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One of the great problems of the Christian life is the fact that negative volition is not always recognized in the experience of believers. We don't recognize it until something happens in our lives – a crisis arises, and we experience a spiritual breakdown. Or we make a move that later we recognize was pure spiritual insanity. And this happens with Christians who think that they are just real gung-ho, and all for the Word of God.

**Be Positive – Not Neutral**

The reason that happens is because we often confuse being neutral with being positive. And that is not the case. Many times we listen to instruction in the Word of God, and we are really not positive – it's just that we're not against it. We're really simply neutral. Consequently, we, in effect, are holding reservations. And when we discover that something comes up in our lives, and this particular point of truth, or conduct, or advice is in conflict with which we want to do, then the fact that we were simply neutral toward that particular truth readily converts itself to negative volition. We, at that point, resist the will of God.

So, when you listen to instruction in the Word of God, be careful that you are not equating your simple, indifferent neutrality with positive volition, because that is potential negative volition. That is a viper in your experience that will, in time, readily destroy you. And someplace along the line, the time will come when you will have to make a choice on the basis of your instruction in the Word of God, and your neutral attitude will go negative.

Now, being positive does require some encouragement, because being positive toward the Word of God throws you into the minority position. You're in a minority category. You're not really where (in our society) it's all at. But that was the case with Elijah and the Old Testament. I just wanted to read to you his statement again in 1 Kings 19:14, where Elijah had taken all kinds of abuse and all kinds of beating as God's positive spokesman. And this was taking place even after his great challenge of the prophet of Baal under the auspices of King Ahab. Elijah gets to the point in 1 Kings 19:14: "And he said (speaking to God), I have been very jealous for the Lord God of hosts because the children of Israel have forsaken Your covenant; thrown down Your altars; and slain Your prophets with the sword. And I, even I only, am left, and they seek my life to take it away."

Elijah had the attitude that: "Everybody is gone. I'm the only one that stands." He was sick and tired of being the brunt of the attacks of all the Jewish people in one way or another. For what? For the fact that he spoke the truth, and for the fact that he told them that which they needed to know. Where they were not neutral toward what he was saying, because it didn't particularly affect them, they were outright negative and antagonistic toward him.

However, notice verse 18, where the Lord says, to comfort and encourage this man: "Yet I have left Me 7,000 in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which has not kissed him." And the Lord had to remind Elijah that there were lots of people who were standing firm and staunch. It's just that when you are positive, you're in the little group. When you are positive, you're not surrounded by a lot of people. You're in the minority category, and therefore, it gets awfully lonely. When you are in that minority category, you make the majority very uncomfortable. So, they take the clubs and, in one way or another, the negative volition crowd and the neutral crowd starts clubbing you. It's a matter of where the authority lies upon which you're taking your stand.

When we study the Word of God, it is either the Word of God or it is simply some good thoughts of some good men. And if it is the Word of God, then it deserves nothing but our utmost absolute positive response to it – not just being neutral, and not just, "Yeah, that's OK," but: "That is my life guidance. What God has declared, upon that I must act. Whatever He tells me, that I must do."

So, the first time you come along, and you want to do something else, and it conflicts with your desires and your choices, you fall back upon your positive attitude toward doctrine. You have this question: "What's my authority? Am I really listening to God? Am I really believing something upon which I may act so that Satan cannot take me and get me sidetracked into secondary things? In my sincerity, Satan cannot take me and divert me so that all those who should be blessed by me are not blessed by me, because I'm sidetracked off on something secondary. The question of authority has to be settled in your mind, and that is what is being challenged today.

Many a young person sits in church, and he's neutral because he has the attitude that what he hears is preacher-talk. He does not concede that what he is hearing is God-talk, and therefore, it is as if God Himself were standing before you and making these pronouncements, and you are to act and respond accordingly.

I'd like to read you a few paragraphs from the July, 1978 issue of a publication called "The Projector" in an article entitled "The Question of Authority," written by John O. Hustler, who is vice-chairman of Christian Challenge Inc. In this article on authority, he says, "It is imperative to distinguish between the inerrancy and the sole authority of Scripture. If the Scriptures are indeed inerrant, must they be considered the sole authority for faith, doctrine, and practice? If the subjective inner voice is in fact the voice of God, then it speaks only infallible words coequal to Scripture."

His point in this article is that fundamental Christians are destroying themselves spiritually because they are adding other authorities to the Word of God. What God has said is not enough for them. They have all these counselors. They have all these wonderful experienced people. They have all their Christian friends. They have what all of the superstars of our generation and the religious world have to say, and they listen to them. They are authorities. And they are adding to the Scriptures just as much as the Roman Catholic Church says, "Yes, what the Bible says is OK. It's true. But the final authority is what the church says about the Bible, and whatever the church may want to add to the Bible. That is what is truth.

Continuing: "If a portfolio of success statistics can in fact demonstrate the validity of a movement's religious philosophy with an authority as powerful as Scripture itself, then we must confess that all beliefs purely based on the Bible are still, at their very best, inconclusive. For if the Scriptures are not the sole authority, they cannot decisively defend the validity of a belief. During the Reformation, the Scriptures were not only the final authority, they were the only authority. And only their dictates could make any position conclusive.

"This generation must decide for itself whether it will accept the Bible as its sole authority. This is most significant in the face of the modern charismatic movement, which claims God to be in direct verbal communication with it in extra-biblical terms.

"Let us remember the words of Hosea 4:6: 'My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. Because you have rejected knowledge, I will also reject you, that you shall be no priest to Me. Seeing you have forgotten the law of your God, I will also forget your children.'

"If we do not cease from the business of seeking mystical, spiritual meanings from the sacred text, and start handling it as the objective, public, and sole authoritative body of literature that God intended it to be, we may pay for it by the loss of an entire generation of fundamentalists.

"James 1:21: 'Wherefore, lay apart all filthiness and superfluity of naughtiness, and receive the engrafted word with meekness, which is able to save your souls.'

"Have many contemporary fundamentalists departed from the Reformation heritage of the sole authority of Scripture for faith, doctrine, and practice, in favor of a plural authority for the same? Has the day come when the question of what is fundamental to the faith is no longer to be determined upon the basis of academic truth? Can two plus two equals four be refuted simply by asserting that it lacks preferred vibrations of love? Was Christ on a tangent simply because there was a division as the result of His doctrine?

"Many young preachers today are being assured that the real truth resides within mainstream fundamentalism. But it is becoming increasingly difficult to determine what that faction of fundamentalism is. The truth is that many young fundamentalists are being assured that a plurality of authorities for faith, doctrine, and practice now exists. We will examine some of these authorities in terms of the plight of King David."

Quoting Scripture here: "1 Chronicles 13:1-4: 'And David consulted with the captains of thousands and hundreds, and with every leader. And David said unto all the congregations of Israel, 'If it seemed good unto you, and that it be of the Lord our God, let us send abroad, and to our brethren everywhere, that are left in all the land of Israel, and with them also to the priests and Levites, which are in their cities and suburbs, that they may gather themselves onto us. And let us bring again the ark of our God to us. For we inquired not at it in the days of Saul.' And all the congregation said that they would do so, for the thing was right in the eyes of all the people.'

"King David realized the need to have the ark of God return to Jerusalem where it belongs. However, in case of controversy, he needed an authoritative promise for his program of action. If he could list a large number of the names of the great leaders of the day, his position should be considered irrefutable. With the endorsement of the great leaders of the brotherhood, and the unity of spirit in the congregation gathered from several cities, any advice offered to David at this point, concerning the authority for his decision, should be considered an unloving, premeditated attempt to divide the brethren. This is an old trick of the devil. Can anything that unites the brethren in spirit be any other than the absolute will of God?

"In many circles today, no attempt is being made to demonstrate that the Bible is the Word of God. But many attempts are being made to prove that a great number of important people think that it is. For instance: 'bullet-man; fire-man; dope-man; Watergate-man; panther-man; former rock-and-roll singer-man; country music-man; and, nightclub man think the Bible is meaningful, and that should carry more weight to the discernment of the congregation than a Bible expositor with nothing but a solid Bible background.

"'And they carried the ark of God in a new cart out of the house of Abinadab' (1 Chronicles 13:7). Regardless of the biblical fact that the Scriptures dictate that the ark was to be carried by the Sons of Kohath on foot (Numbers 4:15), the fundamental major issue at hand is to have the symbol of the presence of God at home where it belongs. Anyone who wishes to improve upon that by bringing up the minor issue of how the ark is to be transported is majoring on a minor: nitpicking; jealous; and, unloving, and is seeking to cripple perhaps the most exciting united movement in Israel in generations.

"If David were possibly wrong, how then does one account for the endorsements of the great names in Israel? And look at the size of those crowds. When was the last time we saw crowds like that? One cannot refute success, can he? Perhaps the apostle Peter should have used this argument when the apostle Paul withstood him to the face in Antioch because he was to be blamed (Galatians 2:11). Peter might have replied, 'Paul, have you ever won three thousand souls to Christ in one sermon? Have you ever built a church of 3,000 in a day that grew to over 60,000 within a decade? Did you know that I was praying; walking with Christ; and, preaching great meetings long before you knew that salvation even existed? Have you ever seen Moses on the top of a mountain? You go out and accumulate for yourself such a portfolio of success statistics, and then come back and suggest that I have broadened my base of operation too far in Antioch when I included the leaders of the circumcision in my evangelistic program.'

"'And David and all Israel played before God with all their might, and with singing, and with harps, and with psalteries, and with timbrels, and with cymbals, and with trumpets" (1 Chronicles 13). This was no dull service. The best music groups were there, and everyone was involved with all their might. Surely this must have been a sign of the power of the Holy Spirit.

"Look for a moment at the life of Samson. Can there be found one thing he did solely for the glory of God? Can there be found one victory that was not an act of self-vindication? Here was a man who picked up the jawbone of a dead carcass in defiance to the will of God and his Nazirite vow, and with it won a victory in the power of the Holy Spirit of God. At his death, he did not seek glory for God. He only asked for an opportunity to avenge himself for his eyes. Yet in the power of the Holy Spirit, he destroyed the temple of Dagon. If someone had sought to advise Samson concerning his methods, ethics and associations, he could have replied, 'If I am wrong, how do you account for the obvious power of the Holy Spirit upon my work? When your work is endued with spiritual strength such as mine, then you may advise me as a brother. As for me, the power of the Spirit guarantees that I am in the center of God's will.'

**Sole Authority**

"A great many books today defend the inerrancy of Scripture as a fundamental of the faith, and rightly so. However, inerrancy is nothing but an empty word unless the Bible is also the sole authority for faith, doctrine, and practice. It is difficult to work with men who assert that God verbally communicates to them, from within or from without, daily, in extra-biblical terms. It is difficult to work with a brother who believes he has been anointed with apostolic authority. The issue of sole authority is rightly dividing many fundamentalists. Inerrancy is not nearly enough. Sole authority is a fundamental issue worth separating over.

"Furthermore, sole authority is just an empty phrase unless the Bible dictates its own method of interpretation. The Bible prescribes for itself the literal, historical, grammatical method of interpretation. This can create a fundamental difference between brethren when some prefer an allegorical, or mystical, or spiritual, or existential method of interpretation that is based upon a subjective inner source of infallible information. Calling them all Bible believers does not seem to resolve the problem. Calling this stand nitpicking and unloving is not going to change a thing.

"Meanwhile, the anger of the Lord is kindled against us: "And He struck dead for touching the ark" (1 Chronicles 13:10). Obviously calling an issue minor does not change it from being a fundamental issue. It is true, however, that one should not major on minors, but the philosophy that one should not even minor on the minors is unbiblical indeed.

"Notice David's corrected course of action. There was a prepared place to do the work of God (1 Chronicles 15:1). There was a prepared method to do the work of God (1 Chronicles 15:2). There was proper instruction for those doing the work of God (1 Chronicles 15:12-13). And the mind of God alone was consulted authority (1 Chronicles 15:15).

"Fundamentalists should seek to be loving; successful; appealing to leaders; crowd-drawing; zealous; and, anointed with the power of the Holy Spirit. If these are used as authorities for faith, doctrine, and practice, the fundamental doctrine of sole authority is in question, whether anyone wishes to admit it or not. It is this very weakness that is driving many into the charismatic movement. People should be considered right only if their position can objectively be demonstrated to be consistent with the literal interpretation of God's Word.

"Just abstractly throwing the word "Bible-believer" around will not solve any problems. It will only continue to deceive good Christians from understanding what the real issues at hand are. Thank God for educators who train young preachers to operate solely upon the authority of the Word of God, regardless of the collectivist, existential, or pragmatic pressures that may challenge their stance in these last days.

"Make certain today that you have embraced the Word of God as more than inerrant, but also as your sole authority for your faith. Make absolutely certain that your eternal salvation is 100% based on God's written record. 1 John 5:13: "And finally, my brethren, do all from a motive of love, and with an objective to bring glory to God by obedience to the Word of God.' May God bless you on those terms."

I think that's an excellent quotation from that article that puts into perspective the issue of not just being neutral, but actually being positive toward the Word of God. And that means not adding to the Word of God. This passage that we're studying in Romans 5:12-21 is a prime example of an area of confusion because people have added to the Word of God. People are looking to super star authorities, and they have injected all kinds of confusion relative to the kind of salvation God has provided for us.

**Adam and Christ**

Romans 5:12-21 is designed to illustrate the doctrine of justification of sinners on the ground of the absolute righteousness of Christ by a comparison to the condemnation of mankind for the sin of Adam. Paul is trying to make it clear once more how God, and God alone, gives you justification. This time, he does it by making a comparison to Adam, who gave us something that caused all the trouble in the first place. The whole first part of the epistle has stress that a sinner's acceptance with God is not based on human doing, but totally apart from it. The justified sinner, therefore, is being treated according to the merits of Jesus Christ, and not according to something which he has done – but totally apart from anything he has done. This justification, on the basis of what Christ has done, is illustrated by a parallel fact of our condemnation on the basis of what Adam has done. We are credited with the actions of both. In the process of making this comparison, Paul is stressing the fact that our doing is not involved in either case. We are but the recipients.

In verse 12, Paul has indicated to us that sin entered the human stream through Adam. The divine penalty for sin is spiritual and physical death. With the sin of Adam, death enter the human experience. The sin of Adam was imputed to all mankind on the principle of his being the federal and seminal head of the race. By divine reckoning, everyone participated in Adam's sin and fall.

So, we have the statement in verse 12: "For all have sinned," which should be translated: "All sinned." It's the aorist tense. That is one point action, and it means that everyone was constituted a sinner at some point in human history. This includes everything relative to sin: our guilt; our sin nature; and, our personal sins.

We have been looking at verses 13-14. These explain Paul's statement in verse 12 that: "All sinned in Adam." He stopped to be sure that people would understand what he meant by saying that: "All sinned." He stops to prove that all are condemned to the lake of fire on account of Adam's sin. All are regarded as sinners on account of Adam's sin.

**Personal Sinning**

In verse 13, Paul establishes the principle that the application of a penalty implies the transgression of the law. If there is no law, there can be no transgression of a law. And that's his point. Until you make a rule, you can't break a rule. The penalty of death proved, however, to be universal among mankind, even when there wasn't a series of rules. And he specifically talks about the period from Adam to Moses, before the Mosaic Law was written. People were dying. Everybody dies. And yet the penalty of death is applied for breaking a rule of God. But there were no stated rules as such.

**Personal Guilt**

So, personal sinning was present from Adam to the Mosaic Law, but personal guilt was not recorded. And that's what he says in verse 13: "Until the law, sin was in the world (people were sinners), but until you have stated rules, breaking those rules is not put on their record. It's not imputed." So, Paul's conclusion is that the penalty of death is being suffered by all, because all share the guilt with Adam, who violated a formally declared divine law. Somehow what Adam did has been applied to all.

So, Paul's point is that Adam is the cause of sin in some way comparable to Christ being the cause of righteousness. As all were involved in Adam's sin, so all were involved in his death. As all believers are involved in Christ death for sin, so all believers are involved in Christ's absolute righteousness unto eternal life. The whole plan of the passage is to compare Adam to Jesus Christ, and then to draw conclusions from that.

**Imputation**

So, the principle of imputation (that we looked at last week) is at the heart of this: imputed sin; and, imputed absolute righteousness. This is not sin that you have been guilty of, but sin imputed to you. Neither is this absolute righteousness that you have secured; but imputed to you. Imputation is at the heart of this.

**Law, Sin, and Death**

However, if we all die on Adam's account, how much more shall we live on account of Jesus Christ? So, here's the principle again. Here's the rule, or the law. Then there is the violation, or the sin. And then you have the penalty, or death. Verse 13 simply is telling you that in simple form. Until you have a rule, you can't break the rule. And until you break the rule, you can't apply the penalty. In the case of Adam, that was the rule: "Don't eat of the tree." If you violate that, your penalty will be death. And Adam was guilty of that. But after that, there were no formal stated rules. Yet people were dying. And Paul's point is: "Why is the penalty being applied to everybody?"

That draws him then to the great demonstration of the free grace gift of salvation apart from human doing. The sin of Adam ruined us all. It was the ground of divine condemnation of the whole human race. And the intervention of Jesus Christ in our salvation was an act of pure, sovereign, wonderful grace. This was not a strange doctrine to the Jews. From earliest times, the Jews understood this. This was one thing they understood. When Paul spoke to the Jews who knew the Old Testament, they understood this particular principle: rule; violation; and, penalty. And they acted upon that. And it was common teaching. What we are telling you now was the standard teaching among the Jewish rabbis as to the problem that Adam had brought into the human race. The rabbis knew very well that people die physically because Adam sinned in the garden, and what he did was imputed to all of us.

Verse 14 continues that explanation of verse 12. Remember that verse 12 is an incomplete comparison. Verse 12 starts to make a comparison, he doesn't finish it there. He gets to the "as" part ("as this"), but he never gets to the "even so" part, because he stops to interrupt himself with verses 13-14 to explain that statement that: "All sinned."

Now, coming to verse 14, after having established this principle that we've drawn here (rule, violation, and penalty), then he says, "Nevertheless." This is the Greek preposition "alla." This is a very strong adversative word. It's introducing a contradiction to the principle that we have stated here in verse 12 of law, violation, and penalty. Verse 12 says that you have the penalty of death because there was a violation of a specific stated rule. But Paul says, "Here's an exception. Here's a contradiction." And he's going to introduce it now in this verse. When there is no law or divine rule, then you can have no penalty for violation of it.

He introduces the fact here then that the death penalty was in operation during a certain formal period of history when there were no divine rules to break. Why? He's introducing verse 14 in opposition to what he said at the end of verse 13: "Sin is not imputed when there is no law:"

"But death" ("thanatos"). This refers here primarily to physical death, and that indicates that physical death is also primarily involved in verse 12, although physical death is a consequence of spiritual death. But here, he's talking primarily about physical death, which was present, and it has the definite article, so that in the Greek it looks: It's actually saying "*the* death was in the world."

What death is he talking about? Well, he's talking about "the death" of Genesis 2:16-17, where God said to Adam: "And the Lord God commanded the man saying, 'Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat. But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, you shall not eat of it, for in the day that you eat thereof, you shall surely die." There is the death he is speaking of. And when it says, "*the* death," it is talking about the physical death and spiritual death imposed upon Adam because of the violation of that particular divine rule.

So, it is very important to notice that the Greek has that definite article. It is *the* death. It's not just death in general. It is the specific death that he has in view here.

**Death Reigned**

Now, that is strange. Here we are, human beings in the period from Adam to Moses, and the death that was imposed on Adam, and that he was warned about, is being imposed on all these people. As a matter of fact, he says, "That this death simply reigned. The Greek word is "basileuo." "Basileuo" means "to rule as king." It means "to reign." It connotes the idea of absolute control. There wasn't anybody that escaped it. Death was there, and it was bad, and nobody could escape it. It's in the aorist tense. It is, therefore, looking at the reign of death over mankind as a whole. It’s active. Death brought people to their graves. Death was always working. Death was never absent. Its indicative mood – a statement of fact.

So, death had undisputed power over mankind during a certain period of human history. What was that? Well, he says, "From," which is "apo," which basically means "away from," It indicates separation from a certain point in a span of human history. It's dealing with the same period, actually, that he has talked about in verse 12 – that sin entered the world, and so on. In that same span of time, sin was in the world. He's talking here about a span of time that goes from "Adam," which is just transliterated into English as "Adam." Adam was created by God as a perfect man. He was an actual, historical person, but it is looking upon Adam after he sinned. Here is a period of time: "From Adam to." This is not the normal Greek word for "to." It is "mechri," which is a preposition which means "until." And it is indicating the terminal point. It is used here to indicate the termination of the point of the span of time that he has in view.

So, from Adam (after Adam's sin) to a certain period that he calls "the period of Moses." Of course, that is specifically here after the Mosaic Law was given. Until the Mosaic Law was given, from the time that Adam was now a sinner, and at the point of Mount Sinai when the Mosaic Law was given – that's the time span that he's talking about.

Moses, of course, was the leader who delivered Israel from Egyptian slavery. He was an actual, historical person. He was the one to whom God had given the Mosaic Law system with its specific commandments that the Jewish people were to keep. This law spelled out the absolute righteousness of God with formal divine rules which were to be obeyed and which were punishable by death.

So, people were under a reign of death. Death controlled them in this period from Adam to Moses, wherein there were no formally stated rules. Now, that violates the principle. You can't be punished until you break something that is a rule. Yet people were being punished with death. So, they must have been dying for another reason. And that's the point of Paul's logic. There has to be a different reason why people were dying, because they weren't dying because they were breaking specific rules. And death simply reigned as king: "Nevertheless, death reigned from Moses to Adam."

Then he adds a further explanation. "Even" is the Greek preposition "kai." It's used here to identify a specific category of people: "Even over," and "over" is the preposition "epi," which means "upon." Here it gives direction or motion toward death: "Even over them (a specific group) that have not sinned." This is the word "hamartano" again. We're going to have another word for "sin" in a minute. Notice this one. "Hamartano" is the word for missing the standard of divine righteousness. It is aorist – at the point of missing absolute righteousness. These were people who had actually missed the standard of God's righteousness. They were active, willful negative volition to the divine standard. They were people who were neutral. Thus, when the issue came before them, and they made the decision, they were negative. And it is a participle. It is a spiritual principle.

Notice that this is an aorist participle. We haven't had this for some time. The action of the first participle comes first. First man sinned. The main verb is what? They died. So, here again, the grammar makes very strong emphasis upon the fact that people are dying, but they're dying because the verdict of guilty was placed on their account for breaking specific rules of God. And again, Paul is saying, how are you going to explain that? From Adam to Moses, there were no rules. The order is that you can only die when you have sinned. If you don't sin, you don't die. If you don't break the rule, you don't suffer the penalty. Yet people were dying, and that has to be explained.

**Similitude**

He said this was true even of those of a certain kind: "Who had not sinned after." The word "after" is "epi." This emphasizes position. It really means "in" – those who are in a certain category of sinners. These are those who had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression. The word "similitude" is the Greek word "homoioma." "Homoioma" basically means to be made like something. Here it means "likeness," or "resemblance," or "in the way." So, the idea here is that these people were dying who didn't sin in the way that Adam had sinned. Death reigned over a class of people who had not sin as Adam had sinned. Adam is the frame of reference for these sinners. And the word for "transgression" here is another word that the Bible uses for sin. It is "pararabasis."

**Sin**

We have learned that "hamartano" means (like on a target) you miss the mark – the mark of absolute righteousness. But this word "parabasis" means "a road;" "a path;" or, "a line." And God says, "This is absolute righteousness. You walk on this line and you do not deviate." This is another way that the Bible describes what we are involved in in sin. We step across the line, then we sneak back in; and we step across line, then we sneak back in. And the minute you step across the line once, you are now out of the category of life, and in the category of death. And this is what Adam did. Initially, he walked a straight line. He walked right on that path of absolute righteousness, never deviating for a moment. Then he ate the fruit, and he deviated off that straight line.

Here, the reference is to sin, viewed as deviating from a divinely defined line of conduct. Adam's deviation was from the restriction of not eating from that tree. So, Adam's sin was a deliberate violation of a clean line of action. God had told him, "Adam, the minute you step across the edge of this path, the result is going to be death: "Dying, thou shalt die – dying spiritually at the moment; and in time, thou shalt also die physically. The Hebrew has a way of putting it of intensification: "Dying – boy, will you die!" That is what the Hebrew is saying: "Dying. Oh, will you really die!" This is the Hebrew way of intensifying – that immediately there was a result, but there was such a long range result. He died spiritually, and then it compounded and compounded itself, until he fell over dead physically. He had stepped aside. He had been guilty of a transgression.

**Infants and Imbeciles**

This explains the confusion for all these people, like infants or imbeciles. Infants and imbeciles cannot be said to be guilty of deviating from God's path of absolute righteousness. Infants cannot sin. Yet all these babies who could not deviate by an act of sin on their own; they could not miss the mark of God's absolute righteous; and, they could not deviate from that path, received the penalty of death. How can that be? That's what Paul is getting it here. Here are all these people who do not have mental capacity, and they do not have control over their wills. Here is this span. He uses that particular one from Adam to Moses, because there were no rules. If he goes after that span, then it's a little harder to illustrate this. But before, all these people are dying. But they didn't break any rule. How can you apply the penalty of death to them?

Well, Paul's point is that all suffered death between Adam and Moses. And you cannot explain that on the basis of their personal sinning. It's not enough to try to explain it on the fact that they inherited an old sin nature. The answer to that, of course, is that the reason they're dying is because they have Adam's sin imputed to them, even as infants.

Then he goes on to verse 15-16 (which we'll take up next time) where he explains that. He says, "Now I'm going to tell you how that works. And he makes another parenthesis within a parenthesis to explain what he has just said. But the whole thing is summarized in that last phrase of verse 14: "Who is the figure of Him that is to come?" "Who," of course, refers to Adam. "Is" is the Greek verb "eimi," the verb of status? It is present tense. It is constantly the case. It is active. Adam is this. It is indicative – a statement of fact? He is the figure. The word for "figure" is "tupos." "Tupos" is a word that denoted a blow. So, it came to connote the mark which is left by a blow. If you take a dye, and you strike a blow on it, it leaves a mark. It leaves this impression.

In John 20:25, this is the word that Thomas used. He said, "I don't believe that Jesus is alive until I see the 'tupos' in his hands – the marks of the nails (the imprints or the impressions they made from the blow).

Acts 7:43 talks about making an idle image (a "tupos") – an image of a god.

In Romans 6:17, you have this word used in terms of sound doctrine: "But God be thanked that whereas you were the servants of sin, you have obeyed from the heart that form (that 'topos') of doctrine which was delivered to you." Here it is an impression of true doctrine.

The word in the New Testament is used mostly to denote a model after which anything is made. You have it in Hebrews 8:5 like that.

It is also used an example to follow. You have this in Philippians 3:17. "Tupos" is an example.

**A Type**

So, the whole idea here is summarized in the word that it looks like. We can just take it to English: "type." Adam was a type. Adam was a resemblance. It connotes something that Adam prefigured about Christ. Adam was, in a doctrinal sense, a type of the Lord Jesus Christ.

This is not an accident. This is a divinely created illustration. The Bible many times has what we call "types," where a person illustrates a spiritual truth. Here Adam is a type of Jesus Christ. It's a divine way of teaching doctrine. As Adam was the head and the representative of mankind, so Christ is the head and representative of believers. This is the imputation of sin or righteousness coming from one or the other.

So, it says, "Adam was a type (an impression – an image; or, a pretty figuration) of Him that was to come. That's the Greek word "mello," which means "to be about to do something," or "to be about to arrive." It is a present tense – constantly through. It is active. Jesus Christ was the one that's referred to. It refers to the incarnation of Jesus Christ as the last Adam who has come to resolve the sin disaster which was caused by the first Adam. 1 Corinthians 15:45 refers to Adam, and then, of course, it calls Jesus Christ the last Adam.

So, the word "mello" indicates that we have a parallel between Adam and Jesus Christ, which is the basis of Paul's illustration of justification. We got that justification as the result of what someone else did for us (Jesus Christ). He says, "Just as we got our condemnation by what somebody else did for us." In this way, by comparing these two, and pointing out that Adam is a type of Christ, we can see: "Oh, I am under Adam's guilt. I have his sin imputed to me. But I wasn't there to do it. I didn't have anything to do with it." That's right. But you are condemned for it.

In the same way, then, Adam, is a picture of Christ; a simile to Christ; or, an analogy to Christ. Well, then that means that I get salvation, and I didn't do anything about that. That's right. As you did nothing to be condemned, you do nothing to be declared just. Adam's one sin filled the whole world with sin and death. It was all laid on our doorstep. We were not involved, actually, ourselves. But salvation is dependent entirely in the same way upon a reconciliation that Jesus Christ makes for us. And we are not involved. It's just laid on our doorstep, and we have to accept.

So, Jesus is the reverse of Adam. And we receive the consequences of each, apart from our own doing. And that's the point. Salvation is a matter of divine imputation to those who have done nothing to secure it.

**Salvation is Secure Forever**

Of course, his point in making that is to settle the issue that salvation is secure forever. You can never lose it because it's a gift of God based upon a work of God. If you have any confusion on that, it's because you are weak on the authority of Scripture. It is because you know some wonderful preacher who has done you so much good, and who has told you so much truth, and you can't believe that this guy could be wrong when he tells you that you can be lost again tomorrow. You know some wonderful teacher of the Word of God who tells you that if you do not have water baptism, or you do not have the Lord's Supper, or you do not have circumcision, and that teacher is so wonderful in prophecy, he makes the Word of God so alive and so illuminated, you can't believe that he could be wrong on that thing. The Word of God says, "Believe it. He can be wrong." The very people who can lead you right down to the very rivers of the water of life are the very people who can be so wrong as to undo all of your potential as a believer. Your authority is the Word of God. Do not add anybody or anything to that authority.

Dr. John E. Danish, 1977
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