

CHAPTER 1

Oh Adam, Where Art Thou?

THE PROBLEM WITH TULIPS—AND OTHER PROTESTANT FLOWERS

Popular Evangelicalism has three main theological tributaries. Each of these three tributaries ultimately goes back to the Bible in one way or another and each has made serious and lasting contributions—the Augustinian-Lutheran-Calvinist juggernaut kept Evangelicalism focused on soteriology or the way of salvation. Dispensationalism renewed our focus on and thinking about the future in eschatological ways. Wesleyanism/Pentecostalism stressed the experiential dimensions of Christian thought and life and the need for holiness of heart and life. However, each of these contributions came at a price—individualism and determinism in the case of the Augustinian heritage; systematic ahistoricism in the case of Dispensational reading of prophecy; and the raising of experience to a norm, sometimes even above the Bible, in the case of Wesleyanism/Pentecostalism. My concern is not just to point out the problems with each of these theological streams, but rather to clean up the streams by passing these theological tributaries through a more purifying and rectifying biblical filter. We will begin with the children of Augustine after a few necessary preliminary remarks.

In Evangelical theology today, it is hard to tell who the players are without a program. Sometimes scholars in the Reformed tradition sound remarkably like John Wesley, and sometimes scholars in the Arminian tradition talk about things like total depravity and “once saved always saved,” when they are not busy toying with nonbiblical notions like openness theology.¹ My concern in this portion of the book, however, is with those Evangelicals who deliberately articulate their biblical theology in a way that reflects their deep indebtedness to

Luther or Calvin or both, and to their successors as well (e.g., in the Calvinistic tradition that would include the Hodges, Warfield, Berkhof, Berkower, and the like, to name but a few).

My interest is in the big ideas that serve as building blocks for looking at the biblical text in a certain kind of way and that undergird Evangelical theology in this tradition. My concern is that various of these seminal and interesting ideas are simply not biblical. For example, the idea of “once saved always saved,” or the idea that it is impossible for a “saved person,” a true Christian, to commit apostasy, is simply not an idea to be found in the NT. More to the point, much in the NT flatly contradicts such an idea.

It must be said from the outset to their eternal credit that scholars who look to Calvin and Luther and their legacy pride themselves on being biblical and giving meticulous attention to the biblical text. This is not a surprise since both Calvin and Luther were formidable exegetes and theologians, and they set examples that many have sought to follow ever since. Calvin did not just write *Institutes*, he did the painstaking work of exegeting inch by inch almost the entire corpus of the canon. Luther as well wrote some remarkable commentaries. These were not armchair theologians, nor those who deliberately ignored exegetical particulars. To be honest and to be fair, they would be ashamed of a good deal of what passes for good theology in some Reformed Evangelical pulpits and pamphlets and books today. Would that they were here to discipline their offsprings’ unruly use of their heritage! I do not intend, however, to get bogged down with popular expressions of this theology. My plan is to deal with the problem at its roots—at the level of the underlying exegesis and theological system.

Sometimes with Reformed exegetes, indeed all exegetes, the problem is reading the text outside of its proper original contexts—historical, rhetorical, social, theological, and so on. Proof-texting and what I call the strip-mining of the text are endemic problems with Biblicists who cannot wait to get to the theological or ethical implication or the application pay dirt. Sometimes, of course, the problem is more hermeneutical than it is exegetical, and sometimes it is more presuppositional than it is a matter of careful exposition of texts. Sometimes the problem is a matter of imposing a theological grid on the schema of interpretation and assuming that if text A cannot possibly mean that (since it would be inconsistent with one’s prior theological commitments), then text B surely does not mean that either. And sometimes one’s theological system is so carefully worked out that one assumes that anything that does not fit the system must be a misinterpretation of the text. But it is perfectly possible to argue consistently and logically about something, but draw the circle of argumentation too narrowly,

and so wrongly exclude some of the most important data. I believe the latter is often the case with Reformed exegetes.

Reformed exegetes have a hard time coming to grips with the paradox of a God who is both sovereign and free, and yet somehow so exercises that sovereignty and limits his own freedom that he has made it possible for human beings to have and exercise a measure of freedom as well, including in matters of salvation. They have a hard time understanding that holy love does not involve determinism, however subtle. Indeed love, if it is real love, must be freely given and freely received, for God has chosen to relate to us as persons, not as automata. They have a hard time dealing with the idea that God programmed into the system a certain amount of indeterminacy, risk, and freedom. And maybe, just maybe the good old Evangelical lust for certainty leads us all to too quickly fill in gaps and silences of Scripture, driving us to bad exegesis.

There are in fact profound exegetical problems with the T.U.L.I.P. theology of Calvinism and to a lesser extent of Lutheranism. These theological ideas are linked, and, with the exception of the “T” and the “L,” are necessary corollaries of each other. For example, if one believes that God has predetermined from before the foundation of the world people to be saved, then of course election is unconditional, grace is irresistible, and perseverance is inevitable. These three linked ideas do not necessarily require the notion of total depravity or limited atonement (e.g., God could have predetermined to save everyone, and original sin might not have had as extensive an effect as sometimes thought).

There is then a logical consistency to this cluster of linked ideas, and it is the logic and coherency that seem to make it compelling, rather than its real exegetical viability. And of course the danger of any such necessary linking of ideas is that if one link in the chain is dropped off then the chain ceases to hold. For example, if it can be demonstrated that apostasy from the true faith is not merely possible but is an idea that Christians are regularly warned against in the NT, then there is something wrong not only with the notion of perseverance but also with the ideas of irresistible grace and predetermination. But there is more. The hermeneutic that seeks to see salvation history as various administrations of just one covenant and continues to seek to see Christians as under various parts of old covenants which have been renewed in the new covenant is severely problematic, especially in light of Paul’s remarks about the Mosaic covenant being obsolescent. The older covenants do not determine the character of the new one, as it turns out. In fact the older ones are read in light of the new and final one. There is an indirect critique here not only of Reformed biblical theology but also its child—certain forms of canonical criticism.

Lest this criticism seem one-sided I would stress there is a similar kind of problem with Dispensationalism. If one takes the rapture out of

the system, then the rest of the eschatological schema falls to the ground as well. There will not be two second comings, there are not two fulfillments of final prophecy one in Israel and one in the church—there are not two peoples of God, and so on. The Dispensational hermeneutic applied to the OT is in fact denied in the NT, where all the promises of God are yea and amen in Jesus Christ.

Once more, there is a similar sort of problem with Wesleyan and Pentecostal theology. The theology of prevenient grace, not well tethered to sound exegesis, is allowed to vitiate the concept of being a slave or addicted to or in bondage to sin. This idea then is linked with “free will” or a kind of voluntarism that is not found in the NT. It makes salvation more of a self-help program rather than a radical rescue mission. And then there is the problem with the theology of subsequence, whether it takes the form of “the baptism of the Holy Spirit” or “perfection.” Such ideas on the one hand suggest that conversion is inadequate to save a person and on the other hand, that it is possible to divide Christians into two major categories—Christians and super-Christians. But no such twofold division of Christians can be found in the NT—the dividing line between weak and strong, immature and mature Christians has to do with progressive sanctification and growth in Christ. It is apparently not linked to a second-blessing theology, though the NT does o’t rule out the idea of crisis experiences subsequent to conversion. The point I am making is just this—all these Evangelical theological systems *in their distinctives* are only loosely tethered to detailed exegesis of particular texts.

My modus operandi in this chapter will be to deal with some of the key texts of the Reformation, showing the problems with the traditional Reformed exegesis of the materials. Romans more than any other source has determined Evangelical exegesis when it comes to the nature of salvation. It is time then to dive into the deep water of Romans, all the while seeking to keep our heads above water and our eyes on the safe parameters of the pool.

BACK TO REFORM SCHOOL—SHOULD OUR TEACHERS BE AUGUSTINE AND LUTHER?

Adam was the beginning of it all in more ways than one. For Reformed theology, Adam is a crucial starting point because particular notions about the fall, total depravity of humanity because of the fall, loss of any sort of free will, and general human lostness are bound up in this story. The “T” in T.U.L.I.P. is all about certain kinds of conceptions about Adam and his legacy to us all. But the story of Adam in Genesis 1–3 is not simply read by itself in Reformed theology, it is read through

the eyes of Paul (particularly in light of texts like Rom 5 and 1 Cor 15), and furthermore, it is read through the eyes of Augustine as he viewed those Pauline texts. We must keep all this in mind as we focus on the most crucial Adamic texts in Romans.

There is no text more commented on in the entire Bible than Romans, and within the text of Romans, there is no text more commented on than Romans 7. One would think with all the ink spilt on this text that we could get it right. Yet there are almost as many views of this text as there are major commentaries and dissertations on it. Oddly enough, one of the most fundamental problems in Evangelical exegesis of Romans is the failure to read Romans cumulatively, rather than sound-biting it. This failure manifests itself when Romans 7 is read as if it has little or no connection with Romans 5. But the story told in Romans 5:12–20 is the very story that underlies and undergirds Romans 7, as we shall see. In order to set up the discussion, it is necessary to speak briefly about Augustine's views on Romans 5–7 and their influence on Luther and others.

T. J. Deidun aptly summarizes the key points of Augustine's mature interpretation of Romans, and we turn to this in a moment, but first we need to bear in mind that his interpretation immediately had enormous weight in the West and was to be, in effect, canonized for the Roman Catholic tradition at the Council of Carthage in A.D. 418 and of Orange in A.D. 529.² It was to be canonized, so to speak, for the Protestant line of interpretation by Luther and Calvin. It must be stressed that Augustine's interpretation of Romans, and especially Romans 7, seems to be in various regards an overreaction to Pelagius who argued that sin comes from human beings' free imitation of Adam, and can be overcome by imitating Christ. Pelagius also suggested that justification, at least final justification, is through determined moral action.

Consider now Deidun's summary of Augustine's main points on Romans:

1) The "works of the Law" which Paul says can never justify, mean moral actions in general without the grace of Christ, not Jewish practices as Pelagius and others maintained. 2) The "righteousness of God" is not an attribute of God but the gift he confers in making people righteous; 3) Romans 5:12 now became the key text for Augustine's doctrine of original sin: all individuals (infants included) were co-involved in Adam's sin. As is well known, Augustine's exegesis of this verse largely depended on the Latin translation *in quo* ("in whom") of the Greek *eph hoi* ("in that," "because") and on the omission in his manuscripts of the second mention of "death," with the result that "sin" became the subject of "spread": sin spread to all (by "generation," not by "imitation").³ 4) Romans 7:14–25, which before the controversy Augustine had understood to be referring to humanity without Christ, he now applied to the

Christian to deprive Pelagius of the opportunity of applying the positive elements in the passage (esp. v. 22) to unredeemed humanity. To do this, Augustine was obliged to water down Paul's negative statements: the apostle is describing not the bondage of sin but the bother of concupiscence; and he laments not that he cannot do good (*facere*) but that he cannot do it perfectly (*perficere*). 5) During this period Augustine came to express more boldly his teaching on predestination. It does not depend on God's advance knowledge of people's merit as Pelagius and others maintained in their interpretation of Romans 9:10ff. nor even on his advance knowledge of "the merit of faith" as Augustine had supposed in 394 in his remarks on the same passage: it depends rather on God's "most hidden judgment" whereby he graciously chooses whom he will deliver from the mass of fallen humanity. Everything is pure gift (1 Cor 4:7).⁴

Of course all of these points of Augustine are today under dispute among interpreters of Romans, and some are clearly wrong, such as the conclusions based on the Latin text of Romans 5:12. For our purposes it is interesting to note that Augustine, having changed his mind about Romans 7:14–25 in overreacting to Pelagius, must water down the stress on the bondage of the will expressed in this text in order to apply it to Christians. Luther takes a harder and more consistent line, even though in the end he refers the text to the wrong subject—namely everyone including Christians. It is also noteworthy that Pelagius does not dispute God's destining of persons, only that God does it on the basis of his foreknowledge of the response of believers. It is also important that Augustine talks about God's gift of making people righteous. The later forensic emphasis comes as a result of the translation work of Erasmus.

It is interesting that the discussion of merit which Pelagius introduced into the conversation about Romans resurfaces in the medieval exegetes after Augustine. Paul's doctrine of "justification" is filtered through Aristotelian thinking, so that grace becomes a *donum super additum*, something added on top of God's gift of human faculties (see Aquinas). "Divine *charis* became 'infused grace.'"⁵ The nominalist school of William of Occam focused on merit, even in a Pelagian way, and it was to this repristinization of Pelagius's case that Luther, an Augustinian monk much like his founder, was to react in his various lectures and then in his commentary on Romans. But it was not just Pelagius he was reacting to. In due course Luther came to see self-righteousness as the most fundamental of human sins (not concupiscence), and his polemics were directed against both Judaism and Catholicism, which he saw as religions embodying this besetting sin, as well as being preoccupied with "merit." Luther thought that Romans 7:14–25 was about that sin of self-righteousness.

Deidun notes, rightly, that Luther's exploration of what Augustine says about the righteousness of God led him to criticize Augustine for not clearly explaining about the imputation of righteousness. But in fact, as Deidun says, Augustine's "understanding of justification is thoroughly incompatible with the notion of imputation."⁶ Luther gets this idea from Erasmus, but he is not afraid to critique Erasmus at other points. For instance, drawing on his understanding of Romans 7:14–25 validating the notion of the Christian as being *simul justus et peccator* ("at the same time justified and sinner"), he argues against Erasmus and other humanists in regard to human freedom of the will. It is also noteworthy that Luther's influential two-kingdom theory (spiritual and temporal) is derived from his exegesis of Romans 13. Christians are subject to earthly powers out of respect and love, but in the spiritual sphere only subject to God, not to human authorities such as the pope. Calvin was to follow Luther's line on justification and predestination, except that he at least more explicitly highlight the notion of double predestination, based on a certain reading of Romans 8:29 (cf. the 1539 edition of Calvin's *Institutes*).

The English Reformation or Revival of the eighteenth century did not produce any great commentaries on Romans, not by Wesley, or Coke, or Fletcher, nor later in the Wesleyan tradition by Clarke, Watson (though he offers much exposition on Romans in his *Institutes*, as a rebuttal to Calvin) or Asbury. This helps explain why the Protestant tradition of interpretation of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries continued to be dominated by Lutheran or Calvinist interpreters. This all too cursory summary shows us the context in which we should read Luther's interpretation of Romans 5–7. The especially crucial notions of the influence of Adam on all humanity in terms of total depravity, the bondage of sin, the necessary predetermining of some of the lost for rescue, the imputation of righteousness come from Luther's reading (and sometimes misreading) of Augustine and his indebtedness to Erasmus. But is this really a cogent reading of Paul, if we view the discussion of Romans without an Augustinian lens?

We are perhaps by this time all too familiar with Luther's own wrestling with his Augustinian heritage, especially when it came to the problem of sin, and particularly sin in the life of the believer. But before we too quickly join that wrestling match, leaping into the fray and shouting *simul justus et peccator* as a description of the normal Christian life, it will be well to ask if in fact Romans 7 describes the Christian life at all. My answer will be—on further review no it does not. Christians are not in the bondage to sin as non-Christians may be said to be. But to understand Romans 7, we must hear Paul's explicit telling of Adam's tale in Romans 5 first. Let us attend to the text itself, carefully working through the exegetical particulars.

ROMANS 5 — ADAM'S TALE REVISITED

In a piece of rhetoric like Romans, the effect of the comparison here is rather like a Rembrandt painting; the dark backdrop of Adam's sin serves to highlight the brightness and clarity of God's grace gift. The comparison by contrast also brings to the fore another key point—namely, that those who are in Christ and feeling the effects of the reign of his grace in their lives are no longer in Adam, and do not labor under the reign of sin in the way Paul describes the human condition between Adam and Moses (and beyond until Christ). Thus, by this comparison, Paul has prepared the way for the contrast between the “I” described in Romans 7 and the person in Christ described in Romans 8. The former is laboring under the bondage of sin, while the latter has been set free by the Spirit from that bondage, as we shall see.⁷

Quintilian, the Latin rhetorician, says that comparisons of this sort are to be done on the basis of the character of the two parties (*Inst.* 4.2.99). In this case it is not just the character, of Adam and Christ which are contrasted, but also all those in Adam and all those in Christ. Paul's argument here would likely have been recognized as a sophisticated form of rhetorical comparison that moves from the dark to the light, the lesser to the greater. The psychological dynamics of the technique are that if the listener grants the premise in regard to the example of Adam (namely that his sin affected all humanity), there is a strong pull to grant the conclusion when the comparison is made with Christ. It was important that one conclude the argument on the positive, or “greater” side, which is of course what Paul does with a flourish in Romans 5:21 where the duel between sin and grace, and death and eternal life is won, with grace and life reigning longer and more profoundly in the life of the believer. Consider now a rather literal translation of what Paul says in Romans 5:12–21:

So it is that through one human being sin entered the world, and through sin, death, and thus death spread to all human beings, because all sinned. For until the Law, sin was in the world, but sin was not reckoned, not being against the Law. But death reigned from Adam to Moses, even upon those who did not sin in the same likeness of the trespass of Adam, who is a type of Coming One.

But not like the trespass is thus also the grace gift. For if through the trespass of the one the many died, how much more the grace of God and the gift in grace of the one human being Jesus Christ abounded to the many. And the gift is not like the sin by the one. For on the one hand the judgment from the one unto condemnation, but on the other hand, the grace gift after many trespasses unto acquitting judgment. For if death reigned because of the trespass of the one through that one, how much

more those receiving the abundance of the grace and the gift⁸ of righteousness will reign in life through the one Jesus Christ. So then, as through one trespass unto all humans unto condemnation, thus also through one human being's act of justice/righteous deed unto all humans for the putting right of life. For as through the disobedience of the one human, many were made sinners, thus also through the obedience of the one many were constituted righteous. But the Law intruded in order to increase the trespass. But where the sin increased, the grace superabounded, in order that just as the sin reigned in death, so also the grace reigned through righteousness unto everlasting life through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The logic of argumentation found in Romans 5:12–21 will seem strange to many moderns for it deals with the concept of how one can affect many, for ill or good, and not only affect them but determine their destiny to a real extent. Paul can say in the midst of such an argument that death spread to all humans because they all sinned, but then turn around and say that death reigned over even those who did not trespass in the same fashion Adam did. Some have drawn an analogy with the notion of federal headship over a group of people (e.g., when the president declares war on another nation, whether the citizens of the United States will it or not, they are affected by this decision and are in effect also at war with the nation in question). This analogy does get at some of the dimensions of Paul's argument. But there is a dimension of corporate personality—or, better said, incorporative personality—to Paul's argument as well.

Paul says that death reigned (because of Adam's trespass) through Adam unto all of his progeny, just as through Christ those receiving grace will reign in life. All those in Adam feel the effect of that incorporation, while all those in Christ experience the very resurrection life of Christ through him. This notion goes well beyond the modern concept of federal headship, and it is not a surprise that this passage became a mainstay in later arguments about original sin and its taint and effect.

It is important to note two more things before looking at the details of each verse in the argument: (1) Adam is viewed as not merely sinning, but disobeying a direct commandment of God. Therefore his sin can be called a trespass or transgression—a willful violation of a known law, which becomes important when we consider Romans 7:7–13. Notice also that Paul nowhere blames Eve for original sin here. (2) Paul is using a form of reasoning involving typology, which he has used previously (cf. for example 1 Cor 10). Adam is said to be a type of Christ, in that his action affects all those who are “in him.” This is not the same sort of trope as an allegory, such as we find in Galatians 4. Typology is reasoning by analogy using historical examples, therefore

Paul does not attempt to suggest some aspects of the Adam story are symbolic in some sense. This is a historical form of reasoning, based on Paul's reading of salvation history and its most seminal figures.

Romans 5:12–21 does not stand in isolation but indicates some further conclusions to be drawn from the previous argument in Romans 5:1–11. The *dia touto* of v. 12 must surely refer back to the material in the first eleven verses of this chapter, and should be translated “because of this.” In other words, vv. 12ff. take the argument to a further stage, based on what had been said in 5:1–11.⁹ Here we are dealing with some of the more difficult material in all of Romans in terms of grammar and interpretation.

This whole section is comparing Adam and his progeny and Christ and those in him. It is not about comparing Adam and all other humans. Notice that the phrase “through him” is in the emphatic position in the first part of the leading sentence, which suggests that Paul is going to tell us in the last part of the sentence what is true through another one. It is not unusual for Paul to start a sentence and then digress, or qualify the sentence, as he does here.¹⁰

Thus, I take it that Paul's argument here is more difficult than the notion that each person is their own Adam and that as a result of their individual sins like Adam's, their deaths result.¹¹ At issue is whether or not Paul subscribed to some sort of notion of original sin being passed down to and/or through the race of humanity.¹² The final clause of v. 12 is heavily debated, especially in regard to how to translate *eph ho*. There are at least six possibilities, but we may boil things down as follows: (1) one of the basic questions is whether we should take these words as a conjunction and translate them “because” or whether we should take the *ho* as a masculine relative pronoun referring either to death or to “one man”;¹³ (2) ruled out as an antecedent by case ending is *hamartia* (feminine noun), i.e. sin; (3) notice that in 2 Corinthians 5:4 and Philippians 3:12 and 4:10 *eph ho* is used causally—meaning because of something,¹⁴ not “in which” or “to which.” Thus I must follow Chrysostom—the Greek words mean “because.” Thus the phrase means “because all sinned,” and here concrete acts of sin would be in view. Some have argued that what is meant is not our individual sinning, but rather our participation in Adam's sin. On this view not merely do humans imitate Adam's sin, they do so in consequence of Adam's original sin. This view seems closer than some to what Paul is trying to suggest here. Human beings in general sin because Adam has had an influence on them, but in the end they are judged not just because Adam sinned, but because they all sinned willingly as well.

Paul is not suggesting that Adam and Christ are alike in all respects, not even in the way they affect the race that flows forth from them. The

point of comparison is simply this: that the act of the one man had far-reaching consequences for all those who came after him and had integral connection with him. In all other respects, and at some length in vv. 13–17 Paul wishes to distinguish Adam and Christ. Thus, it is not necessary to argue that Christ's salvation must pass to or affect everyone in the exact same manner as Adam's sin, for as Paul says, the gift of salvation is in many ways not like the trespass. Paul's "universalism is of the sort that holds to Christ as the way for all."¹⁵

Paul begins by stating that because of the action of one man, the destiny of the whole race was affected. *Kosmos* probably means "humanity" here, though it could mean "world." Notice that Paul is clear that death enters the world because of sin. It is not viewed as a natural occurrence, at least insofar as humanity is concerned. As 1 Corinthians 15 makes clear, Paul sees death as an enemy, not a friend. Paul is quite clear that death spread to all because of Adam's sin, but it was not as though this negative result was not deserved, because all did in fact sin. Thus, while it is true that humans die because of the sin of Adam, it is also true that death is a just outcome in view of the fact that all have sinned. Humans do not die simply because of Adam's sin, but because of Adam's and their own sin.

There can be no question that Paul believed in a historical Adam who affected the whole historical process. It is also possible that like his contemporary, the author of *4 Ezra*, he believed in a seminal transmission of a fallen identity passed from Adam to his offspring (see *4 Ezra* 3:7–22). It is interesting to compare and contrast other early Jewish remarks on the story of Adam. *Jubilees* 3:17–32 blames Adam, Eve, and the serpent equally for sin and death entering the world. By contrast Paul says nothing here about Eve. Sirach 25:24 is even a greater contrast with Romans 5, for it says that Eve was the cause of sin and death entering the world, an opinion also found in *Life of Adam and Eve* 3. Wisdom of Solomon 2:24 blames the devil for death entering the world. The famous remark found in *2 Baruch* 54:19 says "Adam was responsible for himself only; each one of us is his own Adam." By contrast *4 Ezra* 7:48 complains: "O Adam what have you done? For though it was you who sinned, the fall was not yours alone, but ours also who are your descendants."¹⁶

Romans 5:13 somewhat abruptly introduces the idea of the Law. Paul says until the Law (surely the Mosaic Law), sin was in the world. Sin is almost personified here, as death was in v. 12.¹⁷ Sin was in the world, but it was not reckoned or counted, since there was no Law. Paul cannot mean that God simply ignored sin since he surely knows the story of Noah. Thus what Paul seems to mean is that sin was not reckoned¹⁸ as transgression, for the latter involves a willful violation of a known law. Transgression then, in the case of all of humanity (except

Adam), does not come on the scene until the time of Moses. This explains why it is that death still reigned between Adam and Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the form of transgression, as Adam did. Death as a consequence for sin still held sway even before the Law of Moses, but a different sort of punishment entered the picture with Moses, just as a different view of sin enters the picture with the Mosaic Law.

In v. 14 we hear that Adam is the type of the Coming One.¹⁹ The word *homoiomati* refers to likeness (the mark made by striking or an impression made by something, or the form or pattern of something made by a mold), but the term *tuπος* is even more important. A *tuπος* refers to something or someone that prefigures something or someone else, in this case someone or something that belongs to the eschatological age. C. E. B. Cranfield says “Adam in his universal effectiveness for ruin is the type which . . . prefigures Christ in his universal effectiveness for salvation.”²⁰ Notice that it is Adam’s transgression which makes him that type of Christ. In short it is his one deed which affects all, just as the Christ event affects all. “Paul sees history gathering at nodal points and crystalizing upon outstanding figures . . . who are notable in themselves as individual persons, but even more notable as representative figures. These . . . incorporate the human race, or sections of it, within themselves, and the dealings they have with God they have representatively on behalf of their [people].”²¹

Having initiated the analogy, Paul in v. 15 proceeds to clarify by saying that the trespass is in fact not exactly like the gift of grace. Again we have a “how much more” argument. If the trespass affected many and many died, how much more will the grace of God and the gift that comes through the one man Christ abound to many all that much more. While it is true that *polloi* can be used to mean “all,” it may be significant that Paul at this juncture switches to using *polloi* whereas before he had used *pantes*. Paul does *not* wish to convey the notion of automatic universal salvation.²² While Paul and his coworkers do not have a problem with the idea that Jesus died for the sins of the whole world, not just for the elect (see, e.g., 1 Tim 2:5–6—“for there is one God and one mediator between God and human beings, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a ransom for all persons”), Paul does not believe that this automatically means all will be saved. There is the little matter of responding in faith to God’s work of salvation in Christ and receiving the gift of God’s grace. Still it is a crucial Pauline theme as early as Galatians and as late as the Pastorals that God’s desire is for all to be saved, and that Christ’s atonement is to cover the sins of the world, not just of the elect. We see this most clearly in the Pastorals, and it is worth digressing here just for a moment to make this point clear.

1 Timothy 2:3–4 provides the sort of context in which we should view this matter, namely that God desires that “all people be saved and come to the full knowledge of the truth,” a theme we also find in 1 Timothy 4:10 where we hear of “the living God who is the Savior of all people, especially of the faithful.” Notice that the limitation comes at the point of those who respond in faith, not at the point of God’s desire or will. It is in this context that we must evaluate what is said in Titus 3:5–6 about how this salvation happens “according to his mercy, he saved us through the washing of rebirth and renewal by the Holy Spirit, which is poured out on us in abundance through Jesus Christ, our Savior.”²³ The language of election is used in a corporate sense in these letters, and when salvation is spoken of, God’s desire for universal salvation is expressed while at the same time making clear that only those are saved who respond in faith to the message of salvation, are reborn, and receive the Holy Spirit.

1 Timothy 2:5 stresses the oneness of God, the basic Jewish claim, and thus multiple mediators to God are ruled out as well. There is said to be only one mediator between God and humankind—the human being Jesus. This has several implications. First of all, a human being is the mediator. He could not represent human beings unless he was one, but equally he could not fully represent God unless he was divine as well. The mediatorship goes in both directions (cf. Job 9:32–33 LXX).²⁴ A mediator was a person who went between two parties in conflict with each other, seeking to reconcile them. The admission that he is a human being in no way compromises the statement in Titus 2:13 that he is God the Savior. The point is that he is both, and so he is the perfect choice to represent God to human beings and human beings to God. There is one mediator, and thus the one means of salvation and reconciliation between God and humankind. Notice that this reference to Jesus being a mediator immediately leads to a comment on his death, probably drawing on Mark 10:45. Of course Jesus’ death was in some ways his most human act.

Here his death is said to be an *antilytron* for all. The word is found only here in the NT, though its cognate *lytron* is used in Mark 10:45 and elsewhere, and Paul uses *apolytron* in much the same sense (Rom 3:24; 8:23; 1 Cor 1:30; Col 1:14).²⁵ It means either a ransom, and therefore a payment of some sort, or redemption, and thus some sort of deliverance from bondage, perhaps mainly the latter here. It should be noted however that we do have here hints of substitutionary atonement.²⁶ Christ gave himself on behalf of all. The prefix *anti-* here probably suggests replacement, Christ in the place of all.²⁷ The accent or emphasis in the Greek here is on the word “all.”²⁸ What is especially interesting about these verses is that our author is relating the oneness

of God to the idea of salvation for all, not just for one people or ethnic group. Not only is there only one God for all peoples, that one God desires the salvation of all peoples and all people groups and has sent one mediator to bring about that reality. This is clearly a different sort of theology than that found in some quarters in early Judaism (e.g., at Qumran) which suggested that the one God had one chosen people, and the only way one could be saved would be to be born into or to join that chosen people. Here the theology is a “one for all, and all for one” theology.²⁹ L. T. Johnson is right to stress: “Nowhere in the New Testament is such an inclusive hope for humanity comparably expressed.”³⁰ What is intimated in Romans is made quite explicit in the Pastorals. The tulip begins to wilt when one reads Romans in light of the Pastorals rather than through the much later lens of Augustine, Luther, and Calvin.

Returning to Romans 5 we find the same principle is stated but with an added factor. Here we learn that judgment followed only one misdeed and resulted in the condemnation of all, whereas the grace gift followed many misdeeds and resulted in a judgment of acquittal and in fact in salvation, potentially for all. In the former case we have an act that followed as punishment for a deed; in the latter case we have an act following God’s long patience with many more sins, and it was not an act of condemnation.

Thus, as Paul was trying to say, there is almost no comparison between the trespass and the grace gift. The one trespass led to death reigning through the one misdeed, but how much more did the grace and the gift of being set right by God and acquitted accomplish, for it will result in believers reigning in life through Christ? Paul may be drawing on the old apocalyptic notion of the reign of the saints, possibly in connection with millennial ideas (cf. 1 Cor 15). The important thing to note is that this reigning is envisioned as happening sometime in the future, not in the present. The life Paul is referring to is also something received in the future, and so not at conversion. It is part of the hope previously mentioned.

Romans 5:18 expands the notion a bit further, speaking of the *dikaiosis* of life. Some have translated this as if it were two ways to refer to the same thing (the right standing, i.e., Life), but it is perhaps more likely that Paul is referring to a *dikaiosis* which results in life, or perhaps, if we translate the phrase as “the setting right of life” we can get at the gist of the matter. Adam’s act led to the condemnation of all, but Christ’s righteous act led to the setting right of life for all. There is a problem with translating *dikaiosis* here as “right standing,” because in fact Paul did not believe that Christ’s death automatically gave all humans right standing with God apart from a faith response.

It appears then that what Paul has in mind is the fact that Christ's "act of justice" wiped the slate clean, and so life was set right. Humans were then in a position to once again have a right relationship with God, whereas there was not even that potential before Christ died. In this entire context Paul has been discussing the vast superiority of Christ and his effect to that of Adam and his effect on humankind. The condemnation of Adam is reversed in Christ. In Christ, human destiny changed. The emphasis on the effect for and upon all in the case of both Adam and Christ is noteworthy. At the very least this implies that Paul does not believe it was God's intent to send Christ to die for the select few. Christ's act of justice was for the whole human race. This argument here, however, does not state the conditions under which all might receive the benefit of Christ's act.³¹ Notice that Paul talks about this blessing as a "gift," and a gift is something which has to be received and unpacked. It is not something that has an automatic effect, and of course it can be rejected.

In v. 19 we hear of the obedience of the one man Christ, and here Paul surely has in mind his obedience unto death on the cross, which made possible the righting of things, as he earlier stated. It was Christ's obedience, earlier in Romans 3 called his faithfulness,³² which constituted or made many to be set right insofar as their relationship with God is concerned. The verb here does not mean "to reckon," but rather "to make." This is to be contrasted with the disobedience of Adam which "made" many sinners. As J. Fitzmyer rightly says, Adam's act not merely made humans liable to punishment, it constituted them as sinners.³³ The effect of Adam's sin is both relational and personal. The action of one person has drastic effects on many. As P. Achtemeier puts it, those who belong to the race of Adam are under the power and reign of sin. The only way to escape this is to join another race of humanity—those who are in Christ.³⁴ C. K. Barrett argues "But the words 'sinners' and 'righteous' are words of relationship, not character."³⁵ But this dichotomy cannot be made between the relational position and condition of a person when Paul chooses to use the verb "made" rather than "reckoned." Paul believes that Christ's death not only affects the believer's position in relationship to God, but also his condition, as Romans 5:1 makes perfectly clear.

At v. 20 we learn that the Law intruded into the historical process. The verb "intrude" is an interesting choice. Just as Paul has personified sin and death in this discussion, so here he personifies the Law, treating it as an actor on the historical stage, who could intrude into some process.³⁶ There is a *hina* clause here which could be purpose or result—the Law intruded for the purpose of increasing sin, or more likely the Law intruded with the result that sin increased (cf. Gal 3:19). How so?