

Adam's Natural Headship/Our Sin in Adam

 Romans 5:12-14

 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

 November 16, 2014

 fbgbible.org

 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Today we come to Romans 5:12, a verse that is well-known for several reasons. First, it is well-known to be a *crux interpretum*. That means that when interpreters come to Romans 5:12 they find themselves at a crossroads. They have to decide which way they are going to go and it is a very difficult decision because the way they decide to go has a number of consequences. Did Adam sin as the representative of the human race and we as the human race are condemned for his sin? If that is so, how does it affect your understanding of God's justice? Did Adam sin and we followed his example by personal sin and are therefore condemned for our own sin? How is Romans 5:12 to be understood?

Second, Romans 5:12 is well-known as the watershed of theology. A watershed, geographically speaking, is an area of land where all the water that is under it, drains off and goes to the same place. The most famous watershed in the United States is the Continental Divide because ultimately if a drop of rain falls on the West of that divide it will end up in the Pacific Ocean whereas if the drop falls on the East of that divide it will end up in the Atlantic Ocean (including the concept of the Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea). Romans 5:12 is a theological watershed because how you interpret Romans 5:12 determines the direction your theology will ultimately go. For example, Covenant Theology exclusively maintains that Adam sinned as the legal representative of the human race such that we are condemned because Adam's sin is legally imputed to us. However, if this is true how does God remain just? Also, if this is true then how is Jesus Christ not legally condemned along with the human race and at the same time not cut off from the human race? Another teaching of covenant theology is that God individually creates each human soul. However, if this is true then how is God not charged with creating a sinful soul by joining it with a sinful nature? These are problems that you get into theologically once you accept the premise of covenant theology that Adam was acting as the legal representative of the human race and his sin was imputed to mankind. Another example is Arminianism. Arminianism holds that God's grace removes the guilt of Adam's original sin so that each individual is condemned only when he commits his own personal sin. However, this is problematic because the passage is saying that all men are condemned for "one sin" and not billions of sins. In the end this is a watershed theologically and how it all works out is a fascinating study that is vital to truly understanding justification in the

one man Jesus Christ. From this you want to learn that all the doctrines of Scripture hang together and since our God is a coherent thinker then all of the doctrines of Scripture hang together in a coherent way and we want to think coherently and have a theology that makes sense and I think that theology is Dispensationalism and while some dispensationalists have held to the Representative View as Covenant Theology, it is inconsistent, and the correct view is Adam's Natural Headship, also known as the Seminal or Augustinian view.

So Romans 5:12 is a *crux interpretum*, which means you find yourself at a very difficult crossroads in terms of interpreting it and understanding it and it is also a watershed, which means your interpretation ultimately determines the direction your theology will go.

Looking at Romans 5:12-21 as a unit we want to preface everything by saying that verse 18 and 16 and 14 contain the core ideas of the passage. Verse 18 says, **So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men.** Note that verse 18 says there is a *similarity* between two acts; the act of condemnation and the act of justification. So we are to lay these side by side and see that they are similar. Then verse 16 gives another idea. Verse 16 says, **The gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification.** Note that verse 16 says there is a *difference* between condemnation and justification. So as we lay these side by side we are also to see that there are differences. But the passage isn't just talking about similarities and differences between condemnation and justification. The passage is also about similarities and differences between two men. Note that verse 14 says **Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come.** Note that Adam is a type of Christ. So two men are also similar and different in these verses. The passage shows similarities and differences between two acts; condemnation and justification and two men; Adam and Christ.

Romans 5:12-21 is therefore a summary of the two sections we have covered so far in Romans. Condemnation in Adam taught in Romans 1:18-3:20 and Justification in Christ taught in Romans 3:21-5:11. Romans 5:12 brings the two sections together as a conclusion and shows that there are similarities and differences.

Let's make some observations before we dig into the exposition. First, the passage begins with Adam and ends with Christ. Note that verse 12 describes Adam who brought sin and death. "Therefore just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—" That's the bad news. But the passage ends with the good news. Note that verse 21 describes Jesus Christ who brought grace and righteousness. "even so grace would reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." So the passage begins with the bad news of Adam and ends with the good news of Christ. This is the same order Paul followed in the preceding chapters.

Second, the passage contains six contrasts. In verses 14-15 Adam is contrasted with Christ. In verse 19 disobedience is contrasted with obedience. In verse 21 sin is contrasted with righteousness. In verse 20 Law is contrasted with grace. In verse 16 condemnation is contrasted with justification. In verse 21 death is contrasted with life. So the passage contains six contrasts.

Third, the passage contains four kings. In verse 21 sin reigned. In verses 14 and 17 death reigned. In verse 21 grace reigned. And in verse 17 those who receive grace will reign. So there are four kings in the passage; sin, death, grace and us!

Fourth, the passage compares Christ's work with Adam's work to show that Christ's work is as far reaching as Adam's work. It does this three times by using the expression "even so." In verse 18 we read, "as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, *even so* through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men. In verse 19 we read, "as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, *even so* through the obedience of the One the many will be made righteous." And in verse 21 we read, "as sin reigned in death, *even so* grace would reign through righteousness..." The point of the "even so" expression is to compare Christ's work with Adam's work and show that Christ's work is as far reaching as Adam's work.

Fifth, however, the passage contrasts Christ's work with Adam's work showing that Christ's work is much farther reaching than Adam's work. It does this two times by using the "much more" argument and once by the words "abounded all the more." In verse 15 we read, "But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, *much more* did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many." In verse 17 we read, "For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ." And in verse 20 we read, "The Law came in so that the transgression would increase; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more." The expressions much more and grace abounded all the more contrast Christ's work with Adam's work to show that Christ's work is much farther reaching than Adam's work.

Having made five introductory observations we can summarize by saying the passage begins with Adam and ends with Christ, shows that Christ's work goes as deep as and even much deeper than Adam's work, contains six contrasts and four kings.

As far as an outline, these verses have been combed by many interpreters and thousands of pages have been written on them so what I will give you as far as a working outline is neither unique, nor is it definitive, but it is a working outline. 5:12 discusses the entrance of sin and death into the world through one man and how death spread to all men, because all sinned. 5:13-17 is a parenthetical section giving evidence that all participated in the sin of Adam and are thereby justly condemned but Christ's work went much farther than Adam's work and

supplied the gift of justification. 5:18-21 Paul picks up where he left off in 5:12 and shows that Christ's work goes as far as Adam's work and again, even farther so that grace reigns through Jesus Christ.

Now how this all begins in Romans 5:12 is most peculiar. Paul says, **Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned**—Two observations. First, note the dashed line at the end of verse 12. What does the dashed line mean? It means Paul suddenly broke off his train of thought.¹ There is actually a name for this phenomena; it's called *aposiopesis*. We see God use *aposiopesis* in Genesis 3:22. In that context it was after the Fall when the LORD God kicked man out of the garden and said, "and now, he might stretch out his hand, and take also from the tree of life, and eat, and live forever"--, end of thought. God just stops and the thought is never completed. For some reason or another God did not continue. Most literary students think that the author who does this is too overwhelmed by the sense of dread or emotion to finish the thought. We're not told but Rom 5:12 starts off the thought but suddenly breaks off from the thought and doesn't return to it until verse 18. Second, note the **Therefore**, and then the obvious beginning of a comparison, **just as through one man sin entered the world**. The **therefore** is *δια τουτο* in the Greek and I would translate it "For this reason" or "because of this." But that leaves us wondering, because of what? Why did sin enter the world through one man? The answer is in the previous context. Because we have been justified and reconciled in one man that is why sin entered the world through one man. What Paul is encouraging us by this cause-effect to do is to think about God's plan for history starting with Christ and His work and from there deriving the rest of the plan. In other words, though we can't put God's thinking in a sequence we are prompted to think from the grammar that God did not plan history in a sequence, as you or I might plan, but God started with Christ and planned back to Adam. What this forces us to do is recognize that Christ is the central feature of God's plan and everything else was planned around Him. So why did sin and condemnation enter the world through the one man Adam? Because righteousness and justification were to enter the world through the one man Christ.

Now we are told here that **through one man sin entered into the world** and who was that one man? We don't have to go too far to find out who that one man is. Verse 14 tells us the one man was **Adam**. What can we say about **Adam** from Paul's usage of **Adam**? First, we can say that Paul believed **Adam** was just as literal a person as the two other people in this passage; Moses and Christ. However, a literal **Adam** does not exhaust **Adam**. Second, **Adam** can mean an individual "man" but can also mean collective "mankind," including man and woman. This causes us to pause because **Adam** as the first man was also at the same time mankind including the woman who was created out of him. This observation of Adam as both man and mankind is so powerful that I think it drives you to the proper interpretation of the passage, namely, that whatever the one man did mankind did. Why? Because Adam is man and mankind when he sinned. This in essence is what Paul means at the end of the verse by the strange expression, **because all sinned**. How is it that all sinned? Is this just saying all committed personal sin? Is this saying all followed in the example of Adam's sin? No, this is saying all sinned in Adam. Somehow all of us participated in Adam's sin.

This is what is known as Adam's Natural Headship view.² Augustus Strong, who wrote in the late 1800's has given a stupendous exegesis of this passage and he explains this view in this way, "It holds that God imputes the sin of Adam immediately to all his posterity, in virtue of that organic unity of mankind by which the whole race at the time of Adam's transgression existed, not individually, but seminally, in him as its head. The total life of humanity was then in Adam; the race as yet had its being only in him. Its essence was not yet individualized; its forces were not yet distributed; the powers which now exist in separate men were then unified and localized in Adam; Adam's will was yet the will of the species. In Adam's free act, the will of the race revolted from God and the nature of the race corrupted itself...Adam's sin is imputed to us immediately, therefore, not as something foreign to us, but because it is ours—we and all other men having existed as one moral person or one moral whole, in him, and, as the result of that transgression, possessing a nature destitute of love to God and prone to evil. In Rom. 5:12—"death passed unto all men...because all sinned in Adam their natural head."³ What this means then is that we are not charged for a sin we did not commit. We are charged for a sin that we did commit. It was a sin committed in Adam. So the sin of Adam was both a personal sin and race-wide sin. This is possible because Adam was both a person and the race at that time. Indeed that is what Adam means.

To see an illustration of this turn to Heb 7:9. This is an example that confirms that God looks at man in such a way that what one does can at the same time be what someone later in his line is considered as doing, not legally but actually. Now in this context the author of Hebrews is arguing that the priesthood of Melchizedek is greater than the priesthood of Levi. The way he argues is to show that Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek and even Levi, who receives tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. Therefore Melchizedek who received tithes is greater than Levi who received tithes. As the author says, "And, so to speak, through Abraham even Levi, who received tithes, paid tithes, ¹⁰for he was still in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him." So Levi, though he did not personally, consciously pay the tithes, he did pay them in Abraham. And therefore we have another passage that shows that one in a lineage is one with the head of that lineage. In the same way, Adam's Natural Headship is saying that we were one with the head of the human race Adam and therefore what he did we did in his loins, so to speak. Therefore we are held accountable not for what he did but for what we did in Him.

This is very different from the Representative View.⁴ It's the Representative View that states that Adam was legal representative of the human race only and it was Adam's sin that God reckoned to us that makes us condemned. In other words, we are condemned for what Adam did. This idea has always been criticized by the most natural objection; namely, how can God remain just and condemn us for the sin of Adam? I agree with this criticism and I find it a biblical criticism. God never holds someone responsible for the sin of another. That idea is contrary to the picture of God that we get from the Bible. It would be unjust of God to hold you or me accountable for someone else's sin even though many theologians preach and teach that He does. Ezekiel 18 addresses this false idea which has been so prevalent in history that during the OT times it became proverbial in Israel. But the Lord said in Ezek 18, "you are no longer going to use this proverb in Israel anymore." "Behold, all souls are Mine; the soul of the father as well as the soul of the son is Mine. The soul who sins will die." The proverb was that the son

died because of the sins of the father. God says, no, the soul who sins will die and if the son turns from the sins of the father then the son will live. So no one, and I repeat, no one, is ever held responsible for someone else's sin. That is why the Representative View is error, terrible error, despite all the illustrations people use to project this idea. You'll hear people say it's like the President and the American people. The President represents the American people and therefore whatever the President does is attributed to you. That idea is easy to understand but that idea is not taught by the Bible with respect to Adam and the human race. That idea is contrary to what the Bible teaches and it is an assault on the justice of God. Strong says it this way, "We are not sinners simply because God regards and treats us as such, but God regards us as sinners because we are sinners."⁵ His point is that we are sinners because we sinned in Adam. Adam was acting both as a man and as mankind and therefore it was a personal sin as well as a race-wide sin. So we can't blame Adam. It's not Adam's fault. It's all of our fault, including Adam.

So we have in Romans 5:12 Adam's Natural Headship. Natural because the whole human race is naturally in Adam and Headship because Adam was the head from whom all came. And in this view we are condemned not for Adam's sin but for our sin in Adam. We actively participated in the one sin of Adam. Note it is one sin that brought the whole race of men into condemnation, not billions of sins. Verse 18, it was "one transgression," not billions, which resulted in condemnation to all men. But if it is only "one transgression" and God doesn't condemn us for another's sin then it can only be that we all participated in the "one transgression." There is no other viable solution.

We see this also in Romans 5:12 that through the **one man sin entered into the world** and we want to make a number of very important observations. First, observe that there must have been a time when there was no sin in the world. If there was a time when **sin entered into the world** then there was a time when there was no sin in the world. Obviously the world then was created without sin and so sin is not normal. It is an abnormal addition to the world. The world was once without sin. So the world that we now live in is not a normal world. A normal world would be a world without sin and that world is described in Gen 1-2. Gen 3 describes the Fall and when **through one man sin entered the world**. Second, one might wonder why the text does not say by one woman sin entered the world. The reason is because while the woman did sin before the man, the woman was made out of the man and therefore sin is viewed by God as having entered through the one man and not the one woman. There's a side point here and that is that everything in this passage is looking at the situation from God's point of view, not man's. You may not have ever viewed sin and man from this point of view but this is God's way of viewing the world. Third, the word **sin** here is articular and therefore means it is the sin *par excellence*. That means that no other sin has the qualities of this original sin. This sin alone was both the personal sin of Adam and the collective sin of mankind in Adam. Therefore this sin stands above all others. It alone introduced sin and all its effects into the world. Fourth, by **world** Paul means the realm of humanity.⁶ Sin entered the realm of humanity through the Fall of the one man Adam in Gen 3. Sin had already **entered into** the realm of angels sometime before the Fall of Adam. In my estimation between Gen 2 and 3. Sometime during this

period Satan committed the first sin and then a third of the angels were led astray by him and they fell. In other words, they did not fall when Satan fell. Each angel had to fall individually by committing personal sin. Angels can't commit collective sin because angels are individual creations. Humans on the other hand are created in the one man Adam and so collective sin becomes a possibility. Thus, when Adam sinned we sinned in Adam and that is what brought sin into the realm of humanity. Fifth, observe that Satan could not bring sin into the realm of humanity. Satan therefore cannot be blamed for the problems of the human race. Sometimes people blame Satan. This is incorrect. Sin came in by **one man** not one angel. Sixth, observe that God did not bring sin into the realm of humanity. Sometimes people blame God. God cannot be blamed for all the problems of the world. God created everything very good. There was nothing wrong when the creation left His fingertips. God, therefore cannot be blamed. Seventh, Adam cannot be blamed for bringing sin into the world. Yes, Adam did sin but Adam did not sin alone, we were all in the **one man** Adam and therefore the sin is the fault of us all. Therefore the blame for all the problems of the world lies with ourselves. It simply will not suffice to blame God, Satan or Adam. It will only suffice to blame ourselves. We sinned in Adam and brought into the world all the problems.

But note in verse 12 that **sin** is not all that entered into the world on that day. On that day something else came into the world of humanity, **and death through sin**. What is meant by **death**? What kind of death? Both spiritual and physical death are meant. Sometimes it is argued by Christians that hold to some form of evolution that only spiritual death is in view here and that this verse cannot be used to show that death came into the world with Adam but death preceded Adam. The problem with that view is that there are three evidences that physical death is included in what Paul said. First, in verse 14 Paul says, "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses." This can only reasonably be understood as physical death. Paul is giving evidence that all men sinned in Adam and the evidence is that death reigned in the period prior to the giving of the Law of Moses. Second, Gen 3:19 makes clear that physical death began at the Fall. God says there, "By the sweat of your face You will eat bread, Till you return to the ground, Because from it you were taken; For you are dust, and to dust you shall return." If dust returning to dust is not a description of physical death I don't know what is! Third, it has been almost universal in both Jewish and Christian thought to attribute physical death to the one man's sin. So the **death** that entered in verse 12 includes physical death. However, it is not physical only, it is also spiritual death. That spiritual death is also meant is shown by verse 18, "So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men." Since the justification of life refers to spiritual life in contrast to the spiritual death we were residing in because of sin then spiritual death must be included. Also note verse 21 which evidences that spiritual death is included, "so that, as sin reigned in death, even so grace would reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord" Since eternal life is spiritual and stands in opposition to death then the death must also be spiritual. So I hold that by **death** in Romans 5:12 Paul means both physical and spiritual death. Strong agrees saying, "By Adam's act, physical and spiritual death passed upon all men, because all sinned. φ = because, on the ground of the fact that, for the reason that, all sinned. πάντες = all, without exception, infants included, as

verse 14 teaches.⁷⁷ His point about infants is made from verse 14 by the fact that if death reigned from Adam to Moses then we must conclude that infants died too. Today infants still die. For what reason do infants die if they have no sin? The fact is that infants die because they did participate in the one sin of Adam. That is why they are subject to death. If they didn't participate in the one sin of Adam then why are they subject to death? It cannot be because they have committed some other personal and conscious sin because infants don't have any personal, conscious sin. If they die without committing some sin then death must be normal and that is a denial of Romans 5:12, that death entered through sin. So the only satisfying explanation is Paul's explanation, that all sinned in the one man Adam, including infants, it was a race-wide sin in addition to being a personal sin.

Finally note the strange expression, **and so death spread to all men**. The Greek word translated **spread** is *διηλθεν* from *διερχομαι* and means "to pass through." In this case what it means is that the sin of Adam permeated Adam's race because the personal sin was also a race-wide sin. That again is why this sin is the sin *par excellence*. And this is why all men are subject to **death**. **Death** is not normal but it was brought in by the one man Adam and **spread to all men** because **all men** were in Adam. If the thought crosses your mind that this is unfair, remember that God constructed it this way because justification is by the one man Jesus Christ. So if it is unfair for God to look at the whole human race as sinning in the one man Adam then it is equally unfair for God to make justification of life available in the one man Jesus Christ. If you reject the Fall you reject the Cross.

Verse 13 is the beginning of the parenthetical explanation. Here he wants to first prove that all men did in fact sin and that this is the cause of our death. We cannot blame anyone else. He says, **for until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come**. He's looking at a period of time and that time is from Adam until Moses, from Adam until the Law was given through Moses. This period was from Creation, about 4004BC, to Mt Sinai in 1447BC. So it's a period of about 2,500 years. During the first 2,500 years of history **death reigned**. The evidence that all men sinned is that all those men died. Gen 5 and 11 give the accounts of how **death reigned**. In Gen 5 it says "all the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died...all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died...all the days of Enosh were nine hundred and five years, and he died...all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and ten years, and he died...all the days of Mahalel were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died...all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty-two years and he died" and this story repeats itself except in the case of Enoch, who we are told enigmatically, walked with God and was not, for God took Him. But the point of the repetition in Gen 5 is to impress upon us that death reigned during the period before the Flood. Then in Gen 11 it says that Haran died and Terah died and that brings you to Abraham. Then everyone knows that Abraham died and Isaac died and Jacob died and the twelve sons of Jacob died and four generations of Israel died in Egypt and the point is that everyone was dying. That is what it means to say **death reigned**. **Death** was king!

And yet verse 13 is prompting us to ask, "How could that be if **sin is not imputed when there is no law** and during that period there was no law? How could they be dying since they lived before the Law of Moses? How could they have sin from breaking the Law of Moses imputed to them? The answer is they couldn't. So they must have broken another law and that sin was imputed to them by their direct association with the actual sin. What other law did all those men break? They broke the only law that God had given, the law of Gen 2:17, eating the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, "in the day you eat from it you will surely die." That is why all those men were dying. They ate of that tree. The sin was imputed to them, it was a real imputation because of a real participation in Adam. If they didn't eat of it then they could not have been dying because death is the penalty for sin. Therefore they had to eat of it. How did they eat of it? They ate of it in Adam, therefore their condemnation is just and they died. There is no other plausible explanation.

As Paul says in verse 14 another way, **Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam.** The word **likeness** means "resembling." They did not sin a sin resembling Adam's sin. They actually sinned Adam's sin. Strong says, "Had the sin by which death came upon them been one *like* Adam's, there would have been as many sins, to be the cause of death and to account for it, as there were individuals. Death would have come into the world through millions of men, and not "through one man" (verse 12), and judgment would have come upon all men to condemnation through millions of trespasses, and not "through one trespass" (v. 18). The object, then, of the parenthetical digression in verses 13 and 14 is to prevent the reader from supposing, from the statement that "all men sinned," that the individual transgressions of all men are meant, and to make it clear that only the one first sin of the one first man is intended." We have sinned in Him. "Those who died before Moses must have violated some law. The Mosaic law, and the law of conscience, have been ruled out of the case. These persons must, therefore, have sinned against the commandment in Eden, the probationary statute; and their sin was not *similar* (μοίως) to Adam's, but Adam's *identical* sin, the very same sin numerically of the "one man."" Granted, "They did not, in their own persons and consciously, sin as Adam did; yet in Adam, and in the nature common to him and them, they sinned and fell... They did not sin *like* Adam, but they "sinned *in* him, and fell *with* him, in that first transgression..."⁸

In conclusion, in Romans 5:12, because justification entered by the act of the one man Jesus Christ sin entered the realm of humanity through the one man Adam, and not only did sin enter but death, both spiritual and physical through sin because all participated in the sin of the one man Adam. In verse 13, this must be because prior to the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. And yet, verse 14, death was king in that period even over those who did not sin in a way that resembled Adam's sin, the only explanation then being that they sinned the identical sin of Adam, they sinned in Him. So we are taught that we can never blame Satan for our plight, we can never blame Adam for our difficulties, we can only blame ourselves because God does not hold us accountable for another's sin. God is just and when the one man Adam was mankind he sinned and we sinned in him and we are thus condemned. This sin is then passed on to the offspring of each descendant from father to the child.⁹ But Jesus Christ had no human father but was conceived by the Holy Spirit

and yet is able to remain in touch with the human race because born of Mary. Therefore the true Dispensational view is that of Adam's Natural Headship which is the only view that correctly protects all these vital points of doctrine.

¹ See explanation and other examples in Roy Zuck, *Basic Bible Interpretation*, p 153.

² Also known as the Augustinian View because attributed in origin to Augustine.

³ Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), 619–620.

⁴ Also known as the Federal View. This view is part and parcel of the covenant of works and grace as espoused by Covenant Theology and attributed to Cocceius.

⁵ Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), 614.

⁶ Cf BDAG, *κοσμος* meaning 6.

⁷ Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), 626.

⁸ Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology* (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1907), 626.

⁹ This is traducianism in opposition to creationism. I reject direct creation of the human soul by God and hold that He only did that in the case of the one man Adam and henceforth through procreation of a father and mother by which the human soul is derived and transmitted.