, it seems to me that the following paraphrase is at least possible, and indicates the view that I prefer in determining the meaning of *συνώνυμα*. "For if we have become grown together with Christ through the likeness of His death (namely, in our sacramental dying with Him in the rite of baptism), then we have grown together with the likeness of His resurrection, share in the first fruits of the Risen Life now, and possess the guarantee of becoming completely grafted into the resurrection when He appears again."

Related Questions for Future Study

The fact that we should retain an "holy doubt" about some of these questions is none the less no excuse for despair or a cavalier attitude over against biblical studies. It is a humbling experience to attempt to capture what the Apostle Paul meant in what is considered the crux of his baptismal theology. Further area for study is, of course, implied, beyond the confines of Romans 6:1-11 and beyond the scope of this study. Some of the directions that such study might take have already been hinted at by the various scholars. First, we should turn to the related baptismal references in Paul's other letters. The second step would be to move to the wider context of Romans 6. For example, in chapter 5 we have the Adam-Christ parallels. This brings to mind the Jewish concept of "corporate personality," that the actions of one man, e.g. the king, implicated all

the people. Was this idea in Paul's mind as he authored these words in Romans? Again, it would seem that a thorough study would have to be made of the concept of the "Body of Christ" as it appears in the New Testament. Since baptism is usually considered the means for entry into that Body, it would appear one would have to have a consistent theology concerning both of them, i.e. if one sees the "Body of Christ" mystically, it would appear that one's baptismal theology would have to be mystical by necessity. On the other hand, if baptism is but an entrance symbol, then what becomes of the Body of Christ?

In the meantime, it would appear that one could opt for any one of the several solutions offered for the mystery of Romans 6:5 and the word *ἐνοίμα* and still not lose the blessing of Holy Baptism!

FOOTNOTES

¹John Bligh, "Baptism in St. Paul," Heythrop Journal,
7 (January, 1966), 60-62.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

- Bible, The Jerusalem. Edited by Alexander Jones. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., c. 1966.
- New Testament in Greek and English, The. Edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. New York: The American Bible Society, c. 1966.
- Novum Testamentum Graece. Edited by Eberhard Nestle. Revised by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, c. 1927.

B. Secondary Sources

- Ahern, Barnabas M. "The Christian's Union with the Body of Christ in Cor, Gal, and Rom," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (February, 1961), 199-209.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, c. 1957.
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. Baptism in the New Testament. London: MacMillan, c. 1962. Pp. 126-146.
- Blass F. and A. Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bligh, John. "Baptism in St. Paul," Heythrop Journal, 7 (January, 1966), 60-62.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Das Ende des Gesetzes; Paulusstudien. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Baptism in the New Testament. Translated by J.K.S. Reid. London: SCM Press, 1961. Pp. 23-46.
- Collins, Berkley. "The Sacrament of Baptism in the New Testament," Expository Times, 27 (October-December, 1915), 70-73.

- Dacquino, P. "La Nostra Morte e la Nostra Resurrezione con Christo secondo San Paolo," Revista Biblica, 14 (March, 1966), 227-259.
- Flemington, W. The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism. London: SPCK, c. 1953. Pp. 52-84.
- Gächter, P. "Zur Exegese von Röm. 6,5," Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie, 54 (1930), 88-92.
- Gäumann, Niklaus. Taufe und Ethik; Studien zu Römer 6. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, c. 1967. Pp. 50-52; 78-80.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath, et al. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. II. Graz-Austria: Akademische Druck-U. Verlagsanstalt, 1954.
- Howard, J.K. "' . . . Into Christ': A Study of the Pauline Concept of Baptismal Union," Expository Times, 79 (February, 1968), 147-151.
- Keller, Walter. "Paul's Baptism Theology with Special Reference to Rom. 6." Unpublished S.T.M. Thesis, Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, 1956. Pp. 23-56.
- Klaar, Erich. Die Taufe nach Paulinischen Verständnis. Heft 93 in Theologische Existenz Heute. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, c. 1961. Pp. 3-31.
- Kuss, Otto. Der Römer Brief. I. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet Verlag, 1963. Pp. 299-304.
- Langevin, P.-É. "Le Baptême dans la Mort-Resurrection. Exégèse de Rm 6 1-5," Sciences Ecclésiastiques, 17 (January, 1965), 29-65.
- Leenhardt, Franz-J. The Epistle to the Romans. Translated by Harold Knight. Cleveland: The World Publishing Company, c. 1961. Pp. 159-161.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart, Roderick McKenzie and Others. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.
- Lohse, E. "Taufe und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus," Kerygma und Dogma, 11 (April, 1965), 308-324.
- Moule, Handley C.G. The Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Vol. XXXVI of The Expositor's Bible. Edited by W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1894. P. 164.

- Moulton, W.F. and A.S. Geden, editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th revised edition by H.K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1963.
- Reid, J.K.S. "The Phrase 'In Christ'," Theology Today, 17 (March, 1960), 353-365.
- Sanday, William and Arthur C. Headlam. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the International Critical Commentary. 5th edition. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1964. Pp. 157-158.
- Schmidt, Hans Wilhelm. Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer. Vol. VI in Theologischen Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962. Pp. 109-110.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Baptism in the Thought of St. Paul. Translated by G.R. Beasley-Murray. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964. Pp. 18-82; 139-207.
- Schneider, Johannes. "Ἐνοίωμα," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. V. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, c. 1967. Pp. 191-198.
- Schwarzmann, Heinrich. Zur Tauftheologie des Hl. Paulus in Roem. 6. Heidelberg: F.H. Kerle, c. 1950. Pp. 27-48.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Dying and Rising with Christ," New Testament Studies, 14 (January, 1967), 1-14.
- Stanley, D.M. "Baptism in the New Testament," Scripture, 8 (1956), 44-57.
- Tremel, Y.B. "Baptism - the Incorporation of the Christian into Christ," in Baptism in the New Testament; a Symposium. Translated by David Askew. Baltimore: Helicon, c. 1964. Pp. 189-208.