

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

AN INVESTIGATION OF PAUL'S USE OF THE WORD "TYPE" IN  
ROMANS 5:12-21: COMPARISON, CONTRAST, OR BOTH?

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO  
THE GRADUATE FACULTY OF THE SCHOOL OF RELIGION  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS IN RELIGIOUS STUDIES

BY

LAURIE SCHWEINSBERG

LYNCHBURG, VA

APRIL, 2007

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

THESIS APPROVAL SHEET

---

GRADE

---

THESIS MENTOR

---

READER

---

READER

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to investigate Paul's use of the word "type" in Romans 5:14. Adam as a "type" of Christ appears incongruent with the rest of the passage, which seems to put Adam and Christ in total opposition.

There is no denying the contrasts between Adam and Christ in their personage, nor in their actions. Even with respect to the actual consequences on those they affected, the differences are obvious, but there are very important comparisons which may be Paul's true focus in this passage. Paul is comparing the principles of sin and death and the principle of righteousness and life in Christ Jesus.

The conclusion of this thesis is that the Adam-Christ typology is both comparison and contrast. God purposed in Adam the typology pointing to Christ to reveal that just as sin and death became universal through the action of another (Adam), so righteousness and life come only through the action of Another (Christ).

## CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of the Problem	
Statement of the Purpose	
Approach	
Theses	
Statement of Position on the Problem	
2. TYPOLOGY.....	5
Is Typology a Valid Means of Interpretation?	
Origin and Definition of Typology	
Definitions	
Type	
Antitype	
Antithesis	
Prototype	
Typology vs. Allegory	
The Reasonableness of Typology	
Four Views	
It's All About God	

**Validity**

**Characteristics of Typology**

**Divine Intent**

**Historical Correspondence**

**Prophecy**

**Christocentricity**

**Interpretation of Types**

**3. EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 5:12-21.....24**

**Theme: The Gospel**

**Remote Context**

**Immediate Context**

**Internal Context**

**Sin Enters the World -- 5:12**

**The Parenthesis -- 5:13-17**

**Adam and Christ-Death and Life -- 5:15-17**

**Paul's Summary -- 5:18-19**

**The Law vs. the Reign of Grace -- 5:20-21**

**4. ADAM CHRISTOLOGY.....44**

**The Development of "Adam Christology"**

**From the Church Fathers to the Reformation**

**Ireneaus**

**Augustine**

**Chrysostum**

	<b>Luther</b>	
	<b>Calvin</b>	
	<b>Nineteenth – Twentieth Centuries</b>	
	<b>Twenty-First Century</b>	
	<b>Interviews</b>	
	<b>Paul’s Adam Christology</b>	
	<b>Adam in Other Scriptures</b>	
	<b>Significance of Typology for the Pauline Adam Christology</b>	
	<b>Adam a type of Christ: Comparison, Contrast or Both?</b>	
	<b>The Reign of Two Kingdoms</b>	
5.	<b>CONCLUSION AND CONSEQUENCES</b> .....	64
	<b>Summary of Theses and Supporting Evidence</b>	
	<b>Implications of the Study for Modern Christology</b>	
	<b>The Affects of Adam Christology on the Christian Worldview in Today’s Culture</b>	
	<b>Applications to the Christian Life</b>	
	<b>Results of this Study</b>	
	<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	71

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

What can be learned from an investigation of Paul's use of the word "type" in Romans 5:14? Is typology a valid means of interpretation? Many scholars view Adam only as an *antithesis* of Christ. Was Adam just a contrast to Christ? Is Paul referring to Adam's pre-fallen state when he calls him a "type?" Was Adam created to be a true type, and if so, what comparisons can be made? What is Paul's focus in Rom 5:12-21, justification or sanctification? What effect would the answers to these questions have on our worldview and our view of the Christian's walk with the Lord?

#### **Statement of the Problem**

If God, in His foreknowledge, knew that He would someday redeem mankind through the death, burial and resurrection of His Son, did He create Adam as a true type of Christ, a picture of the one who was to come? What was Adam truly foreshadowing? Should we only *contrast* the First and Last Adam or are there significant *similarities* between the two? What are those similarities and what difference does that make to the believer of the twenty-first century?

Paul writes that Adam is a type of Christ. Is typology a valid means of interpretation? What are the issues involved? Do the verses in Rom. 5:12-21 only speak of the contrasts between the First and Last Adam or is there truly an important comparison as well? Is the context of this passage justification or sanctification?

Moo writes;

scholars view a consensus as a challenge. It is the very nature of the academic approach to question what most assume to be true—to take a hard, critical look at the ruling paradigms. And that is no bad thing. We too easily can get locked into certain ways of looking at the Bible and never stop to ask whether our approach is the right one or not. If the Bible is truly to be our authority for all of life, then we must constantly be reassessing our reading of its message. Very often, in fact, our failure to appreciate the real message of Scripture lies in certain assumptions about how we read the text –assumptions that we might not even be aware that we hold.<sup>1</sup>

Could it be that we have been locked into a certain way of looking at this passage so as to miss the true intention of Paul’s focus? How would a different interpretation affect our twenty-first century Christology? Finding the answers to these questions could affect the believer’s worldview and that would affect the way he lives out his Christian life.

### **Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this thesis is to analyze more closely the problem of Paul’s use of the word “type,” which is a word giving the basic idea of something similar, rather than opposite, in the midst of a passage full of contrasts.

### **Approach**

In order to answer the questions concerning the typology of Adam in the writings of Paul, and whether his presentation of Adam is one of an antithesis of Christ, a true type, or both, we will do an analysis of Paul’s presentation of the First and Last Adam in Romans 5:12-21. We will look at the development of “Adam Christology” throughout the history of the church and consider how these developments have led to what is believed today about Adam’s role in Christology. Our approach will be to take a look at whether

---

<sup>1</sup> Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1996), 2.

typology is a valid means of hermeneutical interpretation and what the guidelines are for interpreting typology. Using these guidelines we will take a closer look at the typology of Adam, looking at the first and last Adam and making comparison and contrasts. We will consider God's purpose of Adam as a type of Christ, and what affect this might have on modern-day believers.

### **Theses**

At the end of Rom 5:14, Paul begins his comparison between Adam and Christ, the Second Man, by saying that "Adam is a type of the one to come." The word *τυπος* means pattern or figure. *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* defines "*τυπος*," as it is used in this verse, as a hermeneutical term for a figure in the Old Testament pointing to a present eschatological salvation event.<sup>2</sup> Romans 5:12-21 is often considered one of the most difficult passages in the New Testament. In reading through many commentaries, expositions and exegeses on these verses, it seems that many writers are confused about what the Apostle Paul is stating. Paul's usage of run-on sentences and parenthetical phrases makes the interpretation of this passage difficult as well. We will look at the comparison of Adam with Christ to see if God intended Adam to be a true type of Christ rather than just an antithesis.

Many commentators have found it difficult to see Adam as a type of Christ, because the passage is so full of contrasts, they may miss the focus of Paul's purpose and the important truth he is endeavoring to reveal.

---

<sup>2</sup> Leonhard Goppert, "*τυπος*", *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, vol.VIII, Gerhard Friedrich and Geoffrey W. Bromiley, eds., trans. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1972), 251.

## Statement of Position on the Problem

My position is that typology is a valid means of interpretation, especially the typology of Adam. Adam is more than just an antithesis of Christ, rather, God created him with a purpose, as a true type of Christ. I believe that a close look at Paul's purpose for making the comparisons is to reveal what I will call "the principle of control." Our understanding of "Adam Christology" will reveal that the state of man before the fall and after the resurrection are vitally related and that this relationship is "Christ in us the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27). The basis of this "principle of control" has to do with man's sanctification and will affect the Christian's walk and is in agreement with the whole of scripture, in that "without Christ, we can do nothing" (Jn. 15:5), and that "faithful is he who called you who will also do it" (I Thes. 5:24). The Christian life is the impossible life as it is God's life in us, not what we do for Him, but what He did for us and continues to do through us.<sup>3</sup> I will attempt to demonstrate the central function of typology through an examination of the word *typos* (from which we derive typology), and from the way Jesus and the writers of Scripture used typology.

---

<sup>3</sup> W. Ian Thomas, *The Mystery of Godliness* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1964), 27-36.

## CHAPTER 2

### TYOLOGY

#### **Is Typology a Valid Means of Interpretation?**

Through the years the term typology has been used ambiguously and with such a variety of meanings as to cause confusion in theological discussions. Therefore, we will begin by asking the question, “What is typology?” and proceed to define our terms. What are the issues involved in the hermeneutical method of typology? Is typology a valid means of interpretation? We will view the characteristics and examples of typology and then review the methods and procedures used in typological interpretation.

#### **Origin and Definition of Typology**

To answer the question, “what is typology?” we need to look at the historical facts. Monser points out that for many centuries before Jesus’ incarnation the Israelites lived under the law of Jehovah, performing ritualistic observances such as sacrifices, the construction of the tabernacle and temple for worship, as well as a succession of priests; but to what purpose? Did God have a future plan? Were these only given in order to reveal the gospel to us today or were they significant to those who performed them? Did they reveal the salvation of Christ to Abraham and his descendents? When we consider what a type is we immediately think of resemblances.<sup>4</sup> Smith writes that to many theologians the word typology is shunned, though it is easy to see that God uses it, even

---

<sup>4</sup> J. W. Monser, *Types and Metaphors of the Bible* (St. Louis: John Burns Book Co., 1886), 17-19.

if we don't see the purpose in it. It is understandable, when we consider the propensity of writers throughout history to go too far in the use of typology, that many have responded negatively to this area of biblical interpretation. "Much of the problem would be resolved, however, by simply agreeing on what a *type* is. The definition can be broad or narrow, based on the source of information we employ."<sup>5</sup>

### Definitions

Typology is the theological doctrine of types and antitypes found in the Scripture. According to Brindle, "A type is a divinely intended Old Testament foreshadowing of some spiritual reality in the New Testament."<sup>6</sup>

### Type

The word *type* comes from the Greek word *τυπος*, which has many meanings. Mickelsen informs us that it is used fourteen times in the New Testament. Of these there are two uses that are key. The first meaning is "pattern" and the second is that which is shaped from a pattern. Other uses would be to illustrate a *pattern of teaching* as in Romans 6:17, or as an *image* (Acts. 7:43). The writer of Hebrews and Stephen use it technically as a model, or archetype (Heb. 8:5, Acts 7:44). The most frequent use of "τυπος" is "an example or pattern in the moral life (Phil. 3:17; I Thess. 1:7; II Thess. 3:9; I Tim. 4:12; Tit. 2:7; I Pet. 5:3)." Lastly, it is used in connection with the types God gives to indicate the future and is found in the form of persons, things or events.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Robert Smith, Basics of Bible Interpretation: Phase 2. Chapter 9 available from <http://www.pbc.org/dp/smith2/ch9.html>; Internet; accessed 9 April, 2006.

<sup>6</sup> Wayne A. Brindle, "Typology," *The Popular Encyclopedia of Bible Prophecy*, eds. Tim LaHaye, and Ed Hindson (Eugene, OR: Harvest House Publishers, 2004), 396.

<sup>7</sup> Berkley Mickelsen, *Interpreting the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), 239.

Some examples would be Paul's use in Romans 5:14, where he states that Adam is a type of the one who is to come, meaning Christ. Another example is the lamb in the Old Testament representing Jesus as the "lamb of God." Events such as the flood are also types from the Old Testament to foreshadow the spiritual aspect of God's promise in the New Testament.

The etymology of the word "type" is "from Latin & Greek; Latin *typus* image, from Greek *typos*: strike a blow, impression, model."<sup>8</sup> It is defined as "a) a person or thing (as in the Old Testament) believed to foreshadow another (as in the New Testament), b) one having qualities of a higher category."<sup>9</sup> Concerning *typical persons* Dungan believes that "no person, as such, can be regarded as a type. It must be because of some relation, office, or characteristic, that typology is possible."<sup>10</sup> Davidson says there are basically two views "The older conception (mostly represented by authors before the 1950s) views typology in terms of divinely preordained and predictive prefigurations" and the modern definition which "describes typology in terms of historical correspondences retrospectively recognized within the consistent redemptive activity of God."<sup>11</sup>

According to *The Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, τῦπος, as used in Romans 5:14, is a "Hermeneutical Term"; for example, "Adam is for Paul a τῦπος, an advance presentation, through which God intimates the future Adam, namely, Christ in

---

8 *Webster's Revised Unabridged Dictionary*, s.v. "type."

9 *Ibid.*

10 D. R. Dungan, *Hermeneutics* (Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1888), 362.

11 Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical TYPOS Structures* (Berrien Springs: Andrews University Press, 1981), 94.

His universal work of salvation.”<sup>12</sup> He considers the correspondence to be antithetical, therefore making an opposite impression. This suits the theological ideas of most commentators quite nicely, if they are prone to see only the contrast between Adam and Christ.

In *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* τῦπος is defined as:

1. visible impression of a stroke or pressure, mark, trace
2. copy, image
3. that which is formed, an image or statue of any kind of material
4. form, figure, pattern
5. archetype, pattern, model
  - a. technically model, pattern
  - b. in the moral life example, pattern
6. of the types given by God as an indication of the future, in the form of persons or things. . . ; of Adam: τῦπος τοῦ μέλλοντος (Ἄδὰμ) a type of the Adam to come (i.e. of Christ) Romans 5:14.<sup>13</sup>

Let us agree that Paul is using τῦπος in a hermeneutical fashion, as a foreshadowing of Christ. Whether there is an analogous or antithetical correspondence or both will be clarified in a later chapter.

## **Antitype**

A type from the Old Testament must have an antitype in the New Testament that corresponds to it. The *antitype* is that which the type is foreshadowing. Therefore, if Adam is a type of Christ, then Christ is the antitype of Adam. Mickelsen explains, “The Greek adjective *αντιτυπος* (anti-type) has the meaning ‘*corresponding to something*

---

<sup>12</sup> Gopplet, 251.

<sup>13</sup> William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957), 387.

that has gone before. The *antitupos* is usually regarded as secondary to the *tupos* (cf. Exodus 25:40).”<sup>14</sup> “The antitype (*αντιτυπος*) is the ‘representation’ (see Hebrews 9:24) or fulfillment found in the New Testament (Jesus as the Lamb of God)” according to Brindle.<sup>15</sup> Dugan says that “the *similarity* between *type* and *antitype* will lead, in most cases, to the true meaning. Another aspect of the antitype is that it is “always superior to the type.”<sup>16</sup> In the New Testament the word *αντιτυπον* is not used in the same way as it is in theological literature. *Image* or *likeness* is the general meaning when used in Hebrews 9:24 and I Peter 3:21.<sup>17</sup>

The definition for antitype is “1) One that is foreshadowed by or identified with an earlier symbol or type, such as a figure in the New Testament who has a counterpart in the Old Testament. 2) An opposite or contrasting type.”<sup>18</sup>

### **Antithesis**

An antithesis is defined as “direct contrast; opposition. The direct or exact opposite: *Hope is the antithesis of despair.*”<sup>19</sup> Dugan writes, “ANTITHESIS.--This is from the Greek *anti*, against, and *thesis*, a setting. Of this word Webster says ‘An opposition of words or sentiments occurring in the same sentence; contrast . . . .’”<sup>20</sup> Just as the right hand is the exact opposite of the left, or black is the opposite of white, so we

---

14 Mickelsen, 239.

15 Brindle, 396.

16 Dugan, 361.

17 Milton S. Terry, *Biblical Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974), 336.

18 *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, 4th ed., s.v. "antitype."

19 *Ibid*, s.v. "antithesis."

20 Dugan, 346.

see the antithesis expressed in the biblical example in Matthew 25:46 which says “And these shall go away into eternal punishment: but the righteous into eternal life.”

Though it would seem that an antitype is the same as an antithesis, we can see from the definition of antithesis that it is an exact opposite whereas an antitype is most frequently used in the sense of a comparison, rather than a contrast.

### **Prototype**

Relevant dictionary definitions for prototype are “1) The original or model on which something is based or formed, 2) Someone or something that serves to illustrate the typical qualities of a class; model, 3) Something analogous to another thing of a later period”<sup>21</sup>

The definitions of these terms are given in an attempt to clarify their uses in this thesis. It is not a simple thing to define the nature and extent of typology. As a method of interpretation it resembles allegory and is often confused with this method. Therefore let us look at the difference.

### **Typology vs. Allegory**

Throughout the centuries there has been much controversy concerning typology and allegory. Therefore, they need to be contrasted. Mickelsen writes:

No area of biblical interpretation needs more careful definition than typology. Some people associate typology with bizarre, fanciful meaning. To them typology and allegorizing are in the same class—worthless procedures for trying to find meaning in written documents. This is far from true. Allegorizing and typology have only one thing in common. They are both figurative methods of interpretation. But here the

---

<sup>21</sup> *Dictionary.com Unabridged (v 1.1)*, Random House, Inc, s.v. "antithesis."

resemblance ends. They have a different background, a different attitude toward history, and a different way of handling meaning.<sup>22</sup>

Typology has its root in reality, a historical person, object or event.

Woolcombe defines typology, used as an exegetical method as “The establishment of historical connections between certain events, persons or things in the Old Testament, and similar events, persons or things in the New Testament.” He goes on to say that, considered as a method of writing, typology is defined as “The description of an event, person, or thing in the New Testament in terms borrowed from the description of its prototypal counterpart in the Old Testament.”<sup>23</sup>

Allegory, on the other hand is based on the imagination of the interpreter.

According to Fairbaine, “An allegory is a narrative, either expressly feigned for the purpose, or—if describing facts which really took place—describing them only for the purpose of representing certain higher truths or principles than the narrative, in its literal aspect, whether real or fictitious, could possibly have taught.”<sup>24</sup> Edwards says, “The type exists in history and is factual. By contrast, the allegory, the simile and the metaphor have been made according to the fancy of men, and they mean whatever the brain of the begetter is pleased they should mean.”<sup>25</sup>

The allegorist looks at a narrative (even if the writer has given no indication of his text meaning anything other than its literal meaning) and disregards the main or

---

22 Mickelsen, 236.

23 G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Studies in Biblical Theology: Essays on Typology* (London: SCM Press LTD, 1978), 39.

24 Patrick Fairbain, *The Typology of Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1975), 3.

25 Jonathan Edwards, *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*, ed. Perry Miller (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977), 6.

apparent meaning. He randomly affixes the meaning he desires to get across. In doing so, he regards the narrative in a way as to almost deny its historicity, even though he may resolutely defend its historicity. Mickelsen elucidates, “Typology is historically oriented. Allegory rests ‘on a particular quasi-Platonist doctrine of the relation of the literal sense of Scripture—the outward form or ‘letter’ of the sacred writings—to eternal spiritual reality concealed, as it were, beneath the literal sense.’”<sup>26</sup>

### **The Reasonableness of Typology**

There have been issues related to the use of typology throughout the centuries. Smith remarks,

It is exceedingly unfortunate that modern scholarship has succeeded in almost eliminating the investigation and teaching of typology as a valid interpretive pursuit. So much has been lost of the richness and practical illustrative value which I believe God intends we should have through an understanding of types.<sup>27</sup>

There has been a renewed interest in typology since the twentieth century. According to Glenny, “The issue of what constitutes typology surfaces regularly in discussions of continuity and discontinuity and of the relationship between the Old Testament and New Testament. It is also a major component in defining what we mean by literal hermeneutics.”<sup>28</sup> There are many explanations for the renewed interest in typology. First, it is possibly due to a “renewed interest in Biblical theology” suggests

---

26 Mickelsen, 238.

27 Smith.

28 W. Edward Glenny, “Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40/4 (December 1997): 627-638.

Francis Foulkes.<sup>29</sup> Hugenberger says the “revival of interest in typology has been caused by the need to account for this methodology in the New Testament’s use of the Old Testament.”<sup>30</sup> Goppelt, Ellis and France are key figures here. Interestingly the “stimulus for typology has come from Old Testament theologians, like von Rad, Eichrodt and Wolff, who desire to make Old Testament theology more relevant for Gentile readers to whom the Old Testament cult and ritual do not apply.” He continues, “The impetus may come from a growing awareness of the Old Testament’s own use of typology as is seen in the works of Lampe, Fishbane, von Rad and Daube.”<sup>31</sup>

The conservative evangelicals prefer a “controlled typology (modeled on the sober typological method of the New Testament)”<sup>32</sup> Because the approach seems subjective, some scholars are not confident in it and some dispensationalists feel it is not consistent with grammatico-historical exegesis.<sup>33</sup> Robert Thomas, professor at The Master’s Seminary, looking at “the principle of single meaning,” writes:

That a single passage has one meaning and one meaning only has been a long-established principle of biblical interpretation. Among evangelicals, recent violations of that principle have multiplied. Violations have included those by Clark Pinnock with his insistence on adding "future" meanings to historical meanings of a text, Mikel Neumann and his expansion of the role of contextualization, Greg Beale and Grant Osborne and their views about certain features of Revelation 11, recent

---

29 F. Foulkes, “The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 342.

30 G. P. Hugenberger, “Introductory Notes on Typology,” in *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, ed. G. K. Beale (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 331-341.

31 Ibid.

32 Ibid, 334.

33 Ibid, 334-335.

works on hermeneutics and their advocacy of multiple meanings for a single passage, Kenneth Gentry and his preterist views on Revelation, and Progressive Dispensationalism with its promotion of "complementary" hermeneutics. The single-meaning principle is of foundational importance in understanding God's communication with mankind, just as it has been since the creation of the human race. The entrance of sin in Genesis 3 brought a confusion in this area that has continued ever since.<sup>34</sup>

His concern leads him to express:

Someone needs to sound the alarm about recent evangelical leaders who are misleading the body of Christ. A mass evangelical exodus from this time-honored principle of interpreting Scripture is jeopardizing the church's access to the truths that are taught therein. Whether interpreters have forsaken the principle intentionally or have subconsciously ignored it, the damage is the same. The only hope of escape from the pit into which so many have fallen is to reaffirm the principle of single meaning along with the other hermeneutical principles that have served the believing community so well through the centuries.<sup>35</sup>

Unfortunately, we can not put God in a "single-meaning" box. Interpretation would be much simpler if we could, but too often as we compare Scripture with Scripture we find that God has used symbols, situations and people as examples and pictures of future events.

#### **Four Views**

Here we will briefly look at four views of typology in evangelicalism today. Glenn lists these as (1) the covenant view, (2) the revised dispensational view, (3) the progressive dispensational view, and (4) the view of Richard M. Davidson.

#### The covenant view.

According to Glenn, Covenant theologians usually apply typology to illustrate the connection between the Old Testament systems and Israel with the New Testament

---

<sup>34</sup> Robert Thomas, "The Principle of Single Meaning," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 12/1 (Spring 2001): 33-47.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

systems and the Church or “the new Israel.” For them typology describes the progression of salvation-history from the old covenant to the new.<sup>36</sup>

#### The revised dispensational view.

Dispensationalists have generally looked at “history as kingdom history.” According to the revised dispensational view, typology does not represent the connection between the Old Testament and New Testament; rather, it represents the connection between particular entities specifically appointed in Scripture. Their tendency is to find fewer types and limit their typology to “specific persons, events or institutions of the Old Testament that are designated as type in the New Testament.”<sup>37</sup> There are those who would allow more than this, such as seeing Joseph as a type of Christ. Roy Zuck is a representative of the more limited position. His definition is: “A type may be defined as an Old Testament person, event, or thing having historical reality and designed by God to prefigure (foreshadow) in a preparatory way a real person, event, or thing so designated in the New Testament that corresponds to and fulfills (heightens) the type.”<sup>38</sup>

#### The progressive dispensational view.

Progressive dispensationalists concur with the revised dispensationalists in their perception of typology, but add that some of the “Old Testament promises for Israel find a typological fulfillment in the Church age.” They see typology as one of many hermeneutical divisions which give understanding of the Old Testament in the New

---

36 Glenny, 638.

37 Ibid.

38 R. B. Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation: A Practical Guide to Discovering Biblical Truth* (Wheaton: Victor, 1991) 176.

Testament. “It involves an initial fulfillment but does not annul the original Old Testament meaning for Israel.”<sup>39</sup>

#### The Davidson view.

Richard M. Davidson wrote his doctoral dissertation on “Typology in Scripture.” In this, he sees the failure of earlier works on typology “to allow the structure of typology to emerge from within the biblical text.”<sup>40</sup> He has built a broad system of typology relating historical, eschatological, prophetic, ecclesiological, and Christological elements. His view is unique because of his assertion that “typology has a predictive-prophetic element” and that “the indication of this predictive quality of Old Testament types must exist before the antitypical fulfillment.”<sup>41</sup>

### **It’s All About God**

It is essential to realize that the Bible was not written by men alone, but was inspired by God, who from eternity past had a plan to reveal Jesus Christ to the world. It is no surprise that in many events in history He built in types in order to make that revelation. He is a God who acts. He is a God who reveals himself. Mickelsen says:

In typology the interpreter finds a correspondence in one or more respects between a person, event, or thing in the Old Testament and a person, event, or thing closer to or contemporaneous with a New Testament writer. It is this *correspondence* that determines the meaning in the Old Testament narrative that is stressed by a later speaker or writer. The correspondence is present because God controls history, and this control of God over history is axiomatic with the New Testament writers. It is God who causes earlier individuals, groups,

---

39 Ibid.

40 Richard M. Davidson, *Typology in Scripture; a study of hermeneutical ... structures* (Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981).

41 Ibid.

experiences, institutions, etc., to embody characteristics which later he will cause to reappear.<sup>42</sup>

“God, who at sundry times and *in divers manners* spoke in times past unto the fathers by the prophets . . .” (Heb. 1:1), shows us that God varied the manner in which he “spoke,” not always using the *word*. At times he used *transactions* such as the sacrificial system, or even the personalities and character of different Old Testament men and women. “The use of typology rests on the belief that God’s way of acting is consistent throughout history. That is, they believed that many of God’s former actions with Israel (or in the Old Testament) were ‘types’ of what he was now doing in Christ.”<sup>43</sup>

### **Validity**

Is typology a valid method of interpretation? Moorehead says, “How much of the Old Testament is to be regarded as typical is a question not easily answered.”<sup>44</sup> He cautions against going to extremes. He believes the early Fathers were too extravagant in their view of types, seeking and finding *shadows*, no matter how trivial, at every turn of scripture. The other extreme is that only what is stated by the New Testament writers as typical should be regarded as true type. He says,

This opinion assumes that the New Testament writers have exhausted the types of the Old Testament, while the fact is that those found in the later Scripture are but samples taken from the storehouse where many more are found. If they are not, then nothing is more arbitrary than the New Testament use of types, for there is nothing to distinguish them from a multitude of others of the same class. Further, the view assumes that divine authority alone can determine the reality and import of types--a view that applies with equal force against prophecy.<sup>45</sup>

---

42 Mickelsen, 237.

43 W. W. Klein, Craig Blomberg, and R. L. Hubbard, Jr., *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (Dallas: Word, 1993), 130.

44 William G. Moorehead, “Type,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 5, ed. James Orr (Chicago: Howard-Severance Co., 1930), 3029-3030.

According to Mickelsen, W. Eichrodt gets right to the point of the question scholars are asking in his article “Is Typological Exegesis Relevant Exegesis?” He asks if typology is pertinent for the modern student saying, “Is current-day exegesis able to classify typology among its basic hermeneutical principles or must it exclude it from there?” He believes the Old and New Testaments exhibit a qualitative agreement in their revelation of God in contrast to all other religions throughout history. Because of his presupposition he see a flow from the Old Testament to the New Testament “which has its perspective goal in Jesus Christ.” He believes typology should not be the ruling factor in Old Testament exegesis and that its use in the New Testament “must be confined,” having an essential connection with historical Old Testament facts.<sup>46</sup>

According to Brindle “The validity of typology is based on three things.” First, it is based “not only on this New Testament vocabulary” but it ties together the Old and New Testaments because, secondly, it “is part of prophecy, and the prophetic relationship.” The third basis is that “Jesus taught and demonstrated that the entire Old Testament speaks of Him (Luke 24:25-44; John 5:39-44).”<sup>47</sup>

---

45 Ibid.

46 Walther Eichrodt, “Ist die typologisch Exegese sachgemässe Exegese?” *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik* (1960), 205-226, quoted in Mickelsen, 242-43.

47 Brindle, 396.

## Characteristics of Typology

### Divine Intent

Davidson asks the question, “Is typology a mere human analogy or does it involve a divinely ordained prefiguration?”<sup>48</sup> To answer that question we look to Brindle as he explains, “To be genuine, a type must be purposed and ordained by God. The Bible must indicate that God intended the correspondence between the type and its fulfillment (anti-type) and that it doesn’t simply spring from the fertile mind of creative interpreters.”<sup>49</sup> There should be no doubt when the New Testament shows the correspondence between the type and anti-type. Simple parallels between the Old Testament and New Testament should not be considered true types.<sup>50</sup> Mickelsen says, “Some notable point of resemblance or analogy must exist between the type and the antitype. The *particular point* must be worthy of notice.”<sup>51</sup> Terry points out that “there must be evidence that the type was designed and appointed by God to represent the thing typified.”<sup>52</sup>

### Historical Correspondence

“Most scholars would agree” that in typology there is “a historical correspondence between type and antitype,” according to Davidson.<sup>53</sup> Brindle remarks, “A type is a real entity with a real, literal existence in Old Testament passages (it has historical reality), but is nevertheless considered by New Testament authors to

---

48 Davidson, 95.

49 Brindle, 396-397.

50 Ibid.

51 Mickelsen, 245.

52 Terry, 337.

53 Davidson, 95.

foreshadow a greater spiritual reality in its New Testament fulfillment (especially in Christ).”<sup>54</sup> This is not to say that the correspondence is between something visible and invisible, rather the between realities in two different periods of history. It is not a hidden meaning in the text, rather the actual persons, events or things are the types.<sup>55</sup> Brindle says, “For example the mercy seat in the Tabernacle existed physically and literally but it also pointed to the ultimate reality of Christ as the propitiation of God for our sins.”<sup>56</sup> It is also important to note that the correspondence between type and antitype is not contributed by anything in the events or persons themselves. It is based on the fact that both play a part in God’s plan and reveal the way God works with His people.<sup>57</sup>

## **Prophecy**

Typology is a type of prophecy. Davidson says, “Fairbairn, Ellis, and many others view typology as a mute species of prophecy, while Amsler, Baker and others draw a sharp distinction.”<sup>58</sup> According to Zuck, “Prophecy is prediction by means of words, whereas, typology is prediction by correspondence between two realities, the type and the antitype.” In order for a type to be genuine it must have a “forward focus.”<sup>59</sup> When considering the typology of Adam, the first Adam is the Old Testament reality that corresponds to the Last Adam, Jesus Christ, as the *Eschatological* man.

---

54 Brindle, 397.

55 Craig D. Allbert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho* (Boston: Brill, 2002), 252.

56 Brindle, 397

57 Allbert, 252.

58 Davidson, 100.

59 Roy Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation* (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1991), 173.

## **Christocentricity**

There is debate as to whether the Christocentric character of typology is “necessary for a true typological correspondence.” There is also disagreement among those who do hold to the essentialness of Christocentricity, and as to what this means,<sup>60</sup> but as Brindle said, “Jesus taught and demonstrated that the entire Old Testament speaks of Him.”<sup>61</sup> Greidanus declares, “The New Testament teaches throughout that Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of Old Testament history, promises, and prophecies.”<sup>62</sup> Scripture is clear that Christocentricity is fundamental in the interpretation of types. McCartney says, “The Christological focus of the NT was not only a matter of the interpretive framework for the words of Scripture, but indeed Christ is regarded as the fulfillment of the very history itself. Thus this focus is the basis for the NT's typological interpretation.”<sup>63</sup>

## **Interpretation of Types**

Brindle notes the importance of studying each type within its context and taking into account the natural qualities of the type. He reminds us that the antitype must be “greater than the type.”<sup>64</sup> Fishbane writes that in the correlation between the type and the antitype there exists an “inherent disproportion” and that the antitype is “proportionally more dominant than its typological correlate.”<sup>65</sup> This is an important

---

60 Davidson, 97.

61 Brindle, 396.

62 Sidney Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 119.

63 McCartney, 114.

64 Brindle, 397.

aspect of typology. Murdoch points out that “Sound typology must rest on the guidance of inspired writers. When the interpreter moves out of the areas designated by inspiration to be types, he needs to acknowledge that he is moving into the realm of speculation.”<sup>66</sup> There are also some aspects that are not to be used, as Brindle maintains. “Types should not be based on numbers, shapes, or colors. These may be symbols (if shown to be so by their contexts), but they are not foreshadowings of spiritual realities.”<sup>67</sup> The interpretation of types is not a simple thing due to the fact that, as Brindle expresses it, “the type is not given as a direct prediction and the fulfillment is normally not described in detail.”<sup>68</sup> Murdoch states, “There are certain criteria that are necessary to sound interpretation of types.” In researching different authors the main points agreed upon are that “the specific point or points of correspondence” and “the difference and contrast” should be noted between the type and antitype.<sup>69</sup> The New Testament picture of the unity of the people of God should be grasped in its full significance as well. Neither should this be arbitrary, but should agree with the normal meaning in the text. Murdoch exhorts us to avoid speculation, saying “Parallelism alone does not imply typology” and warns us against using types as a primary basis for the development of doctrine.<sup>70</sup>

---

65 Michael A. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 362.

66 W. G. C. Murdoch, “Interpretations of Symbols, Types, Allegories and Parables” *A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*, SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University, 217.

67 Brindle, 397

68 Brindle, 397.

69 Mickelsen, 262.

70 Murdoch, 213-217.

Zuck does not believe that Adam is an “official type” of Christ, but rather a pattern, or example. He says that “Adam was analogous to Christ in some ways but did not point predicatively toward Christ. Adam’s life, in view of his fall, hardly predicted or prefigured Christ.” The only parallel he sees between the two is their headship.<sup>71</sup>

The important thing to remember, as Murdoch recaps, is that “the interpreter should seek understanding of God’s purpose in giving both the type and the antitype. There should be an evident similarity of meaning between them, although the latter usually represents a more vital and broader event of principle than the former.”<sup>72</sup>

The study of types is an extensive topic with such a variety of opinions and emotions involved that we could only cover a brief overview in this paper. Mickelsen exhorts us that

No one should launch out on a career of finding more types until he has carefully studied all of the New Testament examples of typology first. A thorough understanding of these will take time and effort. But the understanding gained in such an undertaking is well worth that effort. In the New Testament, typology was used to make prominent the message of God's grace in Christ—not to exalt the teacher. Interpreters who are faithful to the New Testament can only do the same thing. Any typology which is farfetched or artificial will only hinder the proclamation of the gospel. Hence care in the employment of typology will always be essential.<sup>73</sup>

Let us be sure that we define our terms, follow the accepted guidelines for interpretation, and above all, depend on the Holy Spirit for guidance. We can conclude that typology is a valid means of interpretation, and particularly with regard to Adam and Christ, since Paul specifically uses this term in Romans 5:14.

---

71 Zuck, 181.

72 Murdoch, 217.

73 Mickelsen, 263-4.

## CHAPTER 3

### EXEGESIS OF ROMANS 5:12-21

Through the exegesis of this passage we will take a look at the grammatical and contextual aspects of interpreting these verses.

#### **Theme: The Gospel**

It has been the view of many that the theme of the book of Romans is “justification by faith.” This is, of course, a major message of the book, but in recent years this has been challenged. There are many ideas, such as “Christology” or “salvation-history,” but it seems the overall theme of Romans is the Gospel. As a framework for the epistle, Paul uses the word “gospel” and the related verb “evangelize” in the introduction and conclusion. It is seen in what many call the *theme verses* of Romans 1:16-17: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to everyone who believes, to the Jew first and also to the Greek. For in it the righteousness of God is revealed from faith to faith; as it is written, ‘but the righteous man shall live by faith.’” The heart of the Gospel is Christ, and therefore we see that “Christology” is Paul’s theological starting point. In 1:3-4, Paul describes the substance of his Gospel in the language of Christology. All the topics in Romans are grounded in Christ (3:21-26; 5:12-21). In chapter 5-8 we find his frequent use of “through Jesus

Christ our Lord.” Although Christology is not specifically expressed in Romans, it is the underlying framework for the letter.<sup>74</sup>

### **Remote Context**

The remote context for this study of Romans 5:14 is from Romans 1:16 to chapter 8. Paul begins in 1:16 to reveal God’s plan for the Gospel. There are many who see an Adam Christology already beginning in these verses. He builds a firm foundation therefore in chapters 1-4 of the utter lostness of mankind and absolute need for salvation on the basis of faith. He reveals the assurance and hope the believer has, who is justified by faith and not by obedience to the law. Chapter 5 is then a bridge, tying together the first and last half of the letter. Thomas says,

Thus, these verses give us the logical centre of the Epistle. They are the great central point to which everything that precedes has converged, and out of which everything that follows will flow. . . . This passage, therefore, is no mere episode or illustration, but that which really gives organic life to the entire Epistle. As ch.v.11 had completed the formal treatment of justification by faith, so ch. v.12 is the transition point which leads up to the inseparable consequence of sanctification, to be treated in ch. vi-viii.<sup>75</sup>

Paul begins chapter 5 with “since we have been justified by faith,” and then proceeds to explain what that means to those who are Christ’s. We have “peace with God” and we “rejoice in hope,” not just hope of a future salvation, not just hope of a present standing in God’s sight as reconciled, but a hope that will take us through suffering in the present time, that will be our strength to persevere, that hope that builds character, and does not disappoint us, because that hope is His Spirit, which He has given us. Just as we can be

---

<sup>74</sup> Moo, 25.

<sup>75</sup> W. H. Griffith Thomas, *St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans: A Devotional Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 154.

assured that we have been reconciled to him in his death, we have assurance, a hope that we shall be saved by his life. That is sanctification. Polhill writes,

I would certainly agree that it is a transitional chapter, Paul is talking about salvation in terms of justification in chapters 3 and 4 but then switches to dealing with "representative humanity" in chapter 5 – “in Adam” or “in Christ,” in sin or in righteousness, in death or in life. They are different metaphors for the salvation that is in Christ alone -- one is judicial/law court language (justification), and the other is more relational (in Adam/ in Christ). He moves on in chapters 6-8 to speak in terms of sanctification, as you have noted, but it seems to me that he does so more in the relational terms -- dying and rising with Christ that involves a new life, living in the Spirit rather than in the flesh. All of these are controlled by Paul's idea of living "in Christ," being guided by the Spirit. The two obviously belong together - to be justified is to be acceptable to God, an acceptance that can only come about through accepting Christ and what he has done for us and living in relationship to him. To me the transition is a very natural one.<sup>76</sup>

The verses following our focus passage continue in the comparisons started in chapter 5 comparing the principles of sin and death and the principle of righteousness and life in Christ Jesus. It may be noted that not a few authors give reference to allusions to Adam in chapter 7 as well.

### **Immediate Context**

In order that we might have a clearer understanding of Paul's use of the word “type” in verse 14 we need to look closely at the immediate context. Romans 5:12-21 will be the main focus of this exegesis in order to help us clearly understand what is being said in verse 14. The type of context of Romans 5:12-21 is didactic; that is to say, Paul is trying to teach a truth by using the comparison and contrast between the First and Last Adam. The main idea of our internal text is the theme which I will call the “principle of control.” Though there is both comparison and contrast of the actions of Adam and

---

<sup>76</sup> Polhill, Senior Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, interview by author, email: 19 January 2007.

Christ, the effects of their action on the believer's salvation is the focus of this section. There is much debate over these verses so we will take a close look at the contextual as well as the grammatical possibilities in interpreting the passage. Of particular interest will be Paul's use of the phrase in verse 5:14b "ὅς ἐστιν τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος."

### **Internal Context**

The internal context that is the focus of this study is Romans 5:14b, which says that Adam is a type of the One to come. It appears incongruent with the rest of the passage, which seems to put Adam and Christ in total opposition to one another. There is no denying the differences between Christ and Adam, but have the comparisons, which bring Paul to use the word "type," been overlooked because of the overwhelming contradictions between the two men's actions? There are not a few problems to be considered within this passage and it has been considered one of the most polemic in all the New Testament.

### **Sin Enters the World -- 5:12**

The whole of this passage hangs on how verse 12 is interpreted. As Wallace comments, "The theological issues at stake are profound and complex (e.g., whether humanity's sinning is personal or participatory in Adam's sin)."<sup>77</sup>

Paul begins this section of the passage with διὰ τοῦτο, literally meaning, "because of this," which tends to cause us to look back at the previous section to see what is being concluded. It is not unanimously agreed by scholars as to what is the reference of διὰ τοῦτο. Opinions vary from Dunn and Stuhlmacher who agree that it refers all the

---

<sup>77</sup> Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 342.

way back for verse 1:18-5:11,<sup>78</sup> to Morris who thinks it only refers to verse 11.<sup>79</sup>

Hausman comments, “In its common usage διὰ τοῦτο indicates a logical inference from what precedes.”<sup>80</sup> Hodge says, “*therefore*, at the beginning of verse 12, marks an inference from the whole doctrine of the epistle; the corresponding words here are also strictly inferential. It had been proved that we are justified by the righteousness of one man, and it had also been proved that we are under condemnation for the offense of one. *Therefore*, as we are condemned, even so are we justified.”<sup>81</sup> Whatever the reference, it is certainly related to the previous verses which conclude Paul’s argument for *justification by faith* and begin his explanation of *sanctification by faith*.

Paul begins by taking us back to Adam and the reason for our need of a Savior. He sums up the “history of man before Christ” as Stott puts it, “. . . first that sin entered the world through one man; second, that death entered . . . through sin, because death is the penalty for sin; and third, that death spread to all men because all men sinned. These are the three stages—sin, death and universal death is due to the original transgression of one man.”<sup>82</sup>

The next difficulty we run into is the term ὡσπερ, (‘just as’) which begins a comparative clause; however there is no corresponding clause as would be expected

---

78 James D. G. Dunn, *Word Biblical Commentary: Romans 1-8*, vol. 38a (Dallas: Word Books, 1988), 272; Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul’s Letter to the Romans*, trans. Scott J. Hafemann (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 83.

79 Leon Morris, *The Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 228.

80 Robert A. Hausman, “Adam and Christ: A Comparative Study of Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, and Anders Nygren on Romans 5, 12-21” (Thesis (B.D.)--Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Ill., 1965), 6.

81 Hodge, 265.

82 John R. W. Stott, *Men Made New, an Exposition of Romans 5-8* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 1966), 24-25.

beginning with *so, in order* to complete this sentence,<sup>83</sup> making this an anacoluthon.

Hodge states, “It is however so obvious that the illustration begun in this verse is resumed, and fully stated in verses 18 and 19, that the vast majority of commentators agree that we must seek in those verses the clause which answers to this verse. The other explanations are unnecessary or unsatisfactory.”<sup>84</sup>

The first clause points to Adam (whose name means “man, mankind, or humanity”), as the doorway through which sin entered the world. And it is through sin that death entered. Sin did not begin at the moment of Adam’s disobedience, for Satan had already led his legions on a rebellion against God. The battle that was raging came to earth. It was only at this point that sin *entered* the world. According to Barclay, the Jews believed that “Death is the direct consequence of sin. It was the Jewish belief that if Adam had not sinned, man would have been immortal. In Jewish thought, sin and death are integrally connected. This is what Paul is getting at in the involved and difficult line of thought in verses 12-14.”<sup>85</sup> The question that comes to mind is what is meant by death, for Adam did not die physically until long after his disobedience. We will look at the comparison of Adam with Christ on this point later, but let us now consider the aspects of death. Although we are created much like other creatures with physical bodies and souls, something distinguishes us from other animal life – the human spirit. It is here that the Holy Spirit dwells, and when Adam sinned, God took His glory from man. According to Dunn, Paul’s understanding of salvation is “the restoration of the believer to the glory”

---

83 Hodge, 226.

84 Ibid, 145.

85 William Barclay, *The Letter to the Romans*, rev. ed. (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1975), 78-82.

which was lost as a result of Adam's sin (Rom. 3.23). This view was held among the Jewish contemporaries of Paul. There was a hope of future participation in "eschatological glory" which would be a "reversal of Adam's loss."<sup>86</sup> Thomas says that God was obviously not speaking of physical death as the initial consequence of Adam's disobedience (Gen. 2:17b), though this was a secondary consequence. Rather, he was referring to spiritual death. It is often acknowledged in the New Testament that Adam was capable of "remaining physically alive" though spiritually dead. "But yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead" (Rom. 6:13) and "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins" (Eph. 2:1). "For a Christian is literally a person who has been raised spiritually from the dead,"<sup>87</sup> as Thomas explains:

Apart from life however, death is meaningless! You can say of a piece of wood, "It's dead!" But you cannot say the same of a lump of clay. Clay has not capacity for life, and therefore it cannot die—it cannot forfeit what it does not have; death is what is left when the life that should be there is absent! If Adam was capable of death whilst remaining physically alive, it can only mean that he possessed originally, in his innocency, a quality of life other than physical, which under certain circumstances he could forfeit, without forfeiting physical life.

What was the life which Adam forfeited? It was spiritual life—the very life of God Himself!<sup>88</sup>

Adam, through direct disobedience to God's command, forfeited not only his physical life, but his spiritual life. Mounce states, "Because Adam was the first created person, his sin had consequences for all who were to be born into the human race."<sup>89</sup> Adam had

---

86 James D. G. Dunn, *Christology in the Making: A New Testament Inquiry into the Origin of the Doctrine of the Incarnation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 106.

87 Ian Thomas, *The Saving Life of Christ and the Mystery of Godliness* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988), 213-214.

88 Ibid.

89 Robert H. Mounce, *The New American Commentary: Romans* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 141.

spiritual life, otherwise he could not have died spiritually, therefore if men are considered dead in their trespasses and sin, there must be a connection with the life of Adam before the fall.

The Apostle goes on to say that “in the same way death came to all men because all sinned.” This is probably the most controversial section of the passage because the Greek is vague. Paul’s use of [ἐθ’ ᾧ] could be interpreted in several ways. The three most common would be as follows: First the *New International Version* (NIV) translates it “because.” In this way the prepositional phrase (lit. upon which/whom) is seen as introducing a relative clause, with the pronoun modifying Adam. This would mean that all sinned *in Adam*. Therefore, Adam, meaning “humanity,” gives the impression of an “original sin”.<sup>90</sup> Augustine came up with the idea of “original sin” as being passed down from Adam to all mankind seminally. Rhys goes into much detail on this subject, which we will not do here; but we will note this statement, “Since Paul could not have derived a doctrine of *original sin*, as understood by Augustine and the later Latin Fathers and the magisterial Reformers, from any form of Judaism before his own time, the question naturally arises as to whether he held it himself. In truth he did not.”<sup>91</sup> If Paul had meant to say “in whom,” he would likely have used a less complex and more apparent construction. In other verses using this same construction, it does not take on this meaning (cf. Lk 5:25; Acts 7:33; 2Cor 5:4, Phil 3:12; 4:10).<sup>92</sup> Stifler explains it this way, “Adam did not bring sin into the world by setting a bad example; his one act wrought a

---

<sup>90</sup> Ibid, 140.

<sup>91</sup> Howard Rhys, *The Epistle to the Romans* (New York: The McMillan Company, 1961), 54.

<sup>92</sup> Mounce, 141.

constitutional change of unholiness within his heart. That act resulted in an innate corrupting principle that transmitted itself just as his natural features did. Because he had two feet rather than four, so also his descendants are bi-pedal; and as he became a sinner, so is each one of the race sprung from him.”<sup>93</sup> According to Wallace:

It is possible that  $\hat{\omega}$  refers back to ‘one man’ ( $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$ ) mentioned earlier in the verse. If so, the idea is either ‘all sinned in one man,’ or ‘all sinned because of one man.’ But the distance to  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\upsilon$  is too great for this to be a natural reading. But if  $\acute{\epsilon}\theta' \hat{\omega}$  functions as a conjunction, it does not look back at any antecedent, but explains how death passed to all: “Death is universal for the precise reason that sin is universal.”<sup>94</sup>

A second interpretation would be to translate it as a conjunction. As Mounce puts it, “Death, the inevitable consequence of sin, made its way to each individual member of the race because everyone, in fact, has sinned. Although Adam’s transgression determined human nature with its propensity to sin, the spread of that evil virus is the result of every person’s decision to sin. We are responsible not for what Adam did but for what we have done.” Mounce finds fault with this interpretation because “there are no certain examples in early Greek secular literature where the words are taken as the equivalent of a causal conjunction.” He notes that the conjunction [ $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$ ] means “because, for.”<sup>95</sup>

Though it is true that “all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God,” there are many verses that speak of the “solidarity” of the human race. This leads us to the third possible interpretation which would translate the Greek words “as a consecutive

---

93 James M. Stifler, *The Epistle to the Romans, A Commentary Logical and Historical* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1960), 95.

94 Wallace, 342.

95 Mounce, 142.

conjunction meaning ‘with the result that’.”<sup>96</sup> With this meaning we would conclude that the sin of Adam is the cause of our sinful nature, resulting in “the sinning on the part of all who enter into the human race and in fact sin of their own accord.” Mounce concludes that “This interpretation does justice to the language involved and conforms to the apostle’s theological outlook as he is building his case in the Book of Romans.”<sup>97</sup>

Another consideration is the function of the aorist used in ‘*all sinned*’ (πάντες ἥμαρτον). According to Burton, the aorist could function as an English perfect or pluperfect, with the translation ‘all have sinned.’ It could also be historical, inceptive or resultive. As a historical function it could be momentary, comprehensive or collective.<sup>98</sup> If the function is constative, then it is simply looked at as a whole action that took place at some point, or through a specific period of time. Therefore, it should be translated as ‘all sinned.’

To the modern mind, this may seem difficult to understand; but if we consider an overall look at the scriptures, we might find an interesting viewpoint -- God’s! The idea of solidarity or a unity of the human race was not a new thought to the Jews. According to Barclay, “The Jew never really thought of himself as an individual but always thought as part of a clan, a family, or a nation apart from which he had no real existence. To this day it is said that if an Australian aboriginal is asked his name, he gives the name of his tribe or clan. He does not think of himself as a person, but as a member of a society.”<sup>99</sup>

One example from the Old Testament is the “sin of Achan” in Joshua 7, where the whole

---

96 Ibid, 142.

97 Ibid, 142.

98 Ernst De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973), 28.

99 Barclay, 79.

clan suffered the consequences of one man's sin. As we read through the New Testament, this idea comes through loud and clear as well. Peter speaks of believers as "living stones, being built up together into a spiritual house" (1 Peter 2:4). We are all part of the same building, the church. Paul uses the example of the "body of Christ" (Rom. 12:5); what effects one member touches us all.

### **The Parenthesis -- 5:13-17**

Paul began verse 12 with a protasis, using  $\omega\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$  ("just as"), but it is not followed by an apodosis ("so also") until verse 18. Instead he adds a long parenthesis in order to explain this progression from one man sinning to all men dying.<sup>100</sup>

Before the Law, sin was in the world. This was evident because death reigned; however, since there was no specific commandment, such as was given to Adam, the sin of mankind was not a breaking of the law or direct disobedience, as was Adam's sin. When there is no law, there can be no accounting for sin, yet the curse remained; death reigned from Adam to Moses. Dykes' rendering of verse 13 is as follows:

He calls it 'transgression;' and already in an earlier passage of this Epistle he has laid down the axiom that 'where no law is, there can be no transgression' (iv.15). This legal axiom he now supplements by a second, namely, that 'sin is not imputed when there is no law; (v.13). That is to say, transgression, or statutory crime, is the only description of sin which under the divine administration is charged against the doer of it as the ground of his condemnation. Sin done in the absence of any law to forbid it, or in blameless ignorance of any such law, is still sin, of course; it is moral evil. But by the first axiom 'it is not transgression' –that is, statutory crime; and therefore, by the second axiom, 'it is not imputed; or founded upon as a ground of condemnation in law.'<sup>101</sup>

---

100 Stott, 24.

101 J. Oswald Dykes, *The Gospel According to St. Paul* (New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1988), 130.

At the end of verse fourteen Paul begins his comparison between Adam and Christ, the Last Adam, by saying that “Adam is a type of the one to come.” We have already defined the word [ΤΥΠΟΣ] in Chapter 2 in the hermeneutical sense. The basic meaning is a pattern, figure or foreshadowing. *Strong’s Concordance* defines “type” with words like imprint, form or example.<sup>102</sup> Many commentators found it difficult to see Adam as a type of Christ so they only cited one example, if any, of how Adam is a type of Christ. For example, Harrison says, “It may seem strange that Adam should be designated as a type of Christ when the two are so dissimilar in themselves and in their effect on humankind. But there is justification for the parallel. The resemblance is that Adam and Christ each communicated to those whom he represented that which belonged to him (‘sin’ and ‘righteousness’ respectively). In other words, what each did involved others.”<sup>103</sup> Even this statement draws attention to the differences rather than the similarities of the two. The reference to Adam as a type, according to Bruce, is that he “is the only Old Testament character who is explicitly called a ‘type’ of Christ in the New Testament.” He goes on to say that “There is a fitness in this, even if the typological relation between them involves as much contrast as resemblance; in Paul’s thought Christ replaces the first man as the archetype and representative of a new humanity.”<sup>104</sup> Even Moo can find but one similarity. “The similarity between the two consists in the fact that

---

102 James Strong, *Strong’s New Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible* (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1996).

103 Harrison, Everett F., “Romans” *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, Vol. 2: New Testament, eds. Kenneth L. Barker and John R. Kohlenberger III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 547.

104 Bruce, 124.

an act of each is considered to have determinative significance for those who ‘belong’ to each.”<sup>105</sup>

There are those however who seem to find a variety of comparisons between Adam and Christ, such as Barnhouse and Tulga, and then those like Pate, Hooker and Dunn, who see allusions to Adam here and in other passages as a distinct aspect of Paul’s Christology, using the term “Adam Christology.”<sup>106</sup>

Tulga and Barnhouse, though more expositional, made several comparisons. In describing how Adam is a type of Christ, Tulga says: “(a) He entered the world by a supernatural way (Gen. 2:7; Matt. 1:18-25), (b) He alone was made sinless (Gen. 1:26; John 8:46, II Cor. 5:21), (c) He was appointed lord over creation (Gen. 1:26; Mark 4:35-41; Heb. 2:8), (d) His bride was taken from his side (Gen. 2:21,22; John 19:34’ I Peter 1:19; Eph. 5:30-32), (e) He assumed her guilt (Gen. 3:6; I Tim. 2:14; II Cor. 5:21; Matt. 27:46), (f) He represented his physical posterity (Rom. 5:18), (g) Adam was a living soul but the last Adam was a quickening spirit (I Cor. 15:45).”<sup>107</sup> Though these comparisons might not stand up to the scrutiny of the strictest of hermeneutical typology, there is some validity in several of his comparisons.

Barnhouse agrees that there are comparisons to be seen, in that “each had a bride. The bride of Adam was Eve, the bride of Christ is the Church.” He explains his point by saying,

---

105 Moo, 334.

106 Donald Grey Barnhouse, *God’s Grace: Romans 5:12-21*, Expositions of Bible Doctrines Taking the Epistle to the Romans as a Point of Departure, no. 4 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 3:55; Chester E. Tulga, *Studies in Romans* (Cleveland, Ohio: Union Gospel Press, 1930), 98; C. Marvin Pate, *Adam Christology as the Exegetical & Theological Substructure of 1 Corinthians 4:7-5:21* (New York: University Press of America, 1991), 79-96; Hooker, 27; Dunn, *Christology*, 98-128.

107 Tulga, 98.

The Lord caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and took from his side a rib, out of which He formed the woman to be his companion. The Lord Jesus Christ was put to death on the cross, and in that sleep of death one of the soldiers pierced His side with a spear. Out of the wound came blood and water, but out of that wounded side of Christ also came the bride of the Lord Jesus Christ. For you and I are thus taken from the side of Christ. Oh, how wonderful! As Eve came out of the side of Adam, so you and I come out of the side of Christ!<sup>108</sup>

Another point that we can make is that both Adam (in his innocence) and Christ were under the control of the Holy Spirit; they were the image of God. Thomas writes, “Had we been given the opportunity at that time of watching Adam in action, we would have seen a perfect image of God, expressing His nature and His character, but God Himself would still have remained invisible.”<sup>109</sup> Later, we will look closer at the typology of Adam and the development of Adam Christology, in particular Paul’s “Adam Christology,” but let us ask ourselves at this point, is Paul trying to contrast the bad in Adam, the condemnation that he caused, with the good in Christ and the glorious salvation that he wrought, or is his reference to Adam as a type of Christ a means of explaining how the affects of the one man are the same as the affects of the One man?

It appears that Paul is using Hillel’s Qal Wahomer principle of interpretation.

According to Aageson;

The first principle of interpretation attributed to the Jewish rabbi Hillel and one that is encountered frequently in Jewish literature is referred to as Qal Wahomer. In this form of argumentation, it is asserted that that which applies in a case of lesser importance will be valid also in a case of greater importance. The primary requirement of this manner of reasoning is that the initial element (Adam in this case) have some claim to being authoritative or to being accepted as true by the readers or hearers. Once

---

108 Barnhouse, 55.

109 Thomas, *Saving Life*, 216.

this is established, the argument can be developed on the basis of an underlying connection between the two elements.<sup>110</sup> If we can see that it was Adam's sin that caused death to reign over the many who pertain to him, what glorious hope we have in knowing in the very same way, the obedience of Christ causes life to reign in the many who pertain to Him. It is not what men did, but what Adam did, and the curse controlled all his progeny, so not what men do, but what Christ does, controls his children, whom we are according to Hebrews 2:13.

### **Adam and Christ-Death and Life -- 5:15-17**

Paul now goes on to explain the contrasts between the First Adam and the "Last Adam" (1 Cor. 5:45). In verses 15-17, the apostle uses the phrase "is not like" and concludes each comparison with "how much more" showing how Christ's work "is greater in every way than that of Adam."<sup>111</sup> He begins verse 15 with "but" in order to contrast the typology with the differences in what each accomplished. Here we have "comparisons between Adam and the result of his sin and Jesus and the result of his redemptive work."<sup>112</sup> Hooker says, "It is perhaps a measure of our distance from Paul's way of thinking that many commentators have found themselves puzzled by verses 12-19 of Romans." These verses she declares "are the key to Romans, summing up the argument of the previous chapters in terms of the contrast between Adam and Christ. Throughout the early part of Romans Paul demonstrates how man lost his relationship with God, how he forfeited the divine glory."<sup>113</sup>

---

110 James W. Aageson, *Written Also for Our Sake: Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993), 146.

111 Moo, 334.

112 Mounce, 143.

First, the gift is not like the trespass. “For if the many died by the trespass of the one man, *how much more* did the gift that came by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, *overflow* to the many!” Mounce says that “God’s act of grace was out of all proportion to the offence of Adam” and “God’s grace is infinitely greater for good than Adam’s sin is for evil.”<sup>114</sup> It seems the best interpretation comes from McClain. He states, “‘the judgment came of one.’ He is referring, not to one man but to one offence—one trespass. ‘For the judgment came of one offence unto condemnation, but the free gift came of many offences unto justification.’ The contrast there is between one offence and many offences.”<sup>115</sup> “In Adam death is passed on to his posterity; in Christ life is passed on to all who believe.”<sup>116</sup>

Hooker writes again on Adam and Christ;

In contrast to Adam, who was created in the image of God, but who lost God’s glory (Rom. 1:23; 3:23), Christ is the true image of God and the embodiment of his glory. But this means that ‘by sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, God has achieved what the Law could not do’ (Rom 8:2f). Though the law expressed the purpose of God and reflected his glory, its power was incomplete. Not surprisingly, the attributes of the law came to be applied to Christ, who is now identified, as was the Law (e.g. Eccles. 24:23; Baruch 4:1), with wisdom (I Cor. 1:24, 30). It was probably Paul himself who drew the logical conclusion that what had hitherto been said of the Law (and wisdom) in relation to creation could now be said of Christ . . . .”<sup>117</sup>

In verse 16, Paul tells us that the results of both men’s action were far different.

Harrison suggests “. . . that the work of Christ not merely canceled the effects of Adam’s

---

113 Hooker, 27.

114 Ibid.

115 Alva J. McClain, *Romans: The Gospel of God’s Grace*, (Winona Lake, Indiana:BMH Books,1973), 137.

116 Tulga, 99.

117 Hooker, 5.

transgression so as to put human beings back into a state of innocence under a probation such as their progenitor faced, but in fact gives them far more than they lost in Adam, more indeed than Adam ever had.”<sup>118</sup>

Then there is the contrast that, in Adam, all are judged and condemned, as in Christ all are justified. One man’s sin condemned the many, but in Christ all who believe are justified and no longer condemned. Much more, they are given new life! Verse 17 speaks of death reigning because of Adam’s transgression; but much more through the super abounding grace, we will reign in life. Stott says, “It is worth noting in passing, however, the precise way in which the apostle contrasts life and death. It is not simply that the reign of death is superseded by a reign of life, for (verse 17) it is not life which reigns, but we who are said to ‘reign in life’. Formerly death was our king.” Death ruled us, made us slaves, but we are not exchanging one king for another, rather we are made to rule over death.<sup>119</sup>

Many have concluded that everyone will be saved, just as everyone was condemned; but the passage is not teaching universalism. A look at verse 17 clearly reveals that it is “those who receive God’s abundant grace” who will be saved.<sup>120</sup>

According to Hodge;

The very point of the comparison is, that as the righteousness of Christ, and not our own works, is the ground of our justification, so the sin of Adam, antecedently to any sins of our own, is the ground of the infliction of certain penal evils. If the latter be denied, the very point of the analogy between Christ and Adam is destroyed.<sup>121</sup>

---

118 Harrison, 547.

119 Stott, 27.

120 McClain, 139.

121 Hodge, 23.

### Paul's Summary -- 5:18, 19

“Therefore,” Paul finally ends the parenthesis of his statement and finishes the thought begun in verse 12 - “So also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous” (5:18). The focus is thrown on Christ, the second Man, the Lord from heaven. Ian Thomas describes the relationship between the first and second “Man” like this: “The first man was Adam, and he died. The Last Adam was Christ, who came to raise the dead! The first man was of the earth, earthy; and the Second Man is the Lord from heaven! The first was the one who made the mess and the Second was the One who came to clean it up!”<sup>122</sup>

Verse 19 contrasts again the disobedience of the one, with the obedience of the Other. Trench is credited with saying, “The same law of intimate union between the members of the race and their head, which made one man’s sin so diffusive of death, has made one man’s obedience or righteousness so diffusive of life. Christ shall diffuse himself no less effectually than Adam, as the one by generation, so the other by regeneration.”<sup>123</sup> According to Harrison:

the term ‘disobedience’ accents the voluntary character of his sin. Matching it is the ‘obedience’ of Christ, a concept that was highly meaningful to Paul (see Philippians 2:5-11). The interpretation of that passage in Philippians should be along the lines of a latent comparison between Adam and Christ. Instead of grasping after equality with God, as Adam had done, the Lord Jesus humbled himself and became obedient even to the point of accepting death on a cross.”<sup>124</sup>

---

122 Thomas, *Saving Life*, 234.

123 Bishop of Winchester and James Moffatt, “The Epistle to the Romans, A Little Library of Exposition with New Studies,” *The Study Bible*, ed. John Stirling (London: Cassell & Company, 1927), 70.

124 Harrison, 548.

## The Law vs. the Reign of Grace -- 5:20-21

Verses 20 and 21 are the climax of this passage. The true function of the Law is revealed. Greene uses Wuest's translation, "Moreover, law entered in alongside in order that the transgression might be augmented. But where the sin was augmented, the grace super-abounded with more added to that, in order that just as the aforementioned sin reigned as king in the sphere of death, thus also, the aforementioned grace might reign as king through righteousness, resulting in eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Greene says,

The passage clearly teaches us that in spite of the Bible fact that men 'are by nature the children of wrath' (Eph. 2:1,2), God has set another fact into operation, that is, by His grace, through the Lord Jesus Christ and His death on the cross, He (Jesus the only begotten Son) 'tasted death for every man' (Heb. 2:9). Therefore, if in Adam's sin all men are sinners and death moved upon all men through Adam's sin, it is also true that in Christ death on the cross, many—yea, ALL who will come to God by Christ Jesus—can be made righteous through His shed blood.<sup>125</sup>

In his sermon on Law and Grace, Spurgeon said, "The object of God in sending the law into the world was 'that the offence might abound.' But then comes the gospel, for 'where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.'"<sup>126</sup> Though death reigned from Adam to Moses, meaning that the penalty of sin was affecting all who lived during that time, they did not see the effect until the Law came as a platform to expose sin. Johnson's thoughts on the meaning of law were expressed when he wrote, "Not *the* law, but law. The reference is not only to the law of Moses, but to all divine law, the law written on the hearts of the Gentiles. The effect of its entrance was that offences abounded. Law was

---

<sup>125</sup> Oliver B. Greene, *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Greenville, South Carolina: The Gospel Hour, Inc., 1962), 123.

<sup>126</sup> C. H. Spurgeon, "*The New Park Street Pulpit*, (Southwark: Delivered on Sabbath Morning, August 26, 1855, accessed 18 April 2007) ; available from <http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0037.htm> ; Internet.

continually broken. The reference here is not to Adam's sin, but to the personal sins of each man.”<sup>127</sup> Man soon realized the impossibility of meeting the requirements of the Law, but the grace of God brought righteousness through Jesus Christ our Lord. This is because as Thomas says, “it takes God to be a man and Christ in the Christian put God back into the man. For a Christian is literally a person who has been raised spiritually from the dead.”<sup>128</sup>

Vickers says,

History is boiled down to two figures, and the consequences of their respective actions determine the lives of every human being in every era. Everyone is either identified with one man or the other. As such it is not primarily about what individual people do, but about what they are as a result of what their two representatives have done. In this text everyone is either a “sinner” or they are “righteous,” and the status of all is dependent on one man whose actions determine the standing of all before God.<sup>129</sup>

---

127 B.W. Johnson, “The Epistle of Paul to the Romans” in *The People's New Testament* [book on-line] (St. Louis: Christian Publishing Co., 1891, accessed 18 April 2007) ; available from [http://www.ccel.org/j/johnson\\_bw/pnt/PNT06-05.HTM](http://www.ccel.org/j/johnson_bw/pnt/PNT06-05.HTM) ; Internet.

128 Thomas, *Saving Life*, 213.

129 Brian Johnson Vickers, “The Imputation of Christ’s Righteousness: A Study of Key Pauline Texts” (Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003), University Microfilms International, 3118680. Microfiche.

## CHAPTER 4

### ADAM CHRISTOLOGY

Christology is the study of the nature of *Jesus the Christ*, with its focus on the relationship between the human and the divine natures in his person. The foundation of Adam Christology is based on the Adam-Christ typology.<sup>130</sup>

#### **The Development of “Adam Christology”**

It is speculated that there were pre-Christian beliefs, which affected the development of Christology, in particular the “Gnostic redeemer myth” of a heavenly man. Bultmann, for one, was a proponent of this idea, but it is generally agreed that the Gnostic myth of a heavenly man is not founded, as it can only be dated to the second century AD. Dunn says, “There is nothing of any substance to indicate that a Gnostic redeemer myth was already current at the time of Paul. On the contrary all indications are that it was a post-Christian (second-century) development using Christian beliefs about Jesus as one of its building blocks.”<sup>131</sup>

Prior to Plato, near eastern mythology conceived of archetypal or primal figures existing in heaven, having earthly counterparts. Plato proposed the idea that the perfect, eternal, heavenly forms were the prototypes for the earthly, transient, imperfect copies.<sup>132</sup>

---

130 David A. Sapp, “An Introduction to Adam Christology in Paul: A History of Interpretation, the Jewish Background, and an Exegesis of Romans 5:12-21” (Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Theological Seminary, 1990, 172), 3.

131 Dunn, *Christology*, 99.

There is some speculation of Philo taking the Platonic-style ideas of the “heavenly man” and the “earthly man,” because he mentions “the two creation accounts in Genesis.” The heavenly man was made in the image of God, while the earthly man was molded out of clay. This idea came from the compilers of Genesis, who found two accounts of the creation story and blended them into one. Because of this, someone like Philo could read two different statements in the sacred writings: 1) “Then God said: Let us make man in our image. So God created man in his own image; in the image of God he created him.” (Gen. 1:26-27), 2) “Then the Lord God formed a man (or Adam) from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life” (Genesis 2:7). The first account gives the Platonic “Idea” of man, the spiritual prototype in heaven<sup>133</sup> while in Genesis 2, there seems to be an account of the “creation of the ideal man’s copy, made out of the dust of matter.” It is the first—spiritual—“man” who is said to be made “in the image of God.”<sup>134</sup> As Philo put it:

There are two kinds of men. The one is Heavenly Man, the other earthly. The Heavenly Man being in the image of God has no part in corruptible substance, or in any earthly substance whatever; but the earthly man was made of germinal matter which the writer [of Genesis] calls “dust.” For this reason he does not say that the Heavenly Man was created, but that he was stamped with the image of God, whereas the earthly man is a creature and not the offspring of the Creator.<sup>135</sup>

---

132 Doherty Supplementary Articles - No. 8: Christ As Man: Does Paul Speak of Jesus as an Historical Person? <http://home.ca.inter.net/~oblio/supp08.htm>.

133 Ibid.

134 Ibid.

135 Ibid. (From *Allegorical Interpretation of the Law* 1,31, translated by C. H. Dodd.)

Dunn imagines that Paul might have disregarded Philo's interpretation, making the point that the heavenly man is not first, but rather second (1 Cor. 15.45-47).<sup>136</sup> Wansbrough continues to explain, “Philo would be asserting that the ideal, perfect or heavenly man is the first and sinful, earthly man the second. Paul would be reversing this, to claim that Adam, the sinner and exemplar of fallen humanity, was first, and Christ, the exemplar of the new creation, the second.”<sup>137</sup>

### **From the Church Fathers to the Reformation**

#### **Irenaeus**

There doesn't seem to be any appearance of an Adam-Christ typology among the Apostolic and Church Fathers prior to Irenaeus. According to Sapp, “An Adam-Christ typology in early Christian non-canonical writings first appears in Irenaeus of Lyon's *Adversus Haereses* (ca. 185).”<sup>138</sup> The heart of Irenaeus' Christology was the Adam-Christ typology, he believed, as the type of Christ, Adam, was created with the very intention “of being saved in the end by his “recapitulation” in Christ.”<sup>139</sup>

Apart from Irenaeus, there is not much patristic discussion of Adam Christology. When it is spoken of it is commonly seen in terms of “Son of Man” which is another way of saying “Second Adam” and tends to occur alongside “Son of God,” and in so doing, simply placing “the deity of Christ as Son of God alongside his humanity.”<sup>140</sup>

---

136 Dunn, *Christology*, 98-128.

137 Henry Wansbrough, *Paul and the Second Adam*; <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~sben0056/essays/paulsecondadam.htm>.

138 Sapp, 4.

139 Ibid, 6.

## **Origen**

We might gather some insight by taking a look at how some interpreted Romans 5:12-21. According to Gorday's explanation of Origen's interpretation of Romans 5, "In Origen's perspective, Paul has briefly described the new life in Christ for believers (Rom. 5:1-11) and has then (5:12-21) set out a brief explanation from universal history of the sin and death presupposed by this new life, at the same time that he has emphasized the futurity and eschatological nature of the new life."<sup>141</sup>

## **Augustine**

In Gorday's summarization, Augustine calls Adam the "forma futuri," or "the universal man." It is from Adam that mankind derives their human condition. He explains the parallel between the two as "consisting of the universal scope of what takes place in the two figures, the contrast in the fact that Adam's transgression holds sway only in the temporal realm and leads to death, while Christ's redemption is for eternity and leads to life"<sup>142</sup>

## **Chrysostom**

According to Gorday, Chrysostom believed that the intention of the Adam-Christ typology was to "further buttress the claim that justification by faith in Christ is suitable to the pattern of God's action" He considered the 'ὅτι' clause as a result clause and is

---

140 Ibid, 11.

141 Peter Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine* (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983), 65.

142 Ibid, 160.

insistent on accrediting “the whole dynamic of law, sin and death to a purely human and moral weakness rather than to any kind of mystery within the divine plan itself.”<sup>143</sup>

### **Luther**

Luther relies strongly on Chrysostom and “Blessed Augustine” in his *Lectures on Romans*. His interpretation looks to the Jewish beliefs of Adam, causing him to quote Chrysostom saying, “If a Jew should ask you: How was the world saved by the power of the one Christ? You can answer him and say: How was the world damned by the one disobedient Adam?”<sup>144</sup>

### **Calvin**

Reformation interpreters tended to follow the same thoughts as the Church Fathers. In particular, in Calvin’s view, the use of the title “Second Adam,” as well as the phrase in Romans 5, “one man” are indicative of the true humanity of Christ which was also revealed in his purpose to restore fallen man to the image of God, which is man’s true and complete humanity.

## **Nineteenth –Twentieth Centuries**

After the “Enlightenment” certain presuppositions about God influenced the views of the Adam-Christ typology. Schliermacher and Baur in particular tended toward an anti-supernaturalistic system. Baur sees Adam and Christ as representing two different historical eras. He saw the development from Adam to Christ as a historical development from flesh to spirit. Basically, humanity is controlled by one of two principles, flesh or

---

143 Ibid, 116.

144 Martin Luther, *Luther: Lectures on Romans*, trans. Wilhelm Pauck (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), 172-175.

spirit. Man was originally created with a higher, moral and spiritual nature, which he calls the 'reason' or 'inner man.' This, he considers to be comparable to the divine spirit and would therefore enable a person to elevate himself above the realm of the flesh. Unfortunately, humans are dominated by the principle of the flesh and this has caused man to choose to sin. The difference in the "Second Adam" was that by virtue of his being the 'life-giving spirit' he was not affected by sin and death. He didn't believe there was redemption of human 'flesh'<sup>145</sup> because, "'God' is really just the religious consciousness of humanity in its highest manifestation."<sup>146</sup> Later interpreters such as Holsten, Lüdemann, Pfleiderer and Holtzmann followed in Baur's footsteps, making some modification, finding "the key to Paul's Christology in his anthropology."

In opposition to the ideas from Baur to Pfleiderer, Bernhard Weiss and others objected to the implicit identification of flesh with sin, arguing that if they were the same, how could the body be God's temple? In their view, "sin only dwells in and has dominion over the flesh (man) as a consequence of the sin of Adam."<sup>147</sup>

New alternatives for understanding Paul's Adam Christology occurred during this century and three schools of thought were instigated in Germany. The History of Religions school, the Eschatological school and the Salvation History school all caused significant influence on the interpretation of Adam Christology into the twentieth century.<sup>148</sup>

---

145 Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine, A contribution to the Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols., 2d ed., ed. Eduard Zeller, trans. A. Menzies (London : Williams and Norgate, 1875), 2:21-27, 240-53.

146 Sapp, 14-18

147 Ibid, 28.

148 Ibid, 34-35.

There have been two primary trends in the interpretation of Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15 dealing with Christology. The first arises out of the History of Religions school, where they interpret Paul's Adam Christology according to Deistic or naturalistic presuppositions, in which they claim that Paul's Adam Christology came not as he claimed out of the "Damascus road" revelation, apostolic tradition and Scripture, but was influenced by other religious and psychological sources. They say the Oriental Primal man myth, through the means of Hellenistic Judaism, was the model for his Adam-Christ typology and his view of the Last Adam.<sup>149</sup> More recent history of religions studies have recognized the inadequacy of this approach.

The second trend assumes Paul's claims to be so, that his sources were revelation and his religious background, unless an alternative view can be established. In the latter part of the twentieth century salvation-historical research alleged to have demonstrated the need of the Jewish-Christian background. They view the Last Adam as the Messiah, who typologically obeyed God where Adam had not, and in so doing redeemed Adam's descendants from sin and death.

### **Twenty-First Century**

The term "Adam Christology" which is based on the Adam-Christ typology, and Paul's uses of Adam 'motifs' in his missives has become a topic of controversy over the past few decades. The idea of Paul's 'Adam motif' being found throughout his writings is argued by scholars such as: Hooker, Bauckman, Kim, Borg, Dunn, Dodd, MacDermott, Matera, Fowl, and Pate.<sup>150</sup> According to Hurtado, the "most well-known proponent of the

---

149 Ibid, 98.

150 Pate, 79-137.

Adam-Christology approach” is Dunn.<sup>151</sup> There are those who are skeptical of Dunn’s interpretations, Hurtado being one as well as Bauckham.

In Schreiner’s review of Sang Won (Aaron) Son’s dissertation he says, “the Adam-Christ parallel should be understood typologically, in which there are correspondences in history. Hence, it follows that both Adam and Christ are genuine historical persons and cannot be identified merely as symbols. Most important, Son maintains that all of humanity is included in Adam and Christ as corporate persons (1 Cor 15:20-28; 15:42-29; Rom 5:12-21; Phil 2:5-11; Col 1:15-20; 3:9-10; Rom 1:18-32; Gal 3:27-29; Eph 4:22-24).” Though Schreiner is not convinced that there is a reference to Adam in Romans 1:18-31, he credits Son for his caution in “arguing that Paul does not specify how it is that Adam and Christ determine the existence of human beings, though it is clear that Paul views humanity as in solidarity with Adam and Christ.”<sup>152</sup>

## **Interviews**

In order to get a better idea of what twenty-first century scholars think about the validity of typology and the comparison/contrast of Adam and Christ, I conducted some interviews with several scholars. The following are their responses.

### Grant Osborne

Grant Osborne agrees with the New Testament writers in thinking that it is valid to make comparisons between Adam and Christ. He sees the comparisons in that “Adam

---

<sup>151</sup> Larry W. Hurtado, *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 88.

<sup>152</sup> Thomas R. Schreiner, review of *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul's Usage and Background*, by Sang-Won (Aaron) Son, *Trinity Journal*, (Spring 2003). [http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_qa3803/is\\_200304/ai\\_n9221304](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3803/is_200304/ai_n9221304).

was the first human, Jesus the final human in the sense of bringing humanity to completion (et al.); moreover, all the comparisons of 5:12-21 spell it out pretty well. All that Adam brought on mankind, Jesus has solved and taken away.” As a means of interpreting this passage he says “typology is quite valid, for it means that Jesus is analogous to and has relived what Adam did but provided victory over it and overturned its effects.”<sup>153</sup>

### John Polhill

Polhill states that the term “type” can be used with “respect to certain characteristics rather than a complete correspondence in every way. Obviously, Christ and Adam shared in their humanity. In fact, Paul is arguing here that both serve as representative types of humanity -- Adam as fallen man, Christ as perfect man.” He sees Paul going beyond typology here “and arguing more ontologically -- Adam is in essence the first and thus representative fallen human, while Christ is in essence the perfect man and the firstfruits of redeemed humanity.”<sup>154</sup>

### Daniel B. Wallace

Wallace takes the approach that this is a simple negative comparison because of the syntactical detour that Paul takes, clarifying the contrast by pointing out twice “that the one is ‘not like’ the other.” His position is in agreement with Cranfield’s in his commentary on Romans.<sup>155</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Grant Osborne, Professor of New Testament at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in interview by author, email: 19 January, 2007.

<sup>154</sup> Polhill, Senior Professor of New Testament Interpretation at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, interview by author, email: 19 January 2007.

<sup>155</sup> Daniel B. Wallace, Professor of New Testament Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary, interview by author, email, 18 January 2007.

## Paul's Adam Christology

According to Dunn, Adam's function in Paul's theology is greater than that generally recognized. In Paul's attempt to communicate his understanding of Christ and man, Adam is a significant figure. It is clear that in Paul's theology, soteriology and Christology are closely connected, it is important, therefore, to investigate the Adam motif in his writings if we are to recognize the value of his Adam Christology.<sup>156</sup> Dunn says, "Paul's Adam Christology is an extension of this motif and wholly consistent with it."<sup>157</sup>

Hooker asserts that Paul, being a Jew, saw "God's dealings with mankind" expressed by "his covenant relationship with Israel." After his conversion, he still thought of man in corporate terms. He no longer believed that God restricted His purpose to Israel, but that the gospel was for everyone who would believe – 'the Jew first, and also to the Greek' (Rom. 1:16). For this reason "the only figure who is truly comparable to Christ is Adam, the father of the whole human race: in Christ a new creation comes into being, in which there is no distinction between Jew and Gentile."<sup>158</sup>

It is amazing how often Paul uses Adam Christology throughout his epistles. In 1 Corinthians 15, Paul uses Adam to confirm the resurrection and our reason for hope.

Hooker says in her discussion of redemption that

Underlying this understanding of redemption is the belief that Christ is 'the last Adam' (I Cor. 15:45), the true 'image of God', who by sharing fully in humanity's condition – i.e. by being 'in Adam' – opens up the way for men and women to share in his condition, by being 'in Christ.'

---

<sup>156</sup> Dunn, *Christology*, 101.

<sup>157</sup> Ibid, 107.

<sup>158</sup> Morna Hooker, *From Adam to Christ, Essays on Paul* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3.

Humanity's problems begin with Adam (whose sin brought death into the world and subjected everything to futility, Rom. 5:12, 8:20). Not only humanity but the universe itself is restored through the righteous obedience of Christ (Rom 5:15-21; 8).<sup>159</sup>

### **Adam in Other Scripture**

At first glance it would seem that Paul's use of Adam as a type for Christ is limited to a few passages in Romans and 1 Corinthians, but on further investigation, we see Paul alluding to Adam through out many of his epistles. The author of Hebrews, if not Paul, also refers to Adam Christology. Bruce explains that according to rabbinic tradition, when Adam was created (in a sense making him the "firstborn,") God invited the angels to worship him, but Satan instigated them to refuse.<sup>160</sup> We then find in Hebrews 1:6, speaking of Christ, "he brings the first born into the world, he says, 'And let all God's angels worship him.'" He makes the connection once again in his commentary on Hebrews 2:6-8, saying that the author of Hebrews is quoting from the Psalms on the "glory and honor which God has bestowed on mankind, in making them but little lower than himself and giving them dominion over all the lesser creation." This is clearly based on the words of God at the creation in reference to Genesis 1:26: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moves on the earth." Bruce states that the author is not referring "to the first Adam but to Christ, as the Last Adam, the head of the new creation and ruler of the world to come."<sup>161</sup>

---

159 Hooker, 5.

160 F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 57.

161 Ibid, 72-73.

The idea of Christ as the Last Adam is not a new concept of the author of Hebrews, nor is it unique to Paul as it can be seen in Philippians 2:6-11 which is claimed to be a pre-Pauline hymn speaking of the faithfulness of the second man in contrast to the fall of the first. Bruce writes, “When one person fails in the accomplishment of the divine purpose . . . , God raises up another to take his place. But who could take the place of Adam? Only one who was capable of undoing the effects of Adam’s fall and thus ushering in a new world-order.”<sup>162</sup>

A close look at Colossians 3 reveals Paul’s use of Adam Christology as well. We see death and life in verses 3-4: “For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ [who is] our life . . . ,” which we established earlier as the contrast between the “First and Last Adam” Paul goes on in the chapter to exhort believers to “put off” the old man, and “put on” the new man.

Hooker explores the idea of Adamic Christology in Philippians 2:6-11. She renders the interpretation of the passage as having “always been the *res rapienda* interpretation of the word ἄρπυγμός: Christ did not regard equality with God as something to be grasped. This has been seen as a deliberate contrast with the attempt of Adam in Genesis 3 to grasp at an equality which he did not possess.” She counters that, “If we accept the *res rapta* interpretation, on the other hand, and regard equality as something which Christ did not cling to, then this particular contrast cannot be maintained . . .” rather “equality was something which did not need to be grasped.”<sup>163</sup> Hooker explores the contrast in a different way saying, “It has often been suggested that the phrase εἰν μορφῇ θεοῦ is an echo of Genesis 1:26. Ought we perhaps also to see the

---

162 Ibid.

163 Hooker, 96.

words  $\tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \iota\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega$  as an echo of the same verse? In Genesis 1:26 we read of God's intention to create man 'in our image, after our likeness'.<sup>164</sup> Hooker sees a similar parallelism in Philippians 2:6 in that "he who was in the form of God did not regard this equality of God (or this likeness to God) as something which needed to be usurped."<sup>164</sup> The Greek word  $\iota\sigma\alpha$ , in Phil 2:6, is generally translated as equality, but can also be used in more generally to mean 'like' and would therefore be a suitable reference to Genesis 1:26. She also draws a parallel between the Jews complaint of Jesus use of the phrase  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\ \Theta\epsilon\omega$  in John 5:18 and Paul's use of the phrase  $\epsilon\iota\upsilon\alpha\iota\ \iota\sigma\alpha\ \theta\epsilon\omega$  saying that;

If our interpretation is correct, there is also a close parallel in meaning. For the Jews' objection in John 5 to Jesus' claim that God is his Father is that it is a usurpation,  $\alpha\rho\pi\alpha\phi\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , of a status which does not belong to him, whereas John, who sees Jesus as sharing the activity of God (5:17), recognizes the implications of this claim. In John's presentation, Jesus does not regard his claims as the usurpation of status, but, paradoxically, as part of the obedience of the Son to the Father; Jesus is at once one with the Father, yet dependent upon him.<sup>165</sup>

If we see a reflection of Genesis 1:26 in Philippians 2, we must ask ourselves why is this contrast between Adam and Christ used in this way. According to Genesis 3:5 and 22, when Adam ate from the forbidden tree, he would become, as the serpent said "as God, knowing good and evil;" but Jewish tradition holds that his action meant that he would *cease* to be like God. Through his disobedience, Adam "ceased to be in the likeness of God."<sup>166</sup> Hooker suggests that "Adam, created in the form and likeness of God, misunderstood his position, and thought that the divine likeness was something

---

164 Ibid, 97.

165 Ibid.

166 Ibid.

which he needed to grasp; his tragedy was that in seizing it he lost it.” Many believers today misunderstand their position in Christ and think that the divine likeness which they received at their conversion is something that needs to be grasped and in the seizing of it, tragically lose the ‘rest’ promised in Hebrews, to a life of fleshly striving. The true Adam, Christ, knew that, by virtue of his relationship with the Father, this “likeness” was already his, and, by virtue of the believer’s relationship with Jesus, it is theirs as well.<sup>167</sup>

Dunn says, with regard to Philippians 2:6-11, “Of recent interpretations (or readings), one of the most fruitful but also most controversial has been in terms of Adam Christology.”<sup>168</sup> He believes the passage to be a hymn, which takes on the form of Adam Christology. It is his view that “it is structured both to reflect God’s intention in creating humankind (Adam), and to contrast the traditional understanding of Adam’s failure,” therefore serving the purpose of lauding “a habit of mind ‘which (was) also in Christ Jesus’ (2:5).”<sup>169</sup> He claims this Christology was widespread in the early churches. Christ fulfilled the original purpose intended for mankind (Adam).

In his discussion on “form of God” in Philippians 2:5-8, Hurtado contends with Dunn’s view that it is an allusion to Adam Christology. Hurtado’s argument rather is “that it connotes some kind of divine-like status and mode of Jesus prior to his earthly life—that is, a heavenly “pre-existence.”<sup>170</sup> There is no need to see these views as polemic, but complementary, for Jesus’ pre-existence is declared in John 1:1, “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God and the Word was God.” Adam,

---

167 Ibid, 98.

168 Dunn, *Christology*, 74.

169 Ibid.

170 Hurtado, 98.

was made in the image of God, therefore, Jesus was the heavenly “prototype.” Adam’s purpose was to glorify God, therefore he was filled with God’s glory, until the fall. Jesus’ incarnation was God’s way of restoring man to his original creation. Just as the temple in the OT was designed after the “heavenly temple” so Adam was ‘designed’ after the heavenly man. Just as the earthly temple is a type of the body of believers (1 Cor. 6:19; Eph. 2:21; I Pet. 2:5), Adam is a type of Christ.

Dunn remarks, “In assessing Philippians 2:6-11 it is not too difficult to identify several points of contact with the Adam tradition and Adam Christology as we have already seen it”<sup>171</sup>

<b>Philippians 2:6-11</b>	<b>Adam theology</b>
6 who, being in the form of God, did not reckon to be equal with God as something to be grasped.	“In the image of God” (Gen. 1:27) “You will be like God” (Gen. 3:5) They took and ate (Gen. 3:6)
7 but emptied himself, took the form of a slave, and became in the very likeness of humankind.	Subject/enslaved to corruption and sin (cf. Wis. Sol. 2:23-23; Rom. 8:3, 18-21; I Cor. 15:42, 47-49; Gal. 4:3-4; Heb. 2:7a, 9a, 15)
And being found in likeness as a human being he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, the death of the cross	Subject to death (cf. Gen 2:17; 3:22-24; Rom. 5:12-21; 7:7-11; I Cor. 15:21-22)

Bauckham does not believe this passage embodies an Adam Christology.<sup>172</sup>

Allusions to Adam can also be seen in Romans chapters 1 and 7. In his view, Wansbrough believes that “it is in Romans, that the contrast between first and second Adam is at its most ubiquitous.” He sees the state of sin described in Chapter 1 in terms of fallen Adam, saying,

---

171 Dunn, *Christology*, 76.

172 Richard J. Bauckham, *God Crucified: Monotheism and Christology in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 57.

If 'Adam' is substituted for 'they' or 'those people' in 1.20-25 it reads almost like a paraphrase of the creation-story: 'Ever since the creation of the world, the invisible existence of God and his everlasting power have been clearly seen by the mind's understanding of created things. And so Adam has no excuse: he knew God and yet he did not honour him as God or give thanks to him, but his arguments became futile and his uncomprehending mind was darkened.'<sup>173</sup>

### **Significance of Typology for the Pauline Adam Christology**

Paul is using Adam as an example for his explanation, but does it warrant interpreting him typologically? If so, how did Adam foreshadow Christ? Adam is not just an example Paul is using, he is interpreting Adam as a hermeneutical type. Hodge says, "The comparison is between Adam and Christ, rather than between the sin of the one and the righteousness of the other."<sup>174</sup>

Dunn explains the correspondence as, "when Paul uses Adam language explicitly of Christ, Christ stands for man risen from the dead. Adam denotes life that leads to death; Christ denotes life from the dead (I Cor. 15.21f)."<sup>175</sup>

"As the first Adam came into existence (ἐγένετο) at creation, the beginning of the old age, so the last Adam (as such) came into existence at resurrection, the beginning of the age to come. The same point is implicit elsewhere in Paul – particularly Romans 8.29, where Christ's Adamic role as eldest brother in a new family of men begins with his birth from the dead (cf. Col. 1.18), and Philippians 3:21, where a share in the lost Adamic

---

173 Wansbrough, internet.

174 Hodge, 266.

175 Dunn, *Christology*, 107.

glory is finally attained by transformation of our lowly body to be like Christ's resurrection body.<sup>176</sup>

Hooker clarifies this Adamic relationship, elucidating:

So Christ came in the likeness of men. The chief objection to the Adamic interpretation of this passage is perhaps the fact that at this point in the story the true Adam is said to *become* man; how can this be? One can understand a contrast between the two Adams, as in Rom.5 or I Cor. 15; but what does it mean to say that the second Adam takes on the likeness of Adam? I suggest that it is precisely here that we see the paradox and irony of what the author of this passage is saying. At this point the one who is truly what man is meant to be- the form and likeness of God- becomes what other men *are*, because they are in Adam. This explains the 'shadowy' language of the words *σξημα* and *ομοιωμα*. Men have ceased to be what they were meant to be; they have become slaves to sin and death and the Law, as Paul expresses it elsewhere; hence we have the paradox that when the true man becomes what they are, this human likeness is a travesty of what man is meant to be. In saying that Christ has become what men are, our passage is parallel to other Christological summaries found in Paul, such as Gal. 3:13 and 4:4; 2 Cor 5:21 and 8:9. Moreover, having put himself into this position of helpless enslavement, Christ is content to continue the path to the end. The inevitable end is death – the punishment which came upon Adam because of his grasping; again we see the irony of a situation in which one who refuses to take Adam's course nevertheless accepts the results of Adam's sin; and the death which he accepts is death on a cross – the particular form of punishment which in Roman law was considered proper for rebellious *δουλοι*. This final phrase should certainly not be excised as a gloss, as is now almost universally assumed. It is the climax of this section: the paradox has been pushed to the ultimate point, and the form of death is absurdly appropriate to the self-negation.

Therefore God exalted him. There are no echoes of Adam here- there cannot be! The second part is the reversal worked by God. Only when we come to the term *κυριος* are we reminded of what Adam was meant to be; he was commanded to rule the earth (*κατακυριευσεν*, Gen. 1:28). But Christ's rule is of every creature, not only on earth but in heaven and under the earth as well. This lordship in no way detracts from the authority of God – on the contrary, it brings glory to God, and Christ thus fulfils the original purpose for Adam.<sup>177</sup>

---

176 Ibid, 108.

177 Hooker, 96-99.

Dunn believes that until the resurrection there was only discontinuity between the First and Last Adam. The resurrection marks the commencement of Christ's role as the last Adam, the representative of mankind. "It is the *exalted Christ* who bears the image and glory that Adam lost; it is to the image and glory of the exalted Christ that believers will be conformed."<sup>178</sup>

### **Adam a type of Christ: Comparison, Contrast or Both?**

Though the contrasts between Adam and Christ are obvious, the comparisons are more illusive, yet it is clear that Paul and others use these parallels to reveal the truth at the heart of the Gospel. Hooker notes, "In spite of Paul's somewhat confused syntax, the parallels and contrast between Adam and Christ in this passage are clear."<sup>179</sup>

### **The Reign of Two Kingdoms**

The point of the Romans passage is not to contrast the damage caused by Adam's disobedience and how it is reversed by Christ's obedience, though this is obviously what occurred the point of the passage is to compare these acts and show how the parallel reveals our sanctification. Adam, made in the image of God, did something (made a choice that caused his death) that we did not do, and yet, in his action, we were all made to die with Adam, the affect of his action (sin and death) was given full reign/control over those who were in Adam, all mankind, until Christ became a man, and did something (made a choice that caused his death) that we did not do, and yet, in his action we (who receive) were made to die with Christ, but Christ rose again, from the grave, because in

---

178 Dunn, *Christology*, 108.

179 Hooker, 28.

his action he conquered sin and death, (like a “coup”) and the affect of his action (righteousness and life) was given reign over those who would follow him.

Unfortunately, sin and death still have their kingdom and men have to decide whose kingdom they will be a part of, there is still a spiritual warfare, but we know in the end, our God reigns! Moo writes, “The contrast between two ‘reigns’ . . . reflects a fundamental structure that Paul uses throughout his letters, but especially in chapters 5-8, to interpret and explain the significance of Christ.”<sup>180</sup>

The purpose that we were created for was life and righteousness. We are sanctified when we yield to the work of the Holy Spirit. Ian Thomas explained sanctification as being set apart for a specific purpose. He illustrated his point by using the example of a watch or pair of glasses. When you look at your watch to see what time it is, you are sanctifying you watch. When you set your glasses on your face to see more clearly, you are sanctifying your glasses.<sup>181</sup> God created man to glorify Himself, but the First Adam, lost that glory, the Last Adam, redeemed that glory for mankind and when we, yield ourselves to His Spirit, we are sanctified. The principle of control is in effect, we glorify God when we choose to be controlled by righteousness and life. We understand it clearly when we read “For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set us free from the law of sin and death” (Rom. 8:2). The meaning of ‘law’ here is a principle in action, such as the ‘law’ of gravity. Just as Thomas illustrates this principle of control; explaining that just as the law of aerodynamics sets us free from the law of

---

180 Douglas Moo, “Romans,” *Zondervan Illustrated Backgrounds Commentary*, ed. Clinton E. Arnold (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 32.

181 W. Ian Thomas, “Lectures on the Christian Life,” at the New Tribes Mission Field Conference: Santa Clara, Panama, December, 1995.

gravity, when we submit ourselves to it, so also the law of the spirit sets us free from the law of sin and death.<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>182</sup> Ibid.

## CHAPTER 5

### CONCLUSION AND CONSEQUENCES

In order to understand the truths which Paul expresses in Romans 5:12-21, it is necessary to consider all the ramifications of who Adam was. As the corporate head of mankind, he represents all humanity and his actions affected all who are born of him. “That which is born of the flesh is flesh” (Jn 3:6). As a type of Christ he revealed God’s plan from eternity past to involve Jesus Christ, His Only Begotten Son, in the redemption of mankind. Through redemption, all who believe in Him are born again unto new life, for “that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” (Jn. 3:6). We also must understand that we are not just millions of individuals with only our own interests in mind, but “we are members one of another” (Rom. 12:5, Eph. 4:25) and what affects one affects us all. The grace of God (more . . . *much more than more*) trumped sin! Though sin abounded, “grace did abound much more exceedingly.”<sup>183</sup> Though for a time, death reigns, and the Law causes sin to increase, through the righteousness of Jesus Christ, those who belong to Him do reign in life. It is not our righteousness, for in God’s sight “our righteousness is as filthy rags” (Isa. 64:6). Only the work of Jesus Christ through the life of the believer pleases God. Jesus Christ is the Last Man; hence, there will be no need for another.

We are involved in spiritual warfare. Since Christ came to conquer sin and death, there are two kingdoms and man has a choice, to which he will yield his allegiance. Paul’s Adam typology in verse 5:14 gives a clear view of the “principle of control.” Who

---

183 McClain, 139.

is in control of a man's life reveals the kingdom he is yielding to, either to the principle of sin and death, or to the principle of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus. Romans 6-8 discusses this principle in detail, the focus being; "For the Law (principle of control) of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set us free from the Law (principle of control) of sin and death."

### **Summary of Theses and Supporting Evidence**

Adam is a type of Christ; but is it a comparison, a contrast, or both? There is no denying the contrasts between Adam and Christ in their personage, nor in their actions, even with respect to the actual consequences on those they affected, the differences are obvious. At first glance, one might gloss over Paul's use of the word "type" in this passage teeming with opposites. Great men and women have pondered this passage through the centuries, continually getting tangled up in verse 12, and then, having accomplished that great feat, focused in on the "obvious," never stopping to wonder if there is more here than meets the eye.

But as we have seen from our study, there are some very important comparisons, and in fact, this is Paul's true focus in this passage. He had already fought the battle for the lost-ness of mankind, and the only basis of reconciliation being justification by faith, in the first section of the epistle. In chapter 5 he is ready to move on to disclose the truths of our sanctification, the mystery now revealed, which is "Christ in you the hope of glory" Just as sin entered the world, and death through sin, and that through Adam the many are made sinners, so also are many made righteous through One man, Jesus Christ, the way, the truth and the life. Just as Adam was made in the image of God (and the Word was God), so are we new creatures, created in Christ Jesus. Vine states, "He is

showing how sin and death have become universal because of Adam's sin. As these came through the act of another, so justification and life can, in like manner, become ours only through the act of Another, even Christ."<sup>184</sup>

To see the comparison is to see the glorious hope, after years of man trying to redeem himself through his own righteousness, Paul explains, "you can not." It is not by what we did, but what He did; it is not what we do, but what He does, by the power of His Spirit which dwells in us. It is the principle of control, or to whom do you bow? We are no longer slaves to sin, to obey the lusts of the flesh, but we are slaves to God; to righteousness and life (Rom. 6:16).

Contrast is not the only aspect of this passage that Paul intended. The comparisons are important and with regard to typology, not inconsistent, as Terry remarks, "Resemblance of some kind, real or supposed, lies at the foundation in every case." In support of the comparison and contrast we can also read Terry's remarks, "it is as essential that there be points of dissimilarity as that there be some notable analogy, otherwise we should have identity where only a resemblance is designed. Adam, for instance, is made a type of Christ . . . . Moreover we always expect to find in the antitype something higher and nobler than in the type."<sup>185</sup>

Paul's Christology seems to be brimming with Adam-Christ typology, as we saw in many of his writings, the "Adam motif" and allusions to an "Adam Christology." It may be argued that many of these 'allusions' do not stand up against the strict rules of

---

184 W. E. Vine, *The Epistle to the Romans: Doctrine, Precept, Practice* (London: Oliphants Limited, 1948), 79.

185 Terry, 337.

typology, but there is no question that Romans 5:14 and 1 Corinthians 15:45-47 are genuine Adam-Christ typology.

### **Implications of this Study for Modern Christology**

It is my hope that, if nothing else is accomplished through the writing of this thesis, that it will open the minds of those who might glance at its pages, to begin to look for the true comparisons involved in Paul's Adam Christology. May men remember, that 'men' is all we are, and that God is not going to fit into our boxes. Our understanding will always be limited until one day when we see him face to face, and even then, though our minds may be "blown away" at the magnitude of ignorance we faced in our mortal bodies, even in our glorious heavenly home, only God is omniscient.

### **The Affects of Adam Christology on the Christian Worldview in Today's Culture**

To believe the truths that Paul is expressing concerning the work of righteousness being Christ's work in and through the believer and not a striving in the flesh, would be a revelation to many a true born-again Christian. Look around today's culture, and what do you find, but Pastors and Teachers and men, women, boys and girls, trying to please God by offering him their 'righteousness' as if that might please Him. God is only pleased with that righteousness that is in Christ, that righteousness that brought life to dead men that they might walk in it.

Here are the views of several modern scholars concerning the affects of Adam Christology on the Christian worldview in today's culture:

Osborne stated,

Paul's Adam/Christ typology enables our worldview to overcome its finitude and world-based perspective by taking on Christ's victory and

becoming centered on the "true-world-view" of the reality of the new kingdom in Christ. It becomes an apocalyptic worldview in the sense that it centers not on the "illusion" that this world is all there is but on the reality that we can even now live in the "world" of God and his Spirit.<sup>186</sup>

Hooker regards, “the comparison and contrast between Adam and Christ to be central to Paul's writings. How we are to interpret his thinking in the modern world is a problem, but we are perhaps in a better position to understand the meaning of human solidarity and the effect that the actions of an individual can have on many people than ever before.”<sup>187</sup>

John Polhill says, “The relevance of this concept to any culture is that humanity is fallen (Adamic) and cannot save itself from its fallenness; redemption can only come through the one who pioneered our salvation by his sacrifice of perfect obedience, thus enabling us through faith to become the acceptable humanity that God has always willed us to be.”<sup>188</sup>

### **Application to the Christian Life**

“Just as you have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in Him” (Col. 2:6). The glorious truths from these words of Paul, as well as those in Romans 5, reveal the transforming power of Christ, life reigning, where only death ruled, “that is the Christian life being transformed.” Just as death reigns in those who are of Adam, and with that they are hopeless, without God in the world, so those who believe are “being saved by His life” (Rom. 5:10), that is sanctification by faith. If we see the comparison that Paul is making it leads to the conclusion that, in Adam all sinned, on the basis of Adam’s action,

---

186 Grant Osborne, interview.

187 Morna D. Hooker, Professor of New Testament at Cambridge, interview by author, email: 1 February 2007.

188 Polhill, interview.

not their own, so also, in Christ, all who believe are made righteous on the basis of Christ's action. The Christian life "is the impossible life"<sup>189</sup> and therefore only the One who can do the impossible can accomplish it, which He does, through those who by faith, submit to His control. Sparks wrote,

We pass from Adam as type to Christ the Antitype, and then to ourselves in Christ. Adam was constituted pre-eminently with capacity for Divine relationship. Union with God in Christ is spiritual. The medium of union with God in Christ is the human spirit. Man was constituted with a spirit because God is Spirit, and the human spirit was that which made it possible for man to have union and communion with God. The link between the human spirit and God the Father, in the Son, is the Holy Spirit. Union with Christ is all a spiritual matter. That is why we have become a new spiritual being. In the last Adam, in Christ, the union with the Father and the communion with the Father were perfect, but this was by reason of His human spirit I am speaking of Him now in incarnation- by reason of His human spirit and the link of the Holy Spirit: so that His union with the Father was a perfect union. He lived, walked, spoke, acted and laid down His life, in perfect oneness with the Father. Everything was received by Him from the Father: He even had to obtain from His Father authority to lay down His own life. The oneness was complete, but it was wholly spiritual.<sup>190</sup>

Just as Christ walked in perfect union with the Father, so by faith, the believer may walk in perfect union with Christ, for the Holy Spirit links us with Him.

### **Results of This Study**

Paul's use of the word 'type' in Romans 5:14 is clearly more than just a contrast between two historical figures, and the affect they had on those who pertain to them. The comparison is the focus of Paul's argument that reveals the mystery of our salvation by faith in Christ. Just as through one man, sin entered and death reigned, so also through One Man, righteousness and life triumphed. Adam was created in the image of God. He

---

189 W. Ian Thomas, *Mystery*, 27.

190 T. Austin-Sparks, *A New Creation*, <http://www.christinyou.net/pages/taustsparks.html>.

was a *type* of the One to come. The glory of God was in his spirit and he was immortal, until he disobeyed the command of God. In that day, he surely died as well as all who came after him. Jesus Christ, the Last Adam, who was the very image of God, came in the likeness of sinful flesh, that he might suffer the consequences for all mankind, to restore God's glory to the human spirit by His Spirit, the Spirit of Christ. As Hooker suggests, "it is precisely here that we see the paradox and irony of what the author of this passage is saying. At this point the one who is truly what man is meant to be- the form and likeness of God- becomes what other men *are*, because they are in Adam."<sup>191</sup>

A clear view of "Adam Christology" can affect the modern Christian worldview, by clarifying the relationship between Adam and Christ, not just as federal heads of mankind, but more importantly in the affects their actions have on those who pertain to them. Paul makes it clear that justification is by faith alone, and through his discourse in Romans 5, he makes it clear as well, that our sanctification is only based on the actions of Christ and not the believer. It is only by faith that we live the Christian life. By understanding God's intention for the first and the last Adam, we can more fully understand the truths being revealed to us in the New Testament. The power of His righteousness to reign in our lives is exceedingly, abundantly greater than the power unleashed by Adam's sin.

---

191 Hooker, 69-99.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aageson, James W. *Written Also for Our Sake: Paul and the Art of Biblical Interpretation*. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1993.
- Allbert, Craig D. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho*. Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Alvord, Henry. *The New Testament for English Readers*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983.
- Austin-Sparks, T. *A New Creation*. <http://www.christinyou.net/pages/taustsparks.html>.
- Barclay, William. *The Letter to the Romans*, rev. ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1975.
- Barnes, Albert. "Romans." *Notes on the New Testament, Explanatory and Practical*. Edited by Robert Frew. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1974.
- Barnhouse, Donald Grey. *God's Grace: Romans 5:12-21*, Expositions of Bible Doctrines Taking the Epistle to the Romans as a Point of Departure, no. 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- Barrett, C. K. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. New York: Scribner's, 1962.
- Barth, Karl. *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5*. Translated by T. A. Smail. New York: Macmillan, 1968.
- Bauer, Walter, William Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature: a translation and adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur, fourth revised and augmented edition, 1952*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Work, His Epistles and His Doctrine, a Contribution to the Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. 2 vols., 2d ed., Edited by Eduard Zeller, Translated by A. Menzies. London : Williams and Norgate, 1875.

- Black, Matthew. "The Christological Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 18 (October 1971): 1-14.
- Bray, Gerald L. "Adam and Christ (Romans 5:12-21)." *Evangel* 18 (Spring 2000): 4-8.
- Brindle, Wayne A. "Typology." *The Popular Encyclopedia of Bible Prophecy*. Edited by Tim LaHaye and Ed Hindson, 396-399. Eugene, OR: Harvest House, 2004.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, An Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. "Adam and Christ According to Romans 5." *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, Edited by William Klassen and Graydon F. Snyder. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1962, 152.
- Burke, Kenneth. "The First Three Chapters of Genesis." *The Bible in its Literary Milieu: Contemporary Essays*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Burton, Ernst De Witt. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973.
- Byrne, Brendan. "The Type of the One to Come." *Australian Biblical Review* 36 (1988): 19-30.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5:12." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 22 (September 1969): 324-41.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*, rev. ed. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Custance, Arthur. *Man in Adam and in Christ*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975.
- Davidson, Richard. *Typology in Scripture: A Study of Hermeneutical Typos Structures*. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1981.
- Denny, James. "Adam and Christ in St. Paul." *Expositor's Bible* ser. 6, vol. 9 (1904): 147-60.
- Diemer, Carl. *Notes on Romans*. A PowerPoint presentation for NBST 668, Liberty University, November 2005.
- Doherty, Earl. Supplementary Articles - No. 8: Christ As "Man": Does Paul Speak of Jesus as an Historical Person? <http://home.ca.inter.net/~oblio/supp08.htm>.

- Dungan, D. R. *Hermeneutics*. Cincinnati: Standard Publishing Company, 1888.
- Dunn, James D. G. *Christology in the Making*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Word Biblical Commentary: Romans 1-8*. Vol. 38a. Dallas: Word Books, 1988.
- Dykes, J. Oswald. *The Gospel According to St. Paul*. New York: Robert Carter, 1888.
- Edwards, Jonathan. *Images or Shadows of Divine Things*. Edited by Perry Miller. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1977.
- Elwell, Walter A., ed., *Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House, 1984.
- Eichrodt, Walther. "Ist die typologisch Exegese sachgemässe Exegese?" *Probleme alttestamentlicher Hermeneutik* (1960), 205-226. Quoted in Mickelsen, 242-43.
- Fairbairn, Patrick. *Typology of Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975.
- Foulkes, F. "The Acts of God: A Study of the Basis of Typology in the Old Testament." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, Edited by G. K. Beale, 342-371. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Fishbane, Michael A. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Freerksen, J. A. *Outline of Greek Syntax*. Lynchburg, VA: Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.
- Glenny, W. Edward. "Typology: A Summary of the Present Evangelical Discussion." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (December 1997): 627-638.
- Gopplet, Leonard. "Tupos." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1976. 251.
- Gorday, Peter. *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom, and Augustine*. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 1983.
- Greene, Oliver B. *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*. Greenville, SC: Gospel Hour, 1962.

- Greidanus, Sidney. *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Habershon, Ada R. *The Study of the Types*. Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1977.
- Harrison, Everett F. "Romans." *Zondervan NIV Bible Commentary*, Vol. 2: New Testament. Edited by Kenneth L. Barker and John R. Kohlenberger III. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.
- Hausman, Robert A. "Adam and Christ: A Comparative Study of Karl Barth, Rudolf Bultmann, and Anders Nygren on Romans 5, 12-21." B.D. thesis, Concordia Theological Seminary, Springfield, Ill., 1965.
- Hodge, Charles. *Commentary of the Epistle to the Romans*. Philadelphia: William S. & Alfred Martien, 1865.
- Hooker, Morna. *From Adam to Christ, Essays on Paul*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oneworld, 2003.
- Hugenberger, G. P. "Introductory Notes on Typology." In *The Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*, Edited by G. K. Beale, 331-341. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.
- Hurtado, Larry W. *How on Earth Did Jesus Become a God?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.
- Jamison, Robert, A. R. Fausset, and David Brown. *Critical, Experimental and Practical Commentary*. Vol. 6. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Johnson, B.W. *The People's New Testament: The Epistle of Paul to the Romans, 1891*. <http://www.mun.ca/rels/restmov/texts/bjohnson/hg1/PNT06-05.htm>.
- Johnson, O. L. *Bible Typology: The New Testament in the Old*. Bourbon, IN: Harmony, 1976.
- Johnson, S. L. "Romans 5:12-An Exercise in Exegesis and Theology." *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney, 298-316. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Abridged edition. Translated and abridged by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1985.

- Klein, W. W. Craig Blomberg, and R. L. Hubbard, Jr. *Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Dallas: Word, 1993.
- Kreitzer, Joseph. "Christ and Second Adam in Paul." *Communio Viatorum* 31, no. 1-2 (1989): 55-101.
- Lampe, G. W. H., and K. J. Woollcombe. *Studies in Biblical Theology: Essays on Typology*. London: SCM Press, 1978.
- Longenecker, Richard N. and Merrill C. Tenney, eds. *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.
- Luther, Martin. *Luther: Lectures on Romans*. Translated by Wilhelm Pauck. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961.
- Mather, Samuel. *The Figures or Types of the Old Testament*. New York: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1969.
- McCartney, Dan G. *Inerrancy and Hermeneutic: A Tradition, A Challenge, A Debate*. Edited by H. Conn. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988. Westminster Theological Seminary. <http://www.wts.edu/publications/articles/mccartney-ntuseot-p.html>.
- McClain, Alva J. *Romans: The Gospel of God's Grace*. Winona Lake, IN: BMH Books, 1973.
- McQuilkin, Robert C. *The Message of Romans, An Exposition*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1947.
- Mickelsen, Berkeley A. *Interpreting the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.
- Monser, J. W. *Types and Metaphors of the Bible*. St. Louis: John Burns, 1886.
- Moo, Douglas J. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Romans" *Zondervan Illustrated Backgrounds Commentary Set*, Clinton E. Arnold, ed., 2-99. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002.
- Moorehead, William G. "Type." *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Vol. 5, Edited by James Orr. Chicago: Howard-Severance, 1930.
- Morris, Leon. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

- Mounce, Robert H. *The New American Commentary: Romans*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Mounce, William D. *Basics of Biblical Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003.
- Murdoch, W. G. C. *Interpretations of Symbols, Types, Allegories and Parables. A Symposium on Biblical Hermeneutics*. SDA Theological Seminary, Andrews University.
- O'Neill, J. C. "Adam Who is the Figure of Him That Was to Come: A Reading of Romans 5:12-21." In *Crossing the Boundaries*. Leiden: E J Brill, 1994.
- Osborne, Grant R. *Hermeneutical Spiral*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Romans*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004.
- Pate, C. Marvin. *Adam Christology as the Exegetical & Theological Substructure of 1 Corinthians 4:7-5:21*. New York: University Press of America, 1991.
- Pegler, Stephen. "The Nature of Paul's Universal Salvation Language in Romans." Ph.D. diss., Trinity International University, 2002. University Microfilms International, 3047819. Microfiche.
- Polhill, John B. *Paul and His Letters*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.
- Pounds, Wil <http://www.abideinchrist.com/selah/feb10.html>, 2003.
- Precepts Ministries International. "Romans Commentaries – Part 1." [http://preceptaustin.org/romans\\_514-15.htm](http://preceptaustin.org/romans_514-15.htm).
- Rhys, Howard. *The Epistle to the Roman*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.
- Robertson A. T. and Hersey Davis. *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, 10th ed. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977.
- Sapp, David A. "An Introduction to Adam Christology in Paul: A History of Interpretation, the Jewish Background, and an Exegesis of Romans 5:12-21." Ph.D. diss., Southwestern Theological Seminary, 1990.
- Seemuth, David Paul. "Adam the Sinner and Christ the Righteous One: The Theological and Exegetical Substructure of Romans 5:12-21." Ph.D. diss., Marquette University, 1989.
- Schreiner, Thomas R. Review of *Corporate Elements in Pauline Anthropology: A Study of Selected Terms, Idioms, and Concepts in the Light of Paul's Usage and*

*Background*, by Sang-Won (Aaron) Son. *Trinity Journal* (Spring 2003):  
[http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\\_qa3803/is\\_200304/ai\\_n9221304](http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3803/is_200304/ai_n9221304).

Scroggs, Robin. *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966.

Sharpe, John L. "The Second Adam in the Apocalypse of Moses." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 35 (Ja 1973): 35-46.

Smith, Robert. Basics of Bible Interpretation: Phase 2. Chapter 9 available from  
<http://www.pbc.org/dp/smith2/ch9.html>.

Spurgeon, C. H. "At New Park Street Chapel, Southwark. Delivered on Sabbath Morning, August 26, 1855"; <http://www.spurgeon.org/sermons/0037.htm>.

Stifler, James M. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary Logical and Historical*. Chicago: Moody, 1960.

Stott, John R. W. *Men Made New, an Exposition of Romans 5-8*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1966.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*, Translated by Scott J. Hafemann. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994.

Terry, Milton S. *Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

Thomas, Robert. "The Principle of Single Meaning," *The Master's Seminary Journal* 12/1 (Spring 2001): 33-47.

Thomas, W. H. Griffith. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: A Devotional Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

Thomas, W. Ian. *The Saving Life of Christ and the Mystery of Godliness*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystery of Godliness*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. Excerpts from the writings of Maj. Ian Thomas.  
<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/ianthomas.html>.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Lectures on the Christian Life*. New Tribes Mission Field Conference: Santa Clara, Panama, December, 1995.

Towner, Sibley W. "Interpretations and Reinterpretations of the Fall." *Modern Biblical Scholarship*. Villanova, PA: Villanova University Press, 1984.

- Tulga, Chester E. *Studies in Romans*. Cleveland: Union Gospel, 1930.
- Vickers, Brian Johnson. "The Imputation of Christ's Righteousness: A Study of Key Pauline Texts." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2003. University Microfilms International, 3118680. Microfiche.
- Vine, E. E. *The Epistle to the Romans: Doctrine, Precept, Practice*. London: Oliphants Limited, 1948.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wansbrough, Henry. "Paul and the Second Adam."  
<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~sben0056/essays/paulsecondadam.htm>.
- Wesley, John. *Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament*. London: Epworth Press, 1976.
- Willmington, Harold L. *Introduction to Theology: Willmington's Complete Guide to Bible Knowledge*. Wheaton, IL: Tyndale, 1993.
- Winchester, Bishop of and James Moffatt. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Little Library of Exposition*. Edited by John Stirling. Toronto: Cassell, 1927.
- Zuck, Roy. *Basic Bible Interpretation*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1991.