

SAMULI SIIKAVIRTA

# Baptism and Cognition in Romans 6–8

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*

407

---

**Mohr Siebeck**

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen  
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)  
Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL) · Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg)

J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

407





Samuli Siikavirta

# Baptism and Cognition in Romans 6–8

Paul's Ethics beyond 'Indicative' and 'Imperative'

Mohr Siebeck

SAMULI SIKAVIRTA, born 1985; 2005–15 student of theology and religious studies at Cambridge; 2012–14 teacher of New Testament Greek; 2015 PhD in theology (New Testament exegetics) from the University of Cambridge; currently pastor in St Mark's Lutheran Church in Helsinki, Finland.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-154049-3

ISBN 978-3-16-154014-1

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2015 by Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. [www.mohr.de](http://www.mohr.de)

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Gomaringen on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

## Preface

This book is a minimally revised version of my PhD dissertation submitted on 31 October 2014 to the Faculty of Divinity at the University of Cambridge. Neither the dissertation nor this published version of it would have been possible without the help of numerous individuals, more of whom would deserve to be mentioned than is possible in this short space.

First, I wish to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Dr Andrew Chester, for his indispensable help with the argument and detail of my dissertation and for his support through times both joyful and difficult. I also thank Dr Peter Head for his meticulous feedback during Dr Chester's sabbatical and Dr Jim Aitken, Prof Shane Berg and Dr Timo Eskola for their helpful comments at different stages. I am glad to have had Dr Simon Gathercole and Prof David Horrell as PhD examiners who helped me polish several points in my argument. I thank Prof Jörg Frey and the WUNT editors for accepting my dissertation for publication, Simon Schüz, Dr Henning Ziebritzki and Dominika Zgolik for their support in the copy-editing process and Katharina Stichling for her encouragement at SBL meetings to submit my work to Mohr Siebeck. My friend, colleague and choirmate Rev Wille Huuskonen is to be praised for his time and assistance with the formatting of the book for publication.

Without the encouragement of Rev Dr Juhana Pohjola to continue on to the PhD I would never have gone so far. My thankfulness to Rev Dr Jari Kekäle is without measure for his spiritual fatherhood and for helping me realise the value of writing first and worrying later.

I thank my "PhD sisters", Sarah Dixon and Ruth Norris, for the moments of sharing along the way and my friend Joel Dixon for bearing with us. I thank Javier Garcia and Rev Johannes Börjesson for their true brotherhood within and without the Faculty. I raise a glass to all the Cambridge theologians (especially Rev Dr Collin Bullard, Dr Ryan Williams and Dr Lorne Zelyck) who were part of the Dinklings on Friday afternoons. Chris Fresch, Paul Rogers, Dr Will Timmins, Dr Ben Wilson and are also to be thanked for their doctoral companionship and Dr Fiona Kao and Dr Yun-hua Lo for their peer support and revitalising laughter. All friends at Resurrection Lutheran Church, Cambridge, and Luther Hall also deserve an appreciative mention, especially Anne Shelton for her friendly kicks in the rear and Jean Ra-

jaonasy, my next-door neighbour for three years. I thank Rev Dr Jonathan Mumme for his friendship, encouragement and spiritual food and Rachel Mumme for her sympathy and delicious pies.

It is humbling to have been blessed with so many dear friends all over the world that I cannot list them all here. Without their support, I would not have made it through the PhD. I am particularly indebted to my American brother Simeon Raddatz for the lifeline of uplifting Bible studies, prayers and discussions in Cambridge and across the Atlantic. I am grateful to my dear friend and colleague Rev Sebastian Grünbaum for the summery weeks spent writing together in Rome and for our meaningful chats about life and our PhD progress. I thank Michael and Emily Knippa, Dr Christopher Barnekov and Betsy Karkan for their hospitality while writing in America and Trond Skinstad for his generosity.

I also think humbly on all those relatives and elders who have encouraged me and prayed for me, especially Eeva and Eino Repo, Pentti and Irja Väisänen, Dr Girma Berhanu and my dear aunt Tiina Berhanu, Leena Siikavirta, Sannamari Siikavirta, Kaarina Räsänen, and Mikko and Sirkka Niskanen. I wish to thank the members of St Mark's Lutheran Church, Helsinki, and my friend and colleague, Rev Esko Murto, for their prayers and call to minister to them.

This PhD would not have been financially possible without the provision of The Finnish Cultural Foundation, South Savo Regional Fund; The Finnish Cultural Foundation, North Savo Regional Fund; The Eemil Aaltonen Foundation; The Social Insurance Institution of Finland; and The Luther Foundation Finland, Simo Kiviranta Pastoral Fund. I thank Fitzwilliam College, Cambridge, and the Cambridge Faculty of Divinity for enabling travel to various inspirational conferences overseas. Also Institutum Romanum Finlandiae in Rome, Italy, Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, IN, USA and Concordia Seminary in St Louis, MO, USA are worthy of acknowledgement for providing me with alternative and inspirational places to write.

I dedicate this book to my parents, Pekka and Tuula Siikavirta, who carried me to be baptised into Christ's death and raised me in the Christian faith to walk in the newness of life in Him, awaiting His return. For that life-defining gift, I shall remain forever grateful.

*Sinun omasi minä olen, pelasta minut.* (Ps. 119:94)

*Soli Deo Gloria*  
Samuli Siikavirta  
19 September 2015

## Table of Contents

Preface.....	V
Abbreviations .....	XI
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
1. <i>The Thesis and Its Significance</i> .....	1
2. <i>Method and Procedure</i> .....	5
3. <i>Definition of Terms</i> .....	7
Chapter 2: Paul’s ‘Indicative’ and ‘Imperative’: A Review of Scholarship .....	12
1. <i>The Birth of the Problem</i> .....	12
Paul Wernle: ‘Indicative’ of Sinlessness and Superfluous ‘Imperative’ .....	12
2. <i>Early Solutions to the Problem</i> .....	14
Rudolf Bultmann: A Paradoxical Dichotomy Understandable through Faith.....	14
Günther Bornkamm: Baptismal ‘Imperatives’ Unveiling the Hidden New Life.....	18
Victor P. Furnish: Gift and Demand in Paul’s Theological Ethics .....	20
3. <i>Denials of the Dichotomy that Accept the Terms</i> .....	23
Wolfgang Schrage: Summary Statements of Paul’s Christological Ethics .....	23
Søren Agersnap: The Natural ‘Imperative’ in Paul’s Baptismal Paraenesis .....	24



Rudolf Schnackenburg: Sacramental-Eschatological Ethics as the Solution to a Protestant Problem .....	26
Anders Klostergaard Petersen: No Dichotomy in Paul's Contractual Ethics.....	27
John Barclay: Obliging Gift and Imperative Grace .....	31
<i>4. Re-configurations of the Schema.....</i>	<i>33</i>
Friedrich W. Horn: A Lutheran Criticism of the New Perspective View of the 'Imperative' .....	33
Christof Landmesser: The 'Imperative' as a Christological Performative.....	35
Troels Engberg-Pedersen: Descriptive 'Indicative' and Prescriptive 'Imperative' .....	37
Udo Schnelle: Transformation and Participation.....	39
David G. Horrell: Group Identity Preserved by Ethics .....	42
Knut Backhaus: Locative Being in Christ instead of Imperative Doing.....	45
<i>5. The End of the Problem?.....</i>	<i>47</i>
Ruben Zimmermann: A Complete Rejection of the Old Schema .....	47
<i>6. Conclusion: The Nature and Relevance of the Debate .....</i>	<i>49</i>
<b>Chapter 3: Paul's Ethics in Context .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<i>1. Ritual and Ethics in Paul's Jewish Context.....</i>	<i>53</i>
Ritual and Moral Purity in the Jewish Scriptures .....	54
Miqwa'ot and Purity during Second-Temple Judaism.....	58
Ritual and Moral Purity at Qumran .....	60
Ritual and Moral Purity in Rabbinic Texts .....	64
Ritual and Moral Purity according to John the Baptist and Jesus .....	65
Paul's Jewish Heritage: Purity through Water.....	67
<i>2. Cognition and Ethics in Paul's Stoic Context .....</i>	<i>68</i>
Why Stoicism? .....	70
Cognitive Similarities between Roman Stoics and Paul .....	75
Theological Differences between the Stoics and Paul .....	80
Paul's Stoic Heritage: Cognition of Being in Christ.....	83
<i>3. Paul's Paraclesis in Light of the New Perspective.....</i>	<i>84</i>

4. <i>Romans 6–8 in the Wider Pauline Baptismal Context</i> .....	86
Galatians 3:27 .....	87
1 Corinthians 1:13–17; 6:11; 10:2; 12:13 and 15:29 .....	90
Colossians 2:11–14 .....	94
Ephesians 4:5 .....	96
Titus 3:4–8 .....	99
Some Cognitive Comparisons in the Pauline Corpus .....	99
5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	100
Chapter 4: Baptismal Status and Identity .....	103
1. <i>Baptism in Romans 6: Metaphor, Real Rite and Self-Identification</i> .....	103
Setting the Scene for Paul’s Baptismal Paraclesis .....	103
Baptismal Metaphor or Concrete Rite? .....	104
Insights from Verbal Aspect and Voice .....	111
Baptismal Self-Identification .....	114
2. <i>Baptismal Death to the Old Master</i> .....	117
Death as the Problem .....	117
Death as the Solution .....	121
3. <i>Baptismal Life to the New Master</i> .....	123
Life in Free Slavery under God .....	123
Life in Us: the Indwelling Christ and His Spirit .....	125
Life Now and Not Yet .....	129
4. <i>Sanctification in Romans 6 as Status and Identity-Forming Tool</i> .....	133
Sanctification: Ambiguity of Meaning .....	133
Paul’s OT Background: Ἁγιασμός as Divine Separation .....	135
From Slavery to Slavery: Ἁγιασμός as a Relationship .....	138
The NT Context of εἰς ἁγιασμόν: Holiness as a God-Given Status ....	140
The Significance of the εἰς .....	141
Holiness as Identity-Forming Tool: Cognition of the Baptismal Identity .....	146
5. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	149

Chapter 5: Cognition of the Baptismal State .....	151
1. <i>Reminding as a Purpose of Romans</i> .....	151
2. <i>Paul's Cognitive Language</i> .....	155
Rhetorical Questions as a Cognitive Tool .....	155
Cognitive Imperatives .....	160
Knowing, Understanding and their Opposites (γινώσκω, ἀγνοέω, γνώσις, ἐπίγνωσις, οἶδα, συνήμι) .....	162
Mind and Mindset (φρονέω, φρόνημα, νοῦς) .....	165
Reckoning and Reasoning (λογίζομαι, διαλογισμός) .....	167
3. <i>Conclusion</i> .....	169
 Chapter 6: Conclusion: The Baptismal Foundation of Paul's Ethics .....	 171
 Bibliography .....	 179
 Index of References .....	 193
Index of Modern Authors .....	208
Index of Subjects .....	211

## Abbreviations

### *General Abbreviations*

ASV	American Standard Version
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls
ESV	English Standard Version
GW	GOD'S WORD Translation
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NT	New Testament
OT	Old Testament
RSV	Revised Standard Version

### *Journals, Major Reference Works, Series etc.*<sup>1</sup>

AB	Anchor Yale Bible
ABG	Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte
ACCS	Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BAG	Bauer, W., W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i>
BDAG	Bauer, W., F.W. Danker, W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> (3 <sup>rd</sup> edn)
BDB	<i>Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (und die Kunde der älteren Kirche)
CC	Concordia Commentary
ConBNT	Coniectanea biblica: New Testament Series

---

<sup>1</sup> For full bibliographical references for the dictionaries, see Bibliography.

<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
COQG	Christian Origins and the Question of God
<i>CTQ</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>
CUP	Cambridge University Press
<i>DPL</i>	<i>Dictionary of Paul and His Letters</i>
GBS	Grove Biblical Series
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament
GT	Thayer, Joseph H., <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament</i> (being Grimm's Wilke's <i>Clavis Novi Testamenti</i> , trans. and rev. by J.H. Thayer)
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JSNTSup	Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>LN</i>	<i>Logia Neotestamentaria</i>
LNTS	Library of New Testament Studies
<i>LQ</i>	<i>Lutheran Quarterly</i>
LSJ	Liddell, H.G., R. Scott and H.S. Jones, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i>
<i>LTR</i>	<i>Lutheran Theological Review</i>
MTS	Marburger Theologische Studien
NSBT	New Studies in Biblical Theology
NA28	Novum Testamentum Graece, 28 <sup>th</sup> edition ('Nestle-Aland')
NBC	New Bible Commentary
NIB	The New Interpreter's Bible
<i>NIDNTTae</i>	<i>New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology: Abridged Edition</i>
<i>NT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	<i>Journal of New Testament Studies</i>
OBC	Oxford Bible Commentary
OUP	Oxford University Press
SBG	Studies in Biblical Greek
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
<i>TC</i>	<i>TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism</i>
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
WBC	Word Bible Commentary

WDNTECLR	<i>Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric</i>
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZECNT	Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (und die Kunde der älteren Kirche)</i>

*Non-Christian Greek and Roman Writings*

Aristot. <i>Nic. Eth.</i>	Aristotle, <i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>
Cass. <i>Hist.</i>	Cassius Dio, <i>Historiae Romanae</i>
Cic. <i>Fin.</i>	Cicero, <i>De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum</i>
Ep. <i>Diss.</i>	Epictetus, <i>Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae</i>
Hom. <i>Iliad</i>	Homer, <i>Iliad</i>
Mus. <i>Diss.</i>	Musonius Rufus, <i>Dissertationes</i>
Ov. <i>Met.</i>	Ovid, <i>Metamorphoses</i>
Plut. <i>Virt. Mor.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De Virtute Morali</i>
Quint. <i>Inst.</i>	Quintilian, <i>Institutio Oratoria</i>
Sen. <i>Ben.</i>	Seneca, <i>De Beneficiis</i>
Sen. <i>Ira</i>	Seneca, <i>De Ira</i>
Sen. <i>Prov.</i>	Seneca, <i>De Providentia</i>
Sen. <i>Ep.</i>	Seneca, <i>Epistulae</i>
Sen. <i>Nat.</i>	Seneca, <i>Naturales Quaestiones</i>
Suet. <i>Cl.</i>	Suetonius, <i>Divus Claudius</i>
Stob. <i>Anth.</i>	Stobaeus, <i>Anthologion</i>
Verg. <i>A.</i>	Virgil, <i>Aeneid</i>

*Jewish Apocryphal, Pseudepigraphal and Other Extrabiblical Writings*

2 Bar.	2 Baruch ( <i>Syriac Apocalypse</i> )
Jos. <i>Ant.</i>	Flavius Josephus, <i>Antiquitates Judaicae</i>
Jub.	<i>Jubilees</i>
Ep. <i>Aris.</i>	<i>The Letter of Aristeas</i>
2 Macc.	2 Maccabees
3 Macc.	3 Maccabees
4 Macc.	4 Maccabees
1QH <sup>a</sup>	<i>Thanksgiving Hymns</i> (Qumran Cave 1)
1QM	<i>War Scroll</i> (Qumran Cave 1)
1QS	<i>Rule of the Community</i> (Qumran Cave 1)
4Q416	<i>4QInstruction<sup>b</sup></i> (Qumran Cave 4)
4Q417	<i>4QInstruction<sup>c</sup></i> (Qumran Cave 4)
Philo <i>Spec. Leg.</i>	Philo, <i>De Specialibus Legibus</i>

<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
<i>Sifre Num.</i>	<i>Sifre on Numbers (Midrash)</i>
Sir.	Sirach
<i>b. Yebam.</i>	<i>Tractate Yevamot (Babylonian Talmud)</i>
Wis.	Wisdom of Solomon

*Early Christian and Reformation Writings*

Ambr. <i>Sacr.</i>	Ambrose, <i>De sacramentiis</i>
<i>I Clem.</i>	<i>I Clement</i>
CA	<i>Confessio Augustana</i>
Just. <i>Dial.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Dialogus cum Tryphone</i>
Just. <i>I Apol.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Apologia prima</i>
LC	Martin Luther, <i>Large Catechism</i>
Orig. <i>Comm. Rom.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarii in Epistulam ad Romanos</i>
Oros. <i>Hist.</i>	Orosius, <i>Historiae adversus paganos</i>
Ps. Dion. <i>Eccl.</i>	Pseudo-Dionysius, <i>De ecclesiastica hierarchia</i>
<i>Sol. Decl.</i>	<i>Solida Declaratio</i>
Tert. <i>Marc.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Marcionem</i>
Tert. <i>Bapt.</i>	Tertullian, <i>De Baptismo</i>

## Chapter 1

# Introduction

### 1. The Thesis and Its Significance

This is essential: the Christian ethic is not born from a system of commandments but is a consequence of our friendship with Christ.<sup>1</sup>

It is perhaps unconventional for a book on Paul to begin with a quotation from a Pope. Nevertheless, Benedict XVI puts his finger on my reason for writing this book. Neither Christian ethics in general nor Pauline ethics in particular can be founded on commandments alone, and to speak in terms that may imply that Paul's ethical 'imperatives' arise from his theological 'indicatives' is, for this reason alone, misleading. Thus Paul is not a proponent of moralism, "a morality that tells people what to do without explaining the relationship between who they are in Christ and how they can and ought to act"<sup>2</sup>. The understanding of that relationship is crucial in Paul's moral teaching.

Despite recent criticisms, the relationship between theology and ethics in Paul's writings continues often to be explained with the 'indicative-imperative schema' somewhat uncritically. Summary statements such as "Paul's moral imperative (what believers ought to do) is rooted in the indicative of salvation (what God has already done for them in Christ)"<sup>3</sup> occur time and time again in Pauline scholarship. As Stanley Porter correctly noted, before the most recent resurgence of criticism of indicative-imperative language,

Despite its enshrinement in the secondary literature, indicative/imperative language is potentially misleading, since 'indicative' and 'imperative' are strictly speaking grammatical labels for two of the Greek verbal mood forms (it was in this sense that they were originally used in discussion of Pauline ethics). Sometimes they are used in parallel con-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pope Benedict XVI, *Saint Paul*, San Francisco: Ignatius, 2009, 88.

<sup>2</sup> F.J. Matera, 'Living in Newness of Life: Paul's Understanding of the Moral Life', in P. Spitaler (ed.), *Celebrating Paul: Festschrift in Honor of Jerome Murphy O'Connor, O.P., and Joseph Fitzmyer, S.J.* (CBQMS 48), Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2011, 168.

<sup>3</sup> Matera, 'Living', 155.



structions, at other times they are not. The indicative-imperative construct is in actual fact a theological paradigm, in which the two grammatical forms play *some* part.<sup>4</sup>

According to Porter, Rom. 6 shows the misleading nature of the indicative-imperative terminology well. Despite often being used as the main proof text for the terminology, the passage actually contains just a few grammatical imperatives (mostly in vv. 12 and 13), but it does include for instance future forms, hortatory subjunctives, infinitives and participles that form an exhortation based on Paul's "description of the Christian", i.e. "the believer's condition".<sup>5</sup> Porter's summary of the problem has obvious similarities with the citation given from Pope Benedict:

For Paul, ethical discourse is more than simply an appeal to grammatical forms to establish moral directives, but a set of directives for behavior which derive from description of the believer's condition in Christ.<sup>6</sup>

Porter's suggestion for replacing the "potentially misleading terminology" is to use narrative ethics "to describe the tension in Pauline ethics between Paul's description of the believer's current condition (as justified) and his ethical appeal (for sanctification)", which is what scholars have been doing despite their misleading grammatical terminology.<sup>7</sup> Indeed, in spite of the terminology being most often used without implying that Paul's ethics are a collection of grammatically imperatival expressions detached from their theological foundation,<sup>8</sup> what I argue in this book (with Porter and subsequent critics) is that such terminology remains misleading, rigid and oversimplifying. Furthermore, it can be used to drive a wedge between Paul's theology and ethics in a way that is unfaithful to Paul's own teaching, where the two are inseparably conjoined.<sup>9</sup> Although it is true that *abusus non tollit*

---

<sup>4</sup> S.E. Porter, 'Holiness, Sanctification', in G.F. Hawthorne and R.P. Martin (eds), *DPL*, Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1993, 401.

<sup>5</sup> Porter, 'Holiness', 401. Using such language, Porter abandons Bultmann's description of the indicative-imperative dichotomy as ethical command proceeding out of statements of theological truth ("Christians should become what they are"; *ibid.*) and sides more with Käsemann's reading, according to which the believer is simultaneously in two realms ("obedience is a requirement for maintaining the condition of faith"; *ibid.*).

<sup>6</sup> Porter, 'Holiness', 401.

<sup>7</sup> Porter, 'Holiness', 401. On Paul's sanctification terminology and my disagreement with Porter's reading, see Chapter 4, Section 4 below.

<sup>8</sup> So e.g. V.P. Furnish, *Theology and Ethics in Paul*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1968, 92–98; Matera, 'Living,' 158; S. Agersnap, *Baptism and the New Life: A Study of Romans 6.1–14*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1999, 380; W. Schrage, *The Ethics of the New Testament*, (E.D. Green, trans.), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988, 167.

<sup>9</sup> For a non-dichotomous use of indicative-imperative terminology that takes the two sides as inseparable parts of Paul's behaviour-shaping theologising (in other words, his gospel that "proclaims an act of God that grasps us and remakes us"), see R.B. Hays, *The*

*usum*, because of such risks and inherent faults in this terminology that is still often used, a better way of wording, and also approaching, the relationship between Paul's theology and ethics must be found.

The distinctive research question of this study is, therefore, whether the core of the relationship between Paul's theology and ethics can be most clearly reached in Rom. 6–8 (and, to a lesser extent, elsewhere) by analysing the substance of Paul's theological-ethical argument: the relationship between Paul's baptismal teaching and his cognitive reminders arising from it. In other words, my working hypothesis is that focusing on Paul's teaching about being in Christ through baptism and his emphatically cognitive instruction "in the elements of Christian living that follow from baptism"<sup>10</sup> gives us a clearer and more text-based picture of the relationship than what is attainable through the vague and potentially misleading indicative-imperative terminology. As Benedict implies, Paul's ethics arise from his teaching on the change of lordships and the baptismal state<sup>11</sup> as dead to sin but alive to God in Christ (Rom. 6:11). Paul reminds his addressees of this new state in Christ often by cognitive means.<sup>12</sup> This observation does not mean that Paul teaches freedom from moral obligation or instruction,<sup>13</sup> but that what very often stands behind his moral instruction is a distinctly cognitive<sup>14</sup> reminder to know and understand what it means to have been baptised into Christ and to continue in Christ. Such cognitive renewal, Paul teaches, should lead to the correct use of the body as well. This approach helps us go beyond the old terminology into the subject matter of Paul's actual argument. Baptism was, as far as we know, a concrete and identity-defining event in every early Christian's life and conversion. It is significant that in his paraenesis in Ro-

---

*Moral Vision of the New Testament: Community, Cross, New Creation: A Contemporary Introduction to New Testament Ethics*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1996, 18f., 39. For an explanation of how commands do not necessarily imply the possibility of compliance with the command, see L. Thurén, *Derhetorizing Paul: A Dynamic Perspective on Pauline Theology and the Law* (WUNT 124), Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000, 87f., 123 fn. 141.

<sup>10</sup> G.R. Beasley-Murray, 'Baptism', in *DPL*, 64.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. A. Schweitzer (*Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen: Mohr, 1930, 288), "Die Ethik Pauli ist also nichts anderes als seine Mystik des Seins in Christo vom Standpunkt des Wollens aus begriffen."

<sup>12</sup> Cf. John Barclay's observation on Romans, "There are imperatives here (6:11–13; 8:12–13), but the chapters are concerned not so much with norms or practices as with ethic-structuring orientations, allegiances, and dispositions." (J.M.G. Barclay, 'Under Grace: The Christ-Gift and the Construction of a Christian *Habitus*', in B.R. Gaventa [ed.], *Apocalyptic Paul: Cosmos and Anthropos in Romans 5–8*, Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013, 69.)

<sup>13</sup> A point correctly refuted by J.M.G. Barclay, *Obedying the Truth: A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians* (J. Riches, ed.), Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988, 232 cf. 229.

<sup>14</sup> T. Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul and the Stoics*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2000, 5.

mans and elsewhere, Paul points to baptism and the new baptismal state in Christ, and in doing so, uses this kind of cognitive language that aims at shaping his recipients' understanding of the gospel, of themselves in light of the gospel and, ultimately, their own behaviour between now and the *Parousia*. In fact, whenever baptism occurs in Paul's letters, it is always in an ethical context.

Romans 6–8 will act as a good case study to test this hypothesis for two reasons. First, Romans is Paul's only letter to an early Christian community that he had neither founded nor visited, which made him want to present his recipients with a clear summary of his gospel (Rom. 2:16) in an epistle that was "intended to function as a distinct, persuasive entity"<sup>15</sup>. It is true, as Stuhlmacher puts it, that "Nowhere in the entirety of Holy Scripture is the nature of the gospel more clearly and exactly worked out than in the letter to the Romans"<sup>16</sup>. Nonetheless, I do not argue that Paul dictated to Tertius (Rom. 16:22)<sup>17</sup> some kind of systematic treatise completely oblivious to the situation in Rome.<sup>18</sup> The reason, or reasons, that Paul had for sending the letter to Rome have been and still are debated, and no detailed account of them can or needs to be given in this short space.<sup>19</sup> I agree with the general

---

<sup>15</sup> Thurén, *Derhetorizing*, 97.

<sup>16</sup> P. Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Commentary*, Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994, 10.

<sup>17</sup> I take Rom. 16 to have been an original part of the epistle, with e.g. Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 244–246. For further discussion, see Chapter 5, Section 2, 'Knowing, understanding and their opposites (γινώσκω, ἀγνοέω, γνῶσις, ἐπίγνωσις, οἶδα, συνίημι)' below.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. G. Bornkamm, who calls Romans "Paul's testament" not because it is "a timeless theological tractate" but because of its mature and developed thought (*Paulus*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1969, 103–111; *contra* S.K. Stowers, *The Diatribe and Paul's Letter to the Romans* [SBLDS 57], Chico: Scholars, 1981, 180f.).

<sup>19</sup> In its historical context of the Edict of Claudius (Acts 18:2; Suet. *Cl.* 25.4; Cass. *Hist.* 60.6.6–7; Oros. *Hist.* 7.6.15), Rom. 9–11 is no detached appendix but an intrinsic part of the letter; see Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 4, 7f.; Thurén, *Derhetorizing*, 98f.; A.J.M. Wedderburn, 'The Purpose and Occasion of Romans Again', in K.P. Donfried (ed.), *The Romans Debate: Revised and Expanded Edition*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991, 195. For the many uncertainties around the expulsion of possibly up to 50,000 Roman Jews for AD 49–54 and its effect on e.g. the shift of Gentile Christian worship from synagogues to house churches, see J.N. Vorster, 'The context of the Letter to the Romans: a critique on the present state of research', *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994), 129f., 133; A.J.M. Wedderburn, *The Reasons for Romans*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1991, 31–35. For the view that only the leading Jewish (Christian) figures were expelled, see cf. P. Lampe, *From Paul to Valentinus: Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries* (M. Steinhauser, trans., and M.D. Johnson, ed.), London: Continuum, 2003, 13f., 72–75. It is impossible and unnecessary for our understanding of Romans to know all the details and ramifications of the Jewish expulsion (Thurén, *Derhetorizing*, 100), and much more could be said about the

consensus that Paul wrote the letter some time between AD 55 and 59, after the Edict of Claudius in AD 49 and the return of the Jews to Rome in AD 54.<sup>20</sup> Secondly, Rom. 6 is the *locus classicus* for NT baptismal theology. Even more interestingly, it is in chapters 6–8 of Romans that Paul’s ethical teaching interacts with his baptismal teaching and the Christology intertwined with it at its clearest. It is also a section in which Paul’s ethics can best be seen in interaction with his hamartiology, eschatology and pneumatology – all being intrinsic aspects of Paul’s ethics.

## 2. Method and Procedure

As the title of this study suggests, my main research method is to analyse exegetically the interaction between baptism and cognition in Rom. 6–8 in order to attain the goal of this study: to look for the relationship between Paul’s theology and ethics *beyond* the old indicative-imperative terminology and through Paul’s exhortation to know thoroughly one’s baptismal state in Christ. In order to achieve this main goal, the following steps must be undertaken.

Because I argue against the appropriateness of the popular terminology used to conceptualise the relationship between theology and ethics in Paul, it is necessary to provide a review of the different views on the topic – both those that affirm and modify the indicative-imperative schema and those that are critical of it to varying degrees. This review (in Chapter 2) will inevitably

---

purpose and context of the letter than what is relevant for this study. See further Chapter 5, Section 1 below.

<sup>20</sup> The date is calculated on the basis of the Edict of Claudius and Paul’s previous missionary visit to Corinth, during which Gallio was the proconsul of Achaia (Acts 18:12), serving AD 51–52 according to an inscription at Delphi (Lampe, *From Paul*, 11–16; M.P. Middendorf, *Romans 1–8* [CC], Saint Louis: Concordia, 2013, 7). For the traditional AD 49 date of the edict, see J.D.G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A), Waco: Word Books, 1988, xlix, and Lampe, *From Paul*, 15. Luke mentions the three-month-long period between Paul’s arrival in Greece and departure for Syria after the Feast of Unleavened Bread (Acts 20:3, 6), which has been traditionally dated to AD 56 (So e.g. P. Stuhlmacher, *Romans*, 5; F.J. Matera, *Romans*, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010, 5; Middendorf, *Romans 1–8*, 7; for a suggestion for the winter of 55–56 or 56–57 see C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Vol. I, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975, 16; and Dunn, *Romans 1–8*, xliii). Other dates have also been suggested; AD 56–57: B. Witherington, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans: A Socio-rhetorical Commentary*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004, 7; AD 57–58: R.N. Longenecker, *Introducing Romans: Critical Issues in Paul’s Most Famous Letter*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011, 50; AD 59: C.H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*, London: Hodder and Stoughton Ltd, 1932 (14<sup>th</sup> edn 1960), xxvi.

be selective, and limited in scope, in relation to the vast amount of potentially relevant Pauline scholarship. However, in order to understand the often subtle differences, the different approaches will be analysed in substantial detail.

In order to see whether the centrality of the baptismal rite and the correct understanding of the baptismal identity-foundation in Paul stand out as distinct or can be seen as being influenced by pre-existing traditions, I shall (in Chapter 3) place Paul's baptismal-ethical teaching in its religious-historical and cultural context, although again the discussion will have to be selective, and set within clear limits. First, Paul must be placed in his Jewish context. The interaction between the notions of ritual and moral purity will be discussed in light of scholarship on Second Temple Judaism and its archaeology. I shall also provide an analysis of the moral value given to Jewish ritual washings in the Jewish scriptures, Qumran texts, Rabbinic sources and NT traditions associated with John the Baptist and Jesus. Secondly, similarities and differences between Stoicism, the popularised philosophy in the Graeco-Roman world of Paul's time and especially at Rome, will be analysed. I shall compare the rational emphasis in Stoic ethics with the cognitive dimension of Paul's paraclesis. In addition, the other main baptismal passages in the Pauline corpus must then be discussed with specific focus on how they relate to ethics and, in particular, Paul's cognitive appeal to understand the baptismal identity. This chapter will also contain a reflection on Paul's identity-reminders in light of the so-called New Perspective and its view of the works of the law as identity-shaping boundary markers.

From the perspective of this survey of scholarship and the religious-historical background, the main part of the exegetical analysis of Rom. 6–8 will be undertaken in Chapters 4 and 5. In Chapter 4, I shall analyse the text thematically from the point of view of baptismal status and identity. This will include dealing with questions such as the 'truth value' of the baptismal metaphor, the significance of Paul's passive voice and aorist imperatives, and the unity of the death-and-life theme in Rom. 6–8. There will also be discussion here of Paul's view of sin and the law, slavery versus freedom and sonship, the role of the Spirit in ethics, the eschatological tension between the aeons, and holiness or sanctification.

The final stage required to complete this study will (in Chapter 5) consist of an analysis of the role of cognition in Paul's ethics in Rom. 6–8, although reference to this theme will be made throughout the book. The attention in the first part of the chapter will be on reminder as a possible purpose for writing Romans. The second part will consist of an analysis of Paul's cognitive language in Rom. 6–8, including his rhetorical questions, cognitive imperatives and language about knowing, the mind and reckoning. Attention will be drawn to their connection with Paul's baptismal teaching.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I shall present my conclusions on the basis of the preceding study.

### 3. Definition of Terms

Before proceeding further, some key notions need to be defined more closely. I am aware of the anachronism of the term “Christian” (Χριστιανός),<sup>21</sup> in spite of Acts anchoring its origin to Antioch before the beginning of Paul’s missionary journeys (Acts 11:26; cf. 26:28 and 1 Pet. 4:16). “Christianity” or, as Thorsteinsson renders, “Christianism” (Χριστιανισμός) does not occur until the second century with Ignatius.<sup>22</sup> Paul does not seem to have adopted either term, but any neutral scholarly terms such as “Christ-believer” or “Jesus-follower” would be equally alien to Paul’s language. One common Pauline term would be οἱ ἅγιοι (cf. Rom. 1:7; 8:27; 12:13; 15:25f., 31; 16:2, 15), although Paul uses ἀδελφοί and ἐκκλησία more frequently, with οἱ πιστοί and other believer-designations also being prominent. As Paul Trebilco suggests, the term “Christian” may indeed be used alongside other NT self-designations, as it very clearly distinguishes the earliest Christians from those who did not believe in Christ.<sup>23</sup> Hence it will also be used in this book.

By ‘state’ I mean the condition of those baptised into Christ and into his death (Rom. 6:3) as dead to the rule of sin and alive to the rule of God in Christ. In my use, the term refers to one’s status as a living participant in the grace of God in Christ, who is the new Lord of the baptised. For Paul, the baptised person’s status in Christ was seen as a key motivator to lead a morally upright life.<sup>24</sup>

This baptismal state, then, is closely related to one’s self-understanding and identity. Paul wants his addressees to think of themselves in accordance with their baptismal status in Christ. The term ‘identity’ is, of course, modern, but I maintain with Troels Engberg-Pedersen that the content of this term of self-awareness and a sense of who one is can already be found in antiquity.<sup>25</sup>

By ‘cognitive’ and ‘cognition’, I simply mean the mental action of knowing, reasoning and understanding and things related to such mental processes. In this study, ‘cognitive’ is not a statement about reality. I do not mean by it something merely imagined on a theoretical level that is more or less di-

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. E.D. Freed, *The Morality of Paul’s Converts*, London: Equinox, 2005, 4, 21–27.

<sup>22</sup> R.M. Thorsteinsson, *Roman Christianity & Roman Stoicism: A Comparative Study of Ancient Morality*, Oxford: OUP, 2010, 76, 86.

<sup>23</sup> For an in-depth discussion, see P. Trebilco, *Self-designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*, Cambridge: CUP, 2012, 3f., 311, 314.

<sup>24</sup> See e.g. L. Thurén, ‘Motivation as the Core of Paraenesis – Remarks on Peter and Paul as Persuaders’, in J. Starr and T. Engberg-Pedersen (eds), *Early Christian Paraenesis in Context*, Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005, 354. According to Thurén, this motivation makes early Christian paraenesis stand out from other Graeco-Roman paraenesis.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Cic. *Fin.* 3.16, quoted in Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul*, 55.

vorced from reality. That would correspond to Schweitzer's definition of Paul's doctrine of justification by faith as something appropriated cognitively (*gedanklich*) and as a mere fragment of Paul's more comprehensive (*umfassend*) and natural (*naturhaft*) being-in-Christ mysticism, i.e. dying and rising with Christ.<sup>26</sup> Despite disagreeing with Schweitzer's purely 'cognitive' definition of justification in opposition to a more holistic Christ mysticism, I agree with how he anchors the Christian identity in the new baptismal status in Christ and maintains that Paul's ethics flow from this being-in-Christ as the fruit of the Spirit.<sup>27</sup>

By 'ethics' or 'ethical', I do not refer to a systematic ethical theory of norms and foundations of behaviour in the Aristotelian sense,<sup>28</sup> but, in the absence of such an account in Paul, to any moral guidance (in whatever form or grammatical mood) given by him to his audience on how to live well.

Ever since Dibelius, the most common term used to describe hortatory texts in the NT has been 'paraenesis', meaning a rhetorical style of exhortation common in Hellenistic literature.<sup>29</sup> The question has been raised, however, whether the term 'paraclesis' should be preferred, since it is the word used by Paul and other authors of the NT themselves instead of *παραινήσις*, which

---

<sup>26</sup> Schweitzer, *Mystik*, 214–221. Schweitzer takes the former to be incomplete and not independent, which is also shown by how Paul moves on from the sacrificial language of Rom. 3:1–5:21 to the language of the mystical dying and rising with Christ in Rom. 6:1–8:1, without any reference to the former (221). Schweitzer acknowledges that some may find it hard to accept “daß an Stelle der gedanklichen Aneignung ein naturhafter Prozeß tritt” (218), especially since he maintains that there is no logical way to be found from the doctrine of justification by faith to ethics (any such attempt by those who take justification to be Paul's central doctrine being bound to fail tragically). This is quite different, Schweitzer claims, in Paul's mystical being-in-Christ, from which ethics naturally follow (220). It is in the baptismal dying and rising with Christ that Paul teaches that the redemption of the believer has its beginning and the implanting into the body of Christ happens (254f.). Schweitzer claims that in Paul, baptism is explained through the centre of his doctrine, the “Mystik des Seins in Christo”, which redefines the believers' entire natural existence as no longer Jew or Greek, man or woman, slave or free, but as a new humanity being built in Christ (255f.). A similar relocation of the foundations of Pauline ethics from justification to being-in-Christ is undertaken by E.P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, London: SCM, 1977, 511–515.

<sup>27</sup> Schweitzer, *Mystik*, 286.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. R. Zimmermann, 'Jenseits von Indikativ und Imperativ: Entwurf einer impliziten Ethik des Paulus am Beispiel des 1. Korintherbriefes', *TLZ* 132/3 (2007), 272f.

<sup>29</sup> See M. Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (6<sup>th</sup> edn), Tübingen: Mohr, 1971, 239; cf. M. Dibelius, 'Der himmlische Kultus nach dem Hebräerbrief', in G. Bornkamm (ed.), *Botschaft und Geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Vol. II, Tübingen: Mohr, 1956, 176 (cited in M. Übelacker, 'Paraenesis or Paraclesis – Hebrews as a Test Case', in Starr and Engberg-Pedersen, *Early Christian Paraenesis*, 320f.).