

The Role of the Holy Spirit in Rom 8

Ksenija MAGDA

Theological Faculty "Matthias Flacius Illyricus", Zagreb

kmagda@baptist.hr

UDK: 227.1

Original scientific paper

Received: September 27. 2007.

Accepted: October 11. 2007.

Summary *On account of methodological considerations (primarily from theory of space) the article points to the centrality of Rom 8 and particularly to the role of the Holy Spirit in it as the connecting factor in the two Pauline re-definitions of Jewish traditions: that of the role of the Law and that of the adoption of Israel as God's sons. The Holy Spirit is the key to a Christian life – both for «getting in» and «staying in».*

Traditionally, Romans 8 has been understood as Paul's abrupt conclusion to his doctrinal discussion. In a move that seems totally illogical, he leaves concrete theological presuppositions behind and loses himself in eschatological considerations that are unintelligible and in complete opposition to the healthy doctrinal section. From the time of the Reformation, exegetical lances have been broken over this alleged illogicality, triggered by Paul's Jewish patriotism.

Some theologians, particularly those with Protestant roots, have been prepared to free Paul, the declared apostle to the Gentiles (Rom 11:13) of all Jewish aspects and rid themselves totally of these illogical chapters 9-11. Is it not true, that by accepting them, we understand that Paul actually offers a new means of salvation for the Jews by the claim that they will be saved in the end (Rom 11:25) regardless of their unbelief in Christ?¹ In the first half of the 20th century, when theologians, driven by the too-strict science of doubt, were constantly dreaming up interpolations, the suggestion that Rom 9-11 is not Pauline but rather should be considered as a later editorial addition, was quite common. To tell the truth, New Testament scholars of those times were also quite eager to delete Rom 12-16 (some parts with more, some with less enthusiasm) from the *Compendium*

¹ Some authors indeed insist that Paul proposes a two-way salvation – one way for the Gentiles through Christ, and the other for the Jews by their law. See e.g. Gaston

Doctrinae (Melanchthon) of Romans. They considered it their job to separate unreasonable eschatological and generally unpractical considerations from Paul's real centre ("die Mitte bei Paulus") which was defined as "justification by faith" and through which the Judaism of Paul's time, his theology and particularly the Epistle to the Romans, has been evaluated from the time of the Reformation.

Today, those voices requesting the unity of the epistle have become much louder. In serious theology,² as opposed to popular novelist writing of the Dan Brown type, much more faith is attributed to those old Christian documents and to their authors.³

In this article, I want to argue that Romans 8, and particularly the Holy Spirit in Rom 8, present the core of the letter and should be considered the connection between the two doctrinal discussions, from which then the paraenesis of Rom 12-16 naturally follows. We will confine ourselves here mainly to the "doctrinal" part of Romans, i.e. to chapters 1-11, and will not be dealing with the paraenesis of it, although I am deeply convinced that this part is equally vital and completes the message to the church in Rome.

It will also be shown that in the doctrinal chapters, Paul discusses two aspects of the same subject – namely the righteousness of God that is revealed among human kind (3:21). The first part of Romans, I claim, Paul concludes in Rom 8:13: The Holy Spirit is the end of the law and the means of salvation for all people; the second doctrinal part is introduced in Rom 8:14 as the Holy Spirit as a pledge and power for living for the children of God. We need to notice that both parts concern all followers of Christ regardless of their nationality. In Rom. 8 and particularly through the Holy Spirit then, the "getting in" and the "staying in" of salvation is connected. In the "getting in," as well as the "staying in" of the Christian life – i.e. if Christians are entrusting their lives to God for the first time, or are living their daily lives – it is, according to Paul's insight into the will of God, the Holy Spirit who plays the decisive role.

A. Some methodological presuppositions

In contemporary New Testament science, the letter to the Romans gained its particular place, no doubt, because of the perceived doctrinal importance of Rom.

² See for instance J. Dunn "The Letter to the Romans" in *Dictionary of Paul And His Letters* (Leicester: IVP, 1993) 841/2.

³ Hengel insists that the scientific doubt of his predecessors must be even considered unscientific; *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1998, 10).

3-8,⁴ but also because of the basic existentialist meaning of the doctrine of justification of humanity. Reformation readings of Romans are thoroughly Christological, and this is a contribution which cannot and must not be dismissed.

But on the other hand, such an (exclusive) emphasis has created a whole spectrum of confusing theological problems.⁵ So i.e. there have been suggestions of diverse textual-critical fragmentations of the letter and questions of authenticity were raised, although there is evidence of an early established text for Romans in its full length. This all happened predominantly because it has been difficult to harmonize large parts of the text with the demands of doctrinal emphasis.⁶ From there, Paul's audience in Rome has been identified as only Gentile Christians,⁷ only Jews,⁸ or only Jewish Christians⁹ because the emphasis on the doctrinal part of the letter and the theses about interpolation fail to give enough evidence about the audience. From there, confusion emerged about the occasion of Paul's writing: so it was considered that Romans was actually sent to Ephesus;¹⁰ or that it was an apology geared towards Jerusalem and not Rome,¹¹ or that it was a general epistle for a general Christian audience.¹²

Some have even insisted that Romans is a letter of an apostolic establishment and confirmation of the church in Rome. According to their opinion, the church in Rome did not even exist for Paul, as it lacked the apostolic seal, i.e. it emerged from itinerant Christian businessmen and their testimony, and not through apo-

⁴ So that some called it "the Lutheran imprisonment of Romans"; N. Elliott, *The Rhetoric of Romans* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990) 292.

⁵ B. Witherington called them "signposts" which have lead readers "away from the main highway and into various dead-end streets." *The Letter to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 1

⁶ H. D. Liezmann, *An die Römer* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1971) 3 shows that the present layout of Romans can possibly be traced all the way back to the 1st century and Clement of Rome; see also Dunn, *Romans* (Waco: Word, 1990) vol. 1, lx.

⁷ Most commentators in the earlier Protestant tradition; e.g. O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) but sometimes making a concession to the Jews; interestingly also Elliott, *Rhetorics*, 298.

⁸ Käsemann, *Romans* (London: SCM, 1980) 34 following Schlier, *Der Römerbrief* (Freiburg: Herder, 1977) 3-4.

⁹ F. C. Baur, "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs" in *Zeitschrift für Theologie* 3 (1836), 59-178, 76.

¹⁰ J. Munck, *Salvation of Mankind* 187 but Lietzmann calls it with regards to Rom 16 "sehr fraglich" *Römer*, 125, 128/9. Contr. N. T. Wright who calls it a "brilliant suggestion" but sticks with a Roman address; *Romans* 761.

¹¹ J. Jervell, "The letter to Jerusalem" in *The Romans Debate*, 53-64, 67 (as an answer to Fuchs).

¹² See articles by Manson, Jewett, Karis in *The Romans Debate*.

stolic proclamation and blessing.¹³ This dissuading but particularly anachronistic reading is also a product of the emphasis on doctrine in Romans if, of course, it is ripped out of the context of the whole letter – which, however, is not the case.¹⁴ This means that suggestions for the occasion and nature of the letter are manifold and contradictory and as such often confusing. And above all, the practical outworking of some of these theories created huge difficulties for the testimony of the Christian church, particularly in relation to the Jewish community.

Therefore, although the doctrine presented in Romans must be considered as immensely important, it cannot be considered isolated from the rest of the text of the letter, nor can the purpose of Paul's writing be determined solely from it, particularly if doctrinal section is defined as Rom 3-8. For our understanding of the message of this letter today, we need to take both parts of the doctrine, i.e. Rom 3-8 and 9-11 together. The doctrine of justification by faith must be seen in the context of the whole letter.

Such a methodological prerequisite is nothing new. F. C. Baur proposed such a thesis in the 19th century. He insisted that Romans should be understood just like all his other letters – as an occasional writing where historical facts, particularly those from the beginning and from the ending of the letter, are to be taken seriously.¹⁵ Paul emphasizes his role as apostle to the nations in these introductory and concluding chapters; he emotionally describes his calling to bring the Gospel to everyone who would believe in it; and in the end, he requests cooperation in this from the Romans: practically, by equipping him for the journey (15:24) but also spiritually through their prayers (15:30). An approach which does not take this into account can only be explained by an anachronistic western forensic interest in the “salvation of the soul.”

However, Baur's historical-critical emphases on the mission-strategic frame for Romans have not created a satisfactory interaction with the doctrinal part. If, namely, we claim that Paul wrote to win the Romans over for his missionary plans for the West, a question must be raised which stays unanswered: why would Paul need to display to the Romans his doctrinal view by so extensively emphasizing his discord with some Jewish doctrines? And why would he, in the end and almost diametrically opposed to what he said earlier, get himself all tangled up in emotional patriotism?

It is understandable then, that the historical interpretation of Romans and the theological-Christological one have remained opposed in the history of the interpretation of Romans. Almost in a parallel one could remark, a Hellenist Paul

¹³ G. Klein “Paul's Purpose” in *The Romans Debate*, 29-41.

¹⁴ See introduction to Donfried's *The Romans Debate*.

¹⁵ The already mentioned article “Der Zweck.”

thoroughly converted from Judaism, as he was propagated by the History of Religions School has been opposed to a Paul, the Jewish apocalyptic who set out to fulfil the mission to the Gentiles only to create conditions for the salvation of all Israel. The discussion was enforced when E. P. Sanders proposed Covenantal Nomism.¹⁶ It seemed, at first, that he sufficiently argued for a lack of doctrinal discord between Paul and the rabbinic Judaism of his time, emphasizing that the law was not considered salvific in Judaism but that salvation came to Israel as well through God's merciful election of his people. The obedience to the law comes only after this election. Sander's assault on traditional Pauline theology was so strong that J. Dunn called it the New Perspective on Paul,¹⁷ and T. Donaldson speaks about a new paradigm for understanding Paul.¹⁸

The century-old reformation thesis that Paul had a problem with the Jewish understanding of salvation by works sunk and everybody had to take a stand in light of this new development. The main question then for the past two or three decades in Pauline studies has been: what is the problem Paul has with Judaism, if it is not salvation by works?

Of course, different solutions have been offered. In short, one of the leading Paulinists of Great Britain, N. T. Wright, has frustratedly suggested that we should forget the question of "derivation" of Paul's doctrine, and turn towards its "direction" instead.¹⁹ In other words, we should consider less the circumstances of Paul's writing and rather turn to the content of the letter – by which, however, we would arrive at the beginning of our problem! But Wright himself did not stick to his suggestion. In the newest commentary on Romans, he points to something he calls a "fresh perspective." For him, interestingly, this is the Graeco-Roman social and political context of Paul's theology.²⁰ But with this, it is easy to presume, we would be at yet another partial understanding of Paul and his theology, while what we really need is a relational paradigm in which we could identify and test the reciprocity of forces active in the creation of Paul's identity and of his thought. A first such attempt was given by J. C. Beker in his book *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*.²¹ There, Beker suggests that we should discern the coherent centre and the contingency of what is written. However, Beker does not suggest how one can discern what should be considered the centre

¹⁶ *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

¹⁷ *The New Perspective on Paul* (Manchester: Ryland, 1983).

¹⁸ *Paul and the Gentiles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997).

¹⁹ *What St. Paul Really Said* (Oxford: Lion, 1997) 79.

²⁰ "Paul and Caesar" in Bartholomew and Craig, *A Royal Priesthood* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2002) 180f.

²¹ (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 89.

and what the contingent. T. Donaldson has attempted this in his comprehensive work on Paul's convictional world. Unfortunately, Donaldson's work, in addition to being very complicated, is also equally arbitrary with regards to what is central and what is peripheral. Being himself an adherent of Sander's new paradigm, he presupposes but does not prove that Paul is, above all, a Jewish apocalyptic.

The dilemma which opens in front of us can be solved only by an integrated, contextual approach, such as is offered, for instance, in modern theories of space and there in particular in the approach of Robert Sack.²² Sack claims that elements from the different realms of experience – i.e. meaning, social relations, and nature – are collected in the place of the self where they reciprocally influence each other through the self. In other words, territoriality is decisive for a human experience not only because it connects the elements of his experience, but also elements of his perspective, i.e. his evaluations and abstractions and his spiritual being.

For an understanding of the Epistle to Romans and in particular of what seems to be Paul's arbitrary dealings with Jewish traditions, the doctrinal part of the epistle should not be determined via the subject, thematically – as if the doctrine of justification by faith is the only doctrinal part (because anachronistically Romans 1-8 means so much to us) and the dealing with Israel in Rom 9-11 should not be considered doctrine, but something else which is difficult to be determined. A territorial reading of Romans would request that Rom 3-11 be read together as Paul's doctrinal part, which is reciprocally dependent on the discussion about the "nature of humankind" (Sack would call this a discussion from the realm of nature in Rom 1:18-3:20), but also on the paraenesis of Romans 12-16 (which Sack would identify as the realm of social relationships). Such an approach is evident in the letter, as Paul seems to deal with doctrines throughout the long discussion in 3-11. This is not only true in Rom 3-8, where we see him handling traditions of Adam and Abraham which are easily recognized, but also in 9-11 where he is similarly handling the Jewish tradition about the adoption of Israel as God's sons. In the following two sections, we shall look at these doctrines and see how they are re-evaluated and how it is the Holy Spirit who binds them into a unified whole.

²² For an integral explanation of territoriality see R. Sack, *Homo Geographicus* (London: J. Hopkins, 1997). For an application of Sack's theory onto Pauline thought see my thesis: *Paul's Territoriality and Mission Strategy with Particular Emphasis on Romans* (London: LST theses, 2007)

B. Paul's Redefinition of the Jewish re-evaluation of the doctrine of justification by law and the role of the Holy Spirit

The ease with which Paul, a rabbi and initially persecutor of Jesus' followers, accepts the call to be an apostle to the Gentiles is stunning, especially in comparison with the other apostles of Jesus. Luke draws Paul's anti-type, so to say, in the person of Peter and his difficulty to go out and preach in the house of Cornelius in Acts 10:1-48. God had to persuade Peter using three identical visions and only then was Peter ready to enter Cornelius' house. Peter is also shown to excessively recount the difficulty of that process in Acts 10:28f. But even then, the visions fade away quickly as Peter returns to his old ways as is shown in Gal 2:11-14. Again, he is excluding the Gentiles.

Equally, the council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 emits a similar picture of inflexibility towards accepting the Gentiles into the (Jewish) Christian communities. Luke recounts a constant tension in the early church which is created between the "Jerusalem apostles" and Paul concerning the inclusion of Gentiles to the church of Christ.

The reading of Romans (as Galatians, and actually all other Pauline epistles as well) forces us to integrate different elements into Paul. According to his own testimony (Phil 3) Paul is too Jewish to simply claim that his problem with Judaism is that it is not Christianity, as does Sanders.²³ We will not solve the problem by defining "works of the law" in a minimalist way by calling those "social boundaries" either, as was done by Dunn in the tradition of Lohmeyer.²⁴ It may be true that Paul deals primarily with these visible social boundaries, which have, by tradition, divided the world from the Jews nationally, but his arguments are always theologically much deeper than that. This is why we must not neglect those theological emphases that have been so faithfully brought forward by the Reformation tradition. But, we have already stated that in our geographically aware approach we will not need to neglect them. In this approach, the doctrine of justification remains important and cannot be played down as merely situational.

Still, we expect that Paul, in drawing elements from the different realms of his experience, has redefined them in regard to and according to the requirements of his place. We believe that it is his deep roots in the Roman world that drive him and also support his re-evaluation of the different triggers in his realms of "nature," "social relations," and of the workings of the mind. He adapts them and weaves them together into a compact picture. By doing this, Paul is not creating new traditions (as could be said of Philo), but by being faithful to the Word

²³ *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1983) 47.

²⁴ "Gesetzeswerke" in *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 28 (1929) 177-207.

of God, to him it is revealed that which should have been clear much earlier – that God’s plan of salvation is for all nations.

Among the first observations of such a geographical reading of Romans is one that Paul has no problems with the law. His whole discussion on justification depends on the broader Pauline discussion, and also on the missionary framework of the epistle. Paul writes within the context of a request that the Romans might support his mission. This is not only expressed in the lonely Rom 15:24, but we should recognize that large portions of Romans deal with mission. The mission in question is a mission of universal proportions and to all nations.²⁵

N. T. Wright has arrived at similar conclusions in his theological evaluations of Romans. Thus, he suggested that it is indeed the righteousness of God that is Paul’s problem in Romans, and this is equally observed in Rom 3-8 and 9-11.²⁶ This means that the doctrine of justification by faith should be seen within the context of the broader discussion. The first part is only a negative argument: how the righteousness of God cannot be obtained, namely by doing the works of the law. The other is positive, how it is obtained, namely by God’s free election and mercy through his Spirit – or in one word: adoption.

Paul does not deduce his discussions from the circumstances of the Roman Christians, but from his Jewish heritage, however, in view of the problems which might endanger his mission to the ends of the world, as Spain was called in those days. Evidently, the question about God’s righteousness towards the Jews, but also the newly added Gentiles created problems in the Roman church, i.e. churches, as it is today almost generally accepted that there were at least a dozen of them in this huge city. These churches were divided for political but also possibly for theological reasons.²⁷ Paul needed their unity for his efforts in the West.

This division in two equally important and, through one subject, combined doctrinal sections, is supported by the rhetoric of Romans. “Law” is the governing term up until the first part of Rom 8, but later this role is taken by “God’s

²⁵ It is interesting in this regard to leave the current paradigm of translating ἔθνη as «nations» because by doing so one does automatically obtain the breadth of Paul’s world mission, which is lost in the current paradigm.

²⁶ *Romans*, 397.

²⁷ P. S. Minear, *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle of Romans* (London: SCM, 1971); newly similarly also P. Lampe *Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1987).

adoption of people as Sons” and is synonymous for it.²⁸ But the righteousness of God remains an important term throughout the letter. If the letter is read as an integrated whole, Rom 9-11 is freed not only from the imprisonment which has been forced on these chapters by the Protestant reading, but also from slavery to only one verse (Rom 11:26) to which there have been objections ever since Schweitzer’s discovery of the apocalyptic Paul.

In both redefinitions of Jewish traditions it becomes evident that Paul re-defines his former particularist standpoints towards a universalism, i.e. from what was true for the Jews towards that which is true for all humans (or more concretely, for all Christians). This again would stress the fact that Paul’s interest is not to be sought in individual nations, but rather in the world as a whole and in God’s plan for the world of that he is the only Lord. A geographically aware reading would not only point to the source of Paul’s redefinition of doctrine, but also to its direction. Paul is not primarily “the apostle to the Gentiles,” and certainly he is not a non-adapted Jewish apocalyptic Skywalker who evangelizes the Gentiles only to bring this time to its end and introduce the eschaton. On the contrary, he is a mission minded, well-socialized globetrotter who not only understands the world spiritually but also adapts spirituality to the needs of his place and time.

Paul’s redefinition of the role of the law emerges primarily from the re-definition of the two basic, and for Jews, important traditions: that about Abraham and that about Adam. There is no doubt that the tradition about Abraham was basic to the self-understanding of the Jewish people through history (Gen 12: 1-3). G. Mayer showed on account of collected old sources that this tradition can also be seen as Jewish propaganda material in a Hellenist world.²⁹ He points out two views of Abraham. In Palestine, the one that displayed Abraham as a man living out a holy life according to God’s commandments was more popular. But for the Jewish minority living in a Hellenist environment, Abraham was often used as an example of cosmopolitanism and a proof that the Jews were not as egocentric as they were sometimes portrayed to be by the Romans. Abraham and the promise given to him to be a blessing for all nations on the earth were fertile ground for different myths about Abraham’s descendents all throughout

²⁸ J. Scott, *Adoption as Sons of God* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1992). Scott deals primarily with the background of the term. For Rom 9-11 as a reference to this Jewish tradition see also: K. H. Rengstorf “Das Ölbaumgleichnis in Röm 11,16ff. Versuch einer weiterführenden Deutung” in *E. Bammel et al Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in Honor of David Daube* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978) 127-164, 161-2; M. W. Schoenberg “Huiiothesia: Adoptive Sonship of the Israelites” in *American Ecclesiastical Review* 143 (1960) 261-273; 272-3; idem. “St Paul’s Notion on the Adoptive Sonship of Christians” in *Thomist* 28 (1960), 51-75; 60.

²⁹ “Aspekte des Abrahambildes in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur“ in *Evangelische Theologie* 32 (1972) 118-127.

the (known) world. Even the barbarians living on the other side of Gibraltar (at the “end of the world”) could be proud as Abraham’s offspring, as their forefather Hercules, was Abraham’s son in law!³⁰

Even though the Jews, and particularly those in Palestine, despised the learned cosmopolitanism of that day in time, they persisted in viewing Abraham as the law-abiding paradigm of a pious life.³¹ Mayer insists upon the option that they too knew both traditions.³² Therefore, we can also presuppose that a Christian community, like the one in Rome, which, at least in the beginning of its existence depended on the synagogue, lived with both of these traditions.

Paul’s discussion about Abraham in Romans also supports this. In Rom 4, he dwells on Abraham as the example of living by the works of the law and re-defines this doctrine into a doctrine about Abraham who is saved by the pure and undeserved grace of God. In Rom 9:1-24, however, and within the discussion about God’s adoption of humanity, he deals with the tradition of Abraham as the “physical” father of many nations, maintaining that the bodily connection with Abraham has never been of much use, but that everything depends on God’s gracious act of adoption. This should be clear to anybody who reads about Abraham’s call in the Scriptures. Even according to the synagogue’s teachings, 29 years have passed between Gen 15:10 and 17:10, between Abraham’s call and his circumcision.³³ An additional 430 years have passed since the circumcision of Abraham and the giving of the law at Sinai.³⁴ From where Paul was standing, it was impossible to believe that Abraham was saved by his works. Justification, Paul concludes, can only come by God’s grace. People cannot deserve it, and that is true of Abraham as well as of his descendents.

Actually, by showing mercy to the Gentiles, God takes into account the “spiritual” descendents of Abraham. They are these uncircumcised Gentiles who are now, so it seems, first off amazed in accepting God’s call in Christ. “Abraham kommt in seiner Vaterschaft (Gen 15,5; 17,5) zuerst in Heidenchristentum zum

³⁰ Mayer, “Aspekte” 121-122. Mit dieser Verknüpfung mit der Herkulesage verschafft sich Kleodemos die günstige Gelegenheit, die Verbindung von Abrahams Abkömmlingen mit Libyen genealogisch zu untermauern. Als Vorbild dient ihm dabei die Abstammungslegende der mauretanischen Könige in Tingis: Herkakles zeugt Sophax, as dessen Ehe mit Tinge, der Witwe des Antaios, geht Didoros hervor (Plutarch, *Sertorius* 9). Für seine Zwecke formt Kleodemos den Stammbaum so um, dass Abraham zum Schwiegervater des Herakles wird und damit auch zum Stammvater der Mauretanier.”

³¹ Mayer, “Aspekte,” 121-122.

³² Ibid.

³³ O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966) 119. STR-B. III 203; Käsemann, *Romans*, 114.

³⁴ F. F. Bruce, *The Letter to the Romans* (Leicester: IVP, 1986) 108.

Ziel", remarks Michel.³⁵

After Paul has shown Abraham's spiritual fatherhood for all who believe, he turns his attention to the tradition of Adam. In the history of interpretation, much attention has been attributed to Rom 5,³⁶ but this popularity developed independently of the theological context of the letter, insisting on the issue of hereditary sin. In the meantime, many have criticized this approach.³⁷ T. Tobin summed it up nicely when he maintained that, because Paul gives this problem only one verse of attention, hereditary sin is clearly not the problem of his discussion here.³⁸ Tobin's evaluation of this text shows that the rhetorical situation of the text shows firstly, that in Adam, Paul is attempting to show the universality of human experience, and secondly, that in this picture, Paul investigates the relationship between sin, death, and the law of Moses.³⁹ In his doctoral thesis, Wedderburn suggested that when Rom 5:12-21⁴⁰ is treated exegetically, this supports Paul's universality. But he also explained that Paul uses a Jewish, not a Hellenist, Gnostic idea,⁴¹ and that the whole discussion is not about hereditary sin.⁴² On the contrary, he believes that Paul, by employing the tradition of Adam, attempts to show the universality of salvation in Christ.⁴³ Wedderburn even claims that Paul redefines the tradition of Adam by coming from the universal deed of salvation. The universality of Christ's work he reads back into Adam and the effects of sin.

³⁵ Michel, *Römer*, 120.

³⁶ A. J. M. Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ: An Investigation into the Background of 1 Corinthians XV and Romans V 12-21* (Cambridge: Dissertation, 1970) gives an overview in the introduction. Regardless of the fact that the context of the texts are more seriously considered in the newer scholarship, this discussion on hereditary sin finds occasional revival in some commentaries as in Fitzmyer, *Romans* (New York: Doubleday, 1993) 407; as also in the older Cranefield, *Epistle to the Romans I* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979) 269ff.

³⁷ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 215; E. Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Römer 5, 1-21 (1 Kor 15)* (Neukirchen: Neukirchner Verlag, 1962) 16; see in particular note 2; G. Schunack, *Das hermeneutische Problem des Todes im Horizont von Römer 5 untersucht* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1967) 235-6.

³⁸ T. Tobin *Paul's Rhetoric in its Context: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2004) 160-1.

³⁹ Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 177-8.

⁴⁰ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 210-248.

⁴¹ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 77.80. The older discussions in the History of Religions School tried to prove the gnostic character of Paul's analogy. J. Dunn as a representative of the newer trends in exegesis calls the attempt to show the Adam-Christ analogy as a pre-Christian gnostic idea futile (Romans 1, 277); however, Kümmel still maintains it *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989) 139-140.

⁴² Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 215. 219.

⁴³ E. g. Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 211.

Paul does not consider that Adam's sin is universal or that a universal cure needs to be found in Christ, but that only in the universal work of Christ is it evident that all of Adam's descendants have sinned.⁴⁴

But even his suggestion does not give us any other reason why Paul attempts this redefinition, except for the classical – Paul's encounter with Christ.⁴⁵ However, even the Jews who, like Paul, met Christ did not see the need to re-define the Adam tradition in this way. On the contrary, they were satisfied with the traditional understanding that Adam represents the sinfulness of humanity, in particular of the Gentiles and Jews who are breaking the law.⁴⁶ After his encounter with Christ, Paul did not stop being Jewish. In this case it would be much more probable to expect him to understand that those who need Christ are in fact the Jews, and possibly also some pious proselytes. But how could he, all of the sudden, understand that God's call included a mission to the Gentiles? Wedderburn's conclusions ask for additions.

Help comes, it seems to me, from the article by M. Hooker "Adam in Romans 1."⁴⁷ In her investigation of Rom 1:18-3:19, Hooker shows that the man in this introductory paragraph is best understood as Adam. So the definition in 5:12-21 would be linked, like the one of Abraham, on Paul's discussion "from nature" which we saw as dependent on Paul's universal place.

Hooker claims that Paul applies Ps 106:20 (LXX) by using pictures from Gen 1:20-26.

It would appear that Paul, in describing the idolatry into which man has fallen, has deliberately chosen the terminology of the Creation story... Of Adam it is supremely true that God manifested to him that which can be known of him (v. 19); that from the creation onwards, God's attributes were clearly discernible to him in the thing which had been made, and that he was thus without excuse (v. 20). Adam, above and before all men, knew God, but failed to honour him as God, and grew vain in his thinking and allowed his heart to be darkened (v. 20). Adam's fall was the result of his desire to be as God, to attain knowledge of good and evil (Gen iii. 5) so that claiming to be wise, he in fact became a fool (v. 21). Thus he not only failed to give glory to God, but, according to rabbinic tradition, he himself lost the glory of God which was reflected in his face (v. 23). In believing the serpent's lie that his action would not lead to death (Gen iii. 4) he turned his back on the truth of God and he

⁴⁴ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 216.

⁴⁵ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 228.

⁴⁶ Wedderburn shows that Adam was considered a sinner and that the traditions regularly juxtaposed him "with subsequent righteous men who must come to put right what Adam has vitiated or to be what Adam failed to be" *Adam and Christ*, 77.

⁴⁷ M. D. Hooker, "Adam in Romans 1" in *NTS* 6 (1960)297-306. Later also Dunn, *Romans I*, 60-62.

obeyed, and thus gave his allegiance to a creature, the serpent, rather than to the Creator (v.25).⁴⁸

This impression is enhanced even by the unusual oxymoron ὁμοιώματι εικῶν in the interpretation of the Genesis text in Wisdom where these words are used: ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἔκτισεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐπ’ ἀφθαρσίᾳ καὶ εἰκόνα τῆς ἰδίας ἀιδιότητος ἐποίησεν αὐτόν (2,23).

For the contrast between the glory of God and the likeness of an image ... is the contrast between Man’s knowledge of God before the Fall and his imperfect knowledge of him afterwards.⁴⁹

If the connection stands, as it is set up by Hooker, this would mean that the redefinition of the tradition about Adam is linked back to Paul’s incipient cosmopolitan discussion in Rom 1:18-32 and that it is triggered by it. Speaking in Sackian terms, this incipient discussion was a discussion in the realm of “nature” which is centred in Paul’s geographical setting – the broad Roman world. This then would mean that Paul, coming from the universality of the Roman world, discusses the nature of humanity in this place of his experience and he concludes that the nature of all human kind, regardless of their nationality is sinful.

It could be said that Paul redefines this ambivalent Jewish tradition about Adam⁵⁰ towards a doctrine of the universality of human sinfulness which results in universal death. In this way, the tradition becomes even more important for his argument. Paul counters the Jewish expectation of salvation through a physical connection with Abraham with an unexpected physical connection of all human kind, including the Jews, with Adam.

Paul’s redefinition of the role of the law follows from the redefinition of these two traditions. His universal Roman place enables him to see – through the redefinition of the tradition of Abraham – how it was possible for God to accept the nations “outside of the law” by his mercy; and in the redefinition of the tradition about Adam he has exposed the law as that which reveals sin in all human beings. So, at the end of this argumentation Paul can confirm his main thesis: διὰ γὰρ νόμου ἐπίγνωσις ἁμαρτίας (Rom 3:20). These two traditions supported by Paul’s cosmopolitan setting enhance his claim and show how he came to his conclusions. Abraham could not have been saved by the law nor could he have been chosen as a man obedient to the law. The physical connection to Abraham is not salvific so no one can rely on it for salvation; on the contrary, the inevitable connection of all people to Adam is the connection which defines human loyalty

⁴⁸ Hooker, “Adam,” 300.

⁴⁹ Hooker, “Adam,” 303.

⁵⁰ Wedderburn, *Adam and Christ*, 73-77.

and this brings only death. As Adam, before them, was unable to fulfil God's law, so are they also dead and unable to fulfil it. You can recite the law indefinitely to a dead man but he will not obey it.

It is only when the Spirit of God comes to dwell in a believer that a change may be wrought from within. From within then, the Spirit of God revives the mortal human being. Without the Spirit of God, no human body can carry out the will of God. Having the law does not really help. On the contrary, it makes sin more evident. The solution can be sought only in the "law of the Spirit of life" (8:2) and in the "Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead" because "he who raised Christ from the dead will also give life to your mortal bodies" (8:11). Dunn comments:

The believer escapes neither this body of death nor the death of this body, but God's acceptance, life, and power are not subject to sin or death, and when sin plays death as its last card God's Spirit will trump it.⁵¹

In this way, Paul can claim that the law is good as it points out sin which otherwise would not be visible. However, the law is only one step in the salvation of the world, and not salvation in itself. Salvation is possible only through Christ and can be accomplished through the Spirit of Christ which comes to dwell in the believer. If this is so, there can be no competing means of salvation. Paul has thus shown that the law could not be salvific, not for the Gentiles and not for the Jews. Rather, the Spirit, which God has graciously given to all who believe, brings life to Christians so that they can live according to a new law – the "law of the Spirit of life" (8:2) in Christ.⁵² This new "law" is universal, i.e. it is not defined nationally and is not even confined only to human beings but refers to the whole creation which longs for the revelation of the children of God (8:19). And above all, this new law not only gives guidelines for those who believe, but it also bestows power for a life according to the will of God. The Spirit, Paul claims, does in the believer what was impossible for the law: from within he energizes the mortal body so it can comply with God's commands.

Concluding this way, Paul now logically introduces his other great re-definition of a Jewish tradition – the tradition about the eschatological expectation, the doctrine of election which should, as we shall see, rather be called the "doctrine of Israel as God's adopted son."⁵³ In Rom 8, Paul concludes his discussion on the

⁵¹ *Romans I*, 445.

⁵² Sometimes also referred to as "the law of Christ" eg. Gal 6:2.

⁵³ Scott, *Adoption*, 104 shows that the term υιοθεσία is dependent on the eschatological application of the formula of adoption in 2 Sam 7:14 in Jewish tradition. Fitzmyer agrees with Stendahl that what follows in Rom 9 should be identified as "the gospel of promise" (*Romans*, 541).

role of the law in the salvation of human kind by maintaining how that which was impossible for the law has been fulfilled in the believers through the Spirit of God. But the discussion about the Spirit of God and its role is not concluded with this by far.

C. Paul's redefinition of the doctrine of Adoption and the Spirit of Christ

Commentators who are preoccupied with the doctrine of justification by faith rarely realize that this discussion on the adoption of God's sons begins already in Rom 8:14. True, one can be easily led astray by Paul's constant mention of the Spirit in Rom 8 and conclude that the whole of the chapter should be seen as a rounded discussion on the Spirit of God, which is hardly linked to the discussion which follows. This is particularly so because of the poetic display at the end of the chapter (8:31-32) which is often seen as a concluding doxology. This is what Barth did⁵⁴ and other influential Pauline scholars like Käsemann⁵⁵ in the German-speaking realm and Dunn in the English-speaking realm also followed suit.⁵⁶

Dunn however, notices that there might be a "problem" in the link between the thought in 8:13 and 8:14 and terms this as "unclear."⁵⁷ He also maintains that the concealed stream, which carries forward Paul's thought, should be identified as the theme of the fulfilment of the promise of adoption in Abraham. He concludes: "The role of the law, the eschatological Spirit, the status of sonship, all follow in a natural sequence as topics of believers' privileges."⁵⁸

Therefore one could claim that Rom 8:14-38 is the universal and including introduction to Paul's re-evaluation of the doctrine of the eschatological adoption of the children of God, which follows in Rom 9-11. Through this re-evaluation of the old Jewish tradition, Paul attempts to show that God has adopted all of humanity, and not just the Jews (on the basis of the promise given to Abraham).

In this reading the "Spirit" should not be considered a rhetorical means of separation of the two wholes (Rom 3-8 and 9-11). Rather, he would connect the two by pointing to the same theme handled in both: the righteousness of God which is being revealed – once in the Spirit of God who justifies believers by producing in them their "resurrection," and on the other hand, in the Spirit who is

⁵⁴ *Romans*, 295.

⁵⁵ *Romans*, 225.

⁵⁶ *Romans*, 449f.

⁵⁷ *Romans*, 449.

⁵⁸ *Romans*, 450.

the warranty of adoption by God.⁵⁹ Rom 8:14 picks up Paul's announced subject in Rom 3:21. It seems that it is only now that Paul has really come to the main issue of his writing. All who have the Spirit of God are children of God (Rom 8:14). And the Spirit of God is the spirit by which all can call God their Father. All believers are also heirs in the unspeakable heritage of God. So also Fitzmyer notices that "in effect, when one reflects on earlier parts of the letter, one can see that Paul was really preparing for this discussion all along."⁶⁰ The Spirit not only revives the body which is under the curse of death and raises the believer to a new life according to the will of God – i.e. enables believers from within for good works. Rather, he is also the warranty of God's adoption and a sign of a full belonging to the family of God in the capacity of children and heirs (cf. 1 Cor 1:22; Eph 1:13-14). All those who have the Spirit of God are children of God!

This extreme universal optimism and faith in God's unchangeable faithfulness by which Paul concludes Rom 8 have been pointed out on many occasions, as has the question that necessitates from it for the Jewish doctrine of election. Why would Christians now believe that God has decided to bring about a happy ending for them, if he has rejected the Jews whom he has initially given his promises?⁶¹ The answer to this question is – according to Paul – again to be found in the Spirit of God, who is given to all who believe in Christ: not only the Gentiles, who are now enthusiastically accepting the gospel of Christ, but also the Jews.

In Rom 9-11, as we have announced, Paul has to answer to two lines of arguments which develop from two different, yet related, beliefs, and which both need correction. The first is that which is generated in the communities of Jewish Christians and it is evident in Rom 9. We can re-construct it as follows: Why do the Jews not react to the Gospel? And more concretely still: Why has Paul stopped evangelizing the Jews?

The other line of reasoning comes from the communities of the Gentile Christians and finds its expression in Paul's rhetorical question of Rom 11:1: "Has God rejected his people?" This means that there were Christians in Rome – or at least Paul anticipates a number of them in Rome – who believed that this was the case; that God had rejected the Jews and that he has turned to the Gentiles. Paul's re-definition of the doctrine of adoption is a reaction to both of these discussions.

Rom 9-11 has been widely recognized as the doctrine of the Jewish eschatological expectation. But the discussions on the text have been more linked to the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations and the eschatological outcome of this

⁵⁹ See also Schott, *Adoption*, 259.

⁶⁰ *Romans*, 541.

⁶¹ Dunn, *Romans II*, 518.

for the Jews, and also the connection of Jews and Gentiles in the eschaton, than to the righteousness of God which is revealed through God's adoption of all believers. But recognizing how Paul argues and what in particular he tries to achieve through this argument can help us avoid one-sided speculation.

Υιοθεσία, Scott claims, must always be translated as "adoption" and never as "sonship." It is the clear Graeco-Roman adoption term. The difficulty that this term cannot be found in neither the LXX nor in any other early Rabbinic writings, does not automatically mean that Jews did not practice adoption. Scott's research shows that Paul must use this term ritually thinking of the doctrine of adoption of Israel as God's son. He has discovered that the Jews practiced adoption as much as did the Romans,⁶² but that they used other synonyms for it. Scott believes that this would mean that by Paul's time υιοθεσία was used in its cultic meaning and was therefore no longer used in terms of ordinary adoptions.⁶³ Scott shows this by pointing to 2 Sam 7:14 as an adoption formula which is vividly used in Jewish apocalyptic literature for God's adoption of Israel as God's son.⁶⁴ The formula has eschatological character and can signify the Messiah or Israel, the nation as a whole.⁶⁵ This kind of adoption God first applied to Abraham.⁶⁶ Paul's unusual Greek word carries connotations of the biblical tradition and points to the fact that Paul acts from the area of already defined Jewish eschatological tradition.⁶⁷ In Rom 8 as well as in Gal 4, Paul can think along side a defined doctrine of adoption of Israel as God's son – which he now re-defines into a doctrine of adoption of all believers, regardless of nationality, and on grounds of the Spirit of

⁶² *Adoption*, 61.

⁶³ *Adoption*, 57.

⁶⁴ E. g. Q4Flor 1:11; Jub 1:23-25; Tjud 24:3 (where Israel's adoption is mentioned in relation to the messianic king); see full discussion about this in Scott, *Adoption*, 104.

⁶⁵ Scott, *Adoption*, 104.

⁶⁶ See Philo, *Sobr.* 56; Scott, (as well as Hengel, Sohn Gottes, 106) admits that one can observe a Stoic background of this thought in Philo, but that it is not very likely that it is a clean Stoic source. Stoics believed that all people are God's sons, so adoption by God would not be a big deal. Instead he considers a Hellenistic reading which can be found in Plutarch (Alexander, 27:11) where it is possible to see it as a reference of adoption of Alexander by Ammon-Zeus. Because Philo lived in Alexander's city, it is conceivable that he applied such divine adoption to Abraham. Cf. Scott, *Adoption*, 88-94. Indeed, Philo describes Jewish traditions in a totally Hellenistic way. This could also be the source of Paul's usage. Interestingly, Paul uses the picture of Abraham in Rom 9 for an introduction to his discussions on the doctrine of adoption. But his usage should be considered Jewish rather than Hellenist. Scott admits: that "Paul clearly avails himself of a Hellenistic term," although all of his letters are written in Greek he does not use "Hellenistic legal procedure or metaphor... let alone a Roman one. Here the Hellenistic *meaning* of the term must be distinguished from the Hellenistic *background* of the term," 267.

⁶⁷ Scott, *Adoption*, 88.

God who indwells them.

This is also what we find in Rom 8:14-11:36. First, Paul considers adoption from a nationally neutral position – i.e. a universal position: ὅσοι γὰρ πνεύματι θεοῦ ἄγονται· οὗτοι υἱοὶ θεοῦ εἰσιν (8:14) – all who have the Spirit of God are children of God. The Jews believed that they became children of God by their physical relationship to Abraham, but Paul claims that one is not God’s child through a physical relationship, but through the Spirit of God which indwells a person by faith in Christ. Physical relationships, even those in the Bible, did not count for much.

But Paul does not only re-evaluate a wrong Jewish perception, but also the much newer perception, but it seems almost a doctrinal statement already held by Gentile Christians – that God had rejected Israel and had now turned to the Gentiles instead (Rom 11:1-32). According to this doctrine, God would again choose his children according to a physical relationship “according to the flesh.” But Paul objects in a similar manner claiming that God, through his mercy, accepts all who believe. Thus, even the Jews, regardless of their present rejection of the gospel cannot be excluded.

As in a sandwich between these two redefinitions we are served chapter 10 of Romans with its missionary emphasis. It has been noted, and not only by Dunn, that Paul is not brainstorming here about some theories on missions, but that this chapter reveals his own calling to bring the gospel to all the nations.⁶⁸ Paul is called to preach to all, but primarily to those who have not yet heard the gospel (Rom 15:20). But while many recognize the implications of a global Christian mission as Paul’s subject, it is rarely recognized how this theme co-operates with Paul’s entire eschatological argument. The universality of this chapter and the emphasis on the salvation of all nations (Rom 10:4. 11. 18b) are lost in view of the beloved subject of Pauline scholars: the salvation of all Israel (11:26). The universality of Paul’s mission is lost in the overemphasis on the already fulfilled mission to the Jews – they have heard; but they did not believe; and so the link to 11:26 becomes a source of countless discussions: if they heard but did not believe – how will they all be saved?⁶⁹

Paul rejects these two traditions because of his conviction that the Spirit of God dwells in the believers and brings salvation to them all – regardless of their status “in the flesh.” From this universal perspective, God has certainly not rejected Israel! If God accepts all, the Jews must be included. Paul himself is living proof of that (11:1). And he is not alone. Israel has a history of “remnant” – a considerable remnant that is not always evident at first glance (e.g. Elijah, Rom

⁶⁸ Dunn, *Romans II*, 629; also eg. Barrett, *Romans* 205; Bruce, *Romans*, 194.

⁶⁹ Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 595.

11:2-6). In this it is not decisive how faithful this remnant is to the law, but in the fact that Israel's destiny depended on the hand of God who is faithful to his promises. Disobedience (hardening 11:7) must therefore be considered temporary, just as the disobedience of the Gentiles was temporary (11:30). And even the disobedience of the Jews must be considered an important part in the history of salvation of the other nations (Rom. 11:11): Would anybody have bothered to evangelize the Jews had they immediately accepted the gospel?

Paul believes that disobedience will be lifted from Israel at some point. He finds prophetic references for this belief in the promises of Deut 32:21 and 30:13. When Israel sees the faith of the Gentiles – it will be drawn to its God (10:19).

The jealousy motive has also been a much exploited one in the study of Paul's mission from O. Cullman⁷⁰ but in our reading, Paul's eschatology appears to be much less apocalyptic and more a simple and inevitable solution which develops from a wrong perception of adoption as God's sons.

This reading also plays an important role in the understanding of the still discussed problems in Rom 11: What does "a full number of nations" mean in Paul's eschatology and what does it mean that in the end "all Israel" will be saved?

Paul had never evangelized only the Gentiles.⁷¹ It is more likely that his mission became increasingly more "Gentile" for geographical and sociological reasons.⁷² If we read Romans from the perspective of Paul's geographical place in Corinth in the mid fifties of the first century, this mission is still not exclusively Gentile. Is it not possible that in Rom 11:13 Paul ironically uses the name he was given by some Romans circles – by friends and foes alike, but for different reasons?

Because Paul was so very well based and socialized in his Roman world, he understood that God had visited the world in Christ. All the nations – to the ends of the earth – were called to salvation through the Jewish Messiah. According to this universal call and through the support of God's unchanging promise, the world must now, after a long history of "remnant," expect the fullness of Israel's salvation as well.

What does this mean for the long standing discussion on the "full number of

⁷⁰ Cullman, "Le caractère" 210-245.

⁷¹ If we are careful and translate e.g. ἔθνη as "nations" than the task which is εὐθὺς taken on by Paul after his conversion does not exclude the Jews who can be considered numerous in Nabatea. It is not true that it is only Luke who tends to see Paul starting all of his preaching in the synagogues and with his own people (Act 9:29; 17:17; 18:19) but also Paul himself testifies in favour of this (1Cor 1:23-24; 9:20; implied also in Rom 10:1-4. 14).

⁷² Comp. Hengel/Schwemer, *Paulus zwischen Damaskus und Antiochien*, 238.

nations” and “all Israel?”⁷³ From all we have said, it must follow that both terms πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν and πᾶς Ἰσραήλ (11,26) express Paul’s universal perspective.⁷⁴ This conclusion can be backed by the fact that both πλήρωμα and πᾶς in Romans are normally easily recognized by cosmological rather than numerical terms. When, for instance, Paul speaks of the grace and apostleship to bring to the obedience of faith all the nations – he is not counting these nations in his head so as not to miss one. Equally, universality of salvation in Christ in Paul does not exclude the fact of God’s election. Paul always has a special place for God’s sovereignty and the mystery of his will. Faith means to live in confidence in God, sometimes even with open questions. The thought that the apostle might bring about the “end of the world” by his missionary involvement is not conceivable in such a thought frame. God has to remain sovereign.

It is best, therefore, to maintain that πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν and πᾶς Ἰσραήλ mean numerically pretty much the same for Paul: the fullness of salvation within God’s sovereign will and his immeasurable mercy. This is also how Paul concludes his discussion on God’s adoption of human kind as his children in Rom 11:30-32:

Just as you who were at one time disobedient to God have now received mercy as a result of their disobedience, so they too have now become disobedient in order that they too may now receive mercy as a result of God’s mercy to you. For God has bound all men over to disobedience so that he may have mercy on them all.

If Paul’s emphasis on the necessity of a universal mission to all the nations is recognized, then the Jewish question in Romans must be seen within the framework of this purpose. In short: Paul wants that everyone in Rome should know that his missionary effort is universal, just as God’s plan of salvation has at all times included all people. Rom 10, with its mission emphasis, should then be seen as basic to the discussion of Rom 9-11 and in both discussions: the one Paul has with the Jews (whether God has rejected the Jews) or with the Gentiles (that God has rejected the Jews and received “us”).

Conclusion

To sum up, it is clear from this discussion that the role of the Holy Spirit is shown not only as an independent, central subject in Romans but is portrayed as the means by which Christians get in and stay in salvation, and as an element which

⁷³ Fitzmyer, *Romans* 611. 621-622; Moo, *Romans*, 689. 715-718.

⁷⁴ Dunn claims that Paul is pursuing effect and not precision; *Romans* II, 655.

also rhetorically combines the two parts in Romans, which for a long time have been held apart in the study of the letter.

The righteousness of God has been revealed in Christ, not in the law, as it is in Christ that the Spirit of God has been poured out into the hearts of the believers. It is the Spirit who awakens the flesh to new life that is lived out according to the will of God. But only those who have the Spirit of God can be considered children of God. Only they can await the full revelation of the children of God because the Spirit – and not some material inheritance – is now the warranty of God's previous adoption of believers.

Sažetak *Polazeći od metodoloških pretpostavki primarno iz teorije prostora u članku se pretpostavlja da je Rim 8 i tu naosob uloga Duha Svetoga u životu vjernika, faktor koji povezuje dvije Pavlove redefinicije židovskih doktrina – o ulozi Zakona i o Božjem posinjenju Izraela. Po Kristu, Duh Sveti je ključ života vjernika kako za spasenje, tako i za posvećenje.*

