

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Romans - The Gospel of God

Romans 5:12-21

Rev. Jeff Stivason, Ph.D.

February 24, 2023

Transcriber’s Note: *Jeff draws a picture on the board of Don Maurer in a Charlie Brown Halloween costume with pumpkins.*

Jeff: Before you lead us into prayer I thought it would be appropriate to share it now so that our minds cannot be distracted and so that we can pray more informed. I want you to know that I’ve done a little digging. *(Don plays dramatic music. Laughter)* It’s a little late, but it’ll do. *(More music. Laughter)* I’ve done a little digging on Don, because one of the things—well, I’m just going to say it.

Ted Wood: It’s got to be hard.

Jeff: Yes, it has been, because before we went into COVID Don was just vicious—you know, just really vicious. *(Laughter)* And then we got into COVID and I went to a therapist and got some relief counseling. *(Laughter)* And then it came out, and he’s just been kind of nettling at me, you know; he’s wanting it, wanting it. And here I am; I find myself back in full swing.

Okay. So I need to tell you men that I did a little digging last night. And I found out that Don used to be called “Don the Trickster.”

Ted: All along, huh?

Jeff: Yeah. Now there’s a little story behind this, but I’m not going to make it long; I’m going to make it short. One Halloween Don got his comeuppance. *(Don plays the opening notes of the theme song from “The Twilight Zone.” Laughter)* You’ll immediately notice which one is Don because Don made his own costume. But this is live footage about a Halloween night in Don’s neighborhood. “I gotta rock; I gotta rock.” *(Laughter)* That’s what his neighborhood gave him for Halloween. *(Laughter)* *(Don sings:*

“I gotta rock. I got an I-I-island.” That’s all I want to say. *(Laughter)* Don, lead us into prayer. *(Laughter)*

Don Maurer: Well, Jeff just demonstrated the Bob Dylan principle: “Everybody must get stoned.” *(Laughter)*

Jeff: All right. *(Music)* Our gracious Father in heaven, we thank You for the day that You’ve provided, and for the Lord Jesus Christ and for all of the benefits that we possess in Him. We thank You, Father, for the fellowship that You have given us. And Father, thank You for giving us a variety in that fellowship—those who are older in Christ, those who are younger. Thank You, Father, for giving us models to follow. Thank You for giving us folks to mentor. Father, we ask now that You’ll bless us as we gather together in this group. Lord, as we find ourselves in Your word we pray that You will use it to shape us and to strengthen and mold us.

And Father, as we have heard about the things that You’ve done in our midst in the lives of men here, we ask that You’ll hear our praise, first of all for Matt. We thank You, Lord, that You have blessed him not only with previous work but also with new work, and that so quickly, and so close to home so that he can travel and still remain in the Pittsburgh area and center his family here, and be with us at Brave Men. Father, thank

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

You for answering that prayer. Lord, we just pray that You’ll continue to bless his family and strengthen and encourage them.

Father, we give You thanks that Sig and Bruce had such a good time together. And we pray for Bruce, continuing to offer him up as well as his wife to You, asking that You’ll pour out every blessing upon Your faithful servant.

Father, we also pray for Gary and are thankful for him. But as we find that he is about to come to the end of his job we also lift him up to you. We pray that You would grant him further work. And Lord, we pray that You would bring along a company or a business that would be suited to him, and that his gifts would be suited to them. And Father, we pray that You’ll bring about a match not just in terms of skill set, but in terms of attitude and ideals. And Lord, we just ask that Your hand would be upon him as he searches.

Father, be with us as we continue to work together through Your word. We ask that Your blessing would be upon us, Lord. Be with other ministries. We think about the gathering in Jumonville tonight and this weekend and pray your blessing upon them as well. Father, we ask now that You will do this for Christ’s sake and His glory, and we ask it in His name. Amen.

Brave Men: Amen.

Jeff: All right. If I’m remembering correctly, the last time we were together we did not finish looking at some of this in—

Ted: You said that you would continue a discussion about something.

Jeff: Yes, I think I was. I think that before I pick up with Romans it might be best to just do that. I was just going to finish the last part, but I think you’re right; it might be good just to do that. And this is going to be fairly short, unless you guys have work that you would like to do on it. I just thought that maybe we would talk a little bit about the revival. You know, we have this Asbury revival going on. I guess that as of Thursday the school brought it to an end. Is that correct? I think they closed down the services to the public; I think that’s what they said.

And I wasn’t following it a lot. But if you were following some of the professors, Craig Keener was one of those professors who was saying, “Look, you know, this is wonderful. And we also need to focus on what it is that we do here.” So there was that desire to get back to doing what they were doing, and not hold on to the revival as if it were their own enacted thing.

The President’s address that I heard I think represented that pretty well. One of the things that he said in that address to the public and to the students was “This isn’t our revival. And we don’t want to hold on to it as if it were our property. And so we don’t believe that we’re going to squelch the revival by getting back to classes and sort of limiting access to our building, limiting that access to only the student body.”

So maybe we can talk about that a little bit as we go along, because Jonathan Edwards actually believed that revival could be suppressed or even dampened to the point that it was extinguished. And he had a situation like that as a result of a suicide that took place in the town. And I think that suicide was even a relation of his. So the question is, what can dampen it? What can put it asunder? Can we answer that question?—that sort of thing.

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

But I think that before we get into that, maybe it might be a good idea for us to answer the question: What is a true revival? How do we understand a true revival? Now one of the things that I said to you was, I said there is a difference between an awakening and a revival. When we think about an awakening we think about that which happens in the general public, outside of the church. In other words, there’s an awakening to the fact that we are sinners and need something that we can’t provide ourselves; that’s the idea. So there’s an awakening that happens as part of a revival. In other words, what was happening in the surrounding community among the unchurched in Asbury? That would be a good question to ask.

Then *revival* is different from what we might call *revivalism*. In other words, revivalism is a technique. Revivalism may be what we think of with Charles Finney. And we think about his emotional appeals back in the second Great Awakening. And he had means to agitate people, to create in them an emotional response.

One of those things was what was called the sinner’s bench, or the mourner’s bench, or the anxious bench, as it was called. And the anxious bench is where people would go and they would sit. And then you would speak to them directly. And he would try to work them up. He would try to create an emotional response to the things that he was saying.

And if you actually read his book on revivals, he believed that God had given to us means to apply that would bring about revival. And if you enlisted those means then revival would come about. In other words, revival was not the work of the Spirit; it was the employment of means. And if you didn’t have a revival coming about you obviously didn’t employ the means correctly.

Now that’s what’s called a revivalism. And so for instance if you drive by a church, and it says, “Revival a month from now: March 25th,” that mindset is a revivalism. We’re going to have a revival at the end of March, okay?

So there’s awakening which happens in the community. There’s revivalism, which says that if we apply the right means then we’ll get the right result. And then there’s revival. And revival is what happens when the Spirit of God is poured out upon His church, and the church revives.

And the Old Testament calls for that. The Psalmists call out: “*Revive us again.*” That’s the idea. So how can we tell what revival is? Well, I think Jonathan Edwards was a key figure in the first Great Awakening in America.

This is a good thing for us to keep in mind: that there were in our country two great awakenings. Some see a third awakening, but there were at least two Great Awakenings. The first was in the early 1700s. And one of the great revivals, what we call the first Great Awakening, was in 1740.

And then there were the Second Great Awakening revivals. And the Second Great Awakening revivals were I think in part revival and revivalism. And I think you have to keep that in mind when we think about the Second Great Awakening because Charles Grandison Finney was part of those revivals, and there were other figures.

But in both of those we had abuses. In both the First Great Awakening and the Second Great Awakening there were abuses that you had to sort of work through. The reason why Jonathan Edwards wrote some of the books he wrote was because he was trying to work through some of the abuses.

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

You know, in the Second Great Awakening you might go out to the Cambridge revivals in Kentucky and find people barking like dogs around the tree. It was just part of the abuse that was happening as part of the revival. So one of the things that Edwards was doing in that first Great Awakening was that he was trying to work through some of these abuses and asked, according to the Scriptures, what constitutes a genuine revival?

And so in 1741 he wrote a book called *The Distinguishing Marks of the Work of the Spirit of God*. And he basically gave five distinguishing marks where one could say that if these five marks are present, then likely a revival is present.

Now I’m going to go through those with you; I just want to give you a couple of them. I’ll say a little bit more about some than others. But you can feel free to engage on any of them and ask questions or make comments; I’m totally open to that.

But one thing I would say to you is this. I would say to you that when you think about the revival, any revival, like I said, there are going to be balanced figures like Jonathan Edwards. But then there are going to be figures on either side.

I want you to think about this for just a minute. There were two figures in Edwards’ time. One was a guy by the name of Davenport. Davenport was a guy that was to one extreme. He was to the extreme that didn’t want any kind of revival at all. And then there was Chauncey. And Chauncey wanted all kinds of excesses—a pour-it-on kind of thing.

And the thing that I would say to you is that regardless of where the revival is and what’s happening, and what you know about the place and so on, I think that we have to be a little bit more open and balanced. For instance I want you to think about this for just a minute.

This is what we’ve been praying for in this country in a sense. We’ve been praying for God to manifest Himself in the life of this country because things have been getting so bad. So regardless of where you are on the theological spectrum, and where you think Asbury is on the theological spectrum, and how, for instance, if you watched the service that led to this revival—regardless of what views you have of it, I would just encourage you to be as open and as balanced as you possibly can be as you think about these things.

So the first one is: *Jesus is exalted*. That’s the first sign that Edwards gives: Jesus is exalted. Now when you think about that, I would say that when you think about that first sign, I would say that it has to be the Jesus of Scripture. In other words it can’t simply be the name Jesus with someone else’s definition attached to that name. In other words, I don’t think you can have somebody claiming revival and saying, “We worship this Jesus. But this Jesus is just a spiritually sensitive prophet, a man; nothing more.”

That’s not what the Scriptures say about Jesus. I think you’ve got to be really careful with the name Jesus today because I think it is bandied about by all kinds of groups. And I think that if Jesus is exalted it has to be the Jesus of Scripture. That’s a pretty basic one, but I think an important one. And I don’t think that we’re probably going to have too much disagreement there.

The second sign is: *The Holy Spirit acts against the influence of Satan’s kingdom by preaching sin and repentance*. Now let’s just stop and think about that for just a minute, okay? That means that there is an influence going on by the church. And that influence is carried out through preaching the gospel. And Edwards says specifically that it’s by preaching sin and repentance.

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Now why is he saying that? Well one of the reasons he’s saying that is because he’s conscious of the fact that awakening comes as a result of preaching sin and repentance. In other words, when the world around us hears about sin they become guilty; they become agitated in their conscience. And they need to know what to do about it, and that’s to repent.

Now I don’t know about you. But there’s a sense in which I think that our world lacks a sense of sin. There’s nowhere in the world that’s amoral, in the sense that it doesn’t have a moral code. Our world has a moral code, right? It may not be our moral code, but they have a moral code. But what they need to be convicted of is that their moral code is wrong when you put it alongside of the law of God. God’s moral code shows us that their moral code is wrong and that they need to repent of that.

And that comes through preaching. I don’t know about you, but how many of you watched the first revival that led to the revival at Asbury? Did you watch that? One of the things that led to that was basically a kind of an admission of sin and a call to repentance, and a call to join him. And I thought to myself, that second sign was manifest. Apparently when he did that the Holy Spirit brought conviction and people repented of their sins. So pick the sign. Jesus was being exalted in that message—the first one—as the only Savior.

Okay, here are some signs that follow from what we were just talking about. First of all, when you preach sin and repentance, Edwards says that you are sensitive to the dreadful nature of sin. In other words, you recognize that you have sin in you, that there is a sin nature in you that needs to be dealt with. Secondly there’s a sensitivity to God’s holy wrath and judgment for sin. Third, there’s a personal awareness of one’s own miserable condition. And fourth, people become aware of God’s pity and help in Christ.

Now let me just say this. All that is in the Westminster Confession. I become deeply aware of my sin. I apprehend the mercy offered to me in Christ. And I turn from my sin and endeavor to follow after Christ with new obedience. That’s all that is. Well, we’ll leave that side. Is there anything else you want to talk about thus far? Yes, Don?

Don Bishop: When you talked about the call to repentance of sin, the modern pastor or evangelist says, “Ask God to forgive you for the things you’ve done.” That’s okay, but it’s the root that we have to deal with.

Jeff: Yeah.

Don: It’s not just things we have done.

Jeff: It’s that you are a sinner.

Don: By nature we are sinners.

Jeff: Yes; that’s right.

Don: And some just omit that.

Jeff: Yes, that’s right.

David Miller: I may be mistaken, but it seems to me that once the revival started they stopped preaching.

Jeff: And they just left the scene?

David: Yes. For days and days they just seemed to go ahead and join and sing.

Jeff: And that was troublesome to me as well. But it seemed like that initial call to repentance faded. I don’t know; all I saw was the singing and the ongoing kind of experiential sort of “let’s be led in worship” kind of thing; that’s all I saw. So I didn’t

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

know if that was the only preaching that was there. But that’s the only preaching I saw; you’re right. And if that’s the case, that’s a problem.

Matt Reichart: When they preached, were they singing truth?

Jeff: I don’t know; I have no idea. There’s a sense in which the student body president was conducting interviews. But you only saw footage. Some of it seemed to be the same footage. And they were saying that they didn’t want media coverage. So I’m not sure; I just don’t know what to make of it; I don’t know the answer to that.

Don Maurer: I just want to go back to what Don was saying. The Westminster Confession says that *“every sin, both original and actual, being a transgression of the holy law of God,”* deserves God’s curse.

Jeff: Yeah.

Don: So it’s not enough just to repent of what we’ve done, but who we are.

Jeff: Yeah; that’s right.

Ron Baling: On the other hand, we hear our consciences, so to speak, on a daily basis. There are people, even in my church, who are Christian in name only. We see people who are coming to this. This is sort of new to them, so they are overwhelmed by it, so I can see this happening. Maybe that’s critical of them, maybe not.

Jeff: Yeah.

Gary Craig: I do know that they did stop scheduled speakers. They were scheduled to come in and talk. They just happened to come in right in the middle of it and have some kind of discussion.

Jeff: They stopped that, you said?

Gary: They did stop the scheduled speakers. So the scheduled speakers came in and they spoke. And then—

Jeff: You said they stopped that, though?

Gary: They did not stop the scheduled speakers.

Jeff: They did not stop the scheduled speakers. I see; got ya. Okay.

Gary: It wasn’t some preacher.

Jeff: Good; that’s good. Well then, the third sign is that *the Bible is exalted and held in high regard*. Edwards said that the Scriptures are God’s voice, and God’s voice is heard among the people. And when it is heard among the people it’s treated as such. You know, I think he even used the example of a parrot speaking, and people are saying that his voice is as God’s. People will look at the Scriptures as it is in truth, as it is the voice of God.

And that means the Scriptures in their entirety. And then #4: *sound doctrine is taught and promoted*. You know, this is one that I think is easy to stumble on, because when you think about this one, oftentimes people give sort of the “doctrine divides” speech. And so revival sort of brings out the affections of the heart. And so we can just kind of turn off the mind and forget about doctrine. And Edwards said, no, no, because genuine revival is always going to bring about a promotion of sound doctrine.

I think that’s something important for us to remember. It will be interesting to see what comes of the Asbury revival. It will be interesting to see if Jesus appears to be exalted. When you look at the body, at least there, there was a conviction of sin. Scripture is valued. Is sound doctrine promoted through this?

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

In other words, let me just say this to you. Let me give you this: love toward neighbor is promoted. That’s a good sign. Let me just say this. If this group comes out of this being more woke, and calling it love for neighbor, then we know that the fourth one is not being followed, and in one sense will really negate the whole thing.

So my own view is that our young people today are really influenced by our woke culture. And even our good kids are influenced by the woke culture because they can’t help but be. It’s just part of the culture that they’re living and breathing. Even home schooled kids can’t get away from it—not entirely. It’s a myth to think that they can, because they can’t.

So what will happen as a result of this and some of the current wokeness going on? Will these young people have enough courage now to stand up and call error “error,” and so on? That will be interesting.

Matt: What’s your definition of wokeness?

Jeff: What’s my definition of wokeness? Handily, that which is opposite of the Scriptures. But if you’re asking me for specifics, for instance, it’s this idea that transgenderism is okay, that LGBTQ is okay, and those kinds of things. It’s those kinds of issues that we see a lot of today that are being promoted as if they’re the moral agenda for today.

Ted: I would say that “woke” is the realization that there are oppressors and those who are being oppressed in civilization.

Jeff: You would say wokeness is that?

Ted: It comes out of that.

Jeff: Yeah, for sure.

Ted: You’re awakened to the realization that this is reality, that it is true, and that the problems in the society and the world are caused by this conflict between those who have the power and oppress others who don’t have the power. And then, if you’re coming out of a Christian tradition, you might point to the fact that Jesus was for the poor and the oppressed and the needy; this kind of thing. I mean, it seems that those are the lenses.

Jeff: Sure.

Ted: So we’re saying that the group you have written up on the board there is an oppressed group and has been badly treated, and that our need in society as humanity is to right the wrongs. I’m just saying that is the foundation; everything flows from that. And it has traction because you can see it. I mean, what they’re saying is actually true. There are oppressors and there are non-oppressors. Ted Wood would say that there is a deeper problem: that you who are preaching, you yourself, are an oppressor in some fashion. All of humanity wants to be righteous.

Jeff: That’s right.

Ted: And they describe others as unrighteous.

Jeff: Yep.

Ted: So this woke thing is just being into a whole psychology of humanity that we all share. “At least I’m not an Arminian; I’m a Calvinist.” The Arminian is a bad guy. I mean, what do you expect from Asbury Seminary or college or university? (*Laughter*) We look at it with prejudice, because they’re wrong. They’re not as righteous as I am. And so that’s what it all comes out of; it’s a great arrogance and self-righteousness. And all you have to do is have some kind of sense of your own failing. I mean, so that’s—

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Jeff: Yes, that’s a great summary of it; it really is.

Ted: Thanks.

Gary: I see that it’s like it is to be born again.

Jeff: Sure. There are many parallels.

Ted: Being woke? Absolutely. John Whorder is a professor at Columbia University, a leading linguist, and he has written a lot. You ought to watch his tapes. He’s a black man. He has never voted Republican in his life, and he probably never will. He’s a New York city liberal in the classic sense.

Jeff: Mm-hmm.

Ted: But his books have recently come out. He’s made a very strong case that this is the new religion. Woke is the new religion. It has all the characteristics; it’s a religious faith.

Jeff: Yes. And it can’t help but have that.

Don Bishop: It’s in Voddi Baucham’s book. It’s a religion. It parallels—

Ted: Well, that’s right. But when you get something like Whorder talking about it, he’s talking about it from the side of the left. He looks at this and sees this as a problem. And of course he is disqualified because he’s not the right kind of black man because he was educated in private schools.

Jeff: Right.

Ted: So it’s all a case of self-righteousness.

Yeah.

Ted: We’re all full of it.

Jeff: Yes?

Don Bishop: Going back to revival, we can’t determine that from one little—

Jeff: Yeah.

Don: We have to wait and see what happens.

Jeff: Yes; we’ll see what happens. All I’m saying is, let’s see what happens. Let’s be open-minded about it and see where it leads. We’ll see what happens. We’ll see the effects of it for sure.

Well I want us to jump back on target here, and let’s look at Romans 5:12-21. Romans 5:12-21 is really touching on some of the things that we’ve already looked at. Things that have already been said. Romans 5:12-21. Here we are going to get into thinking together about three things. Let me just give you a foretaste of it. We’re going to think about a question that asks: How is Adam’s fall my fall? How did all fall in Adam? Okay, then we’re going to ask: How is Adam’s guilt my guilt? And then we’re going to ask the question: How do I pass this along to my children? Those are the things that are going to be covered when we think about Romans 5:12-21. So let’s just read a little bit of romans 5:12-21 because we’re only going to begin to introduce it today. So I’m not going to read the whole thing in its entirety. Let me read you a bit of it though.

“Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned,—(for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given. But sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the One who was to come.)”

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Boy, there is a lot there. But let me just talk with you about the outline. So we’re going to think about an introduction. But these are basically going to be our three points: *the sin of Adam and the death of all, the sin of Adam and the condemnation of all, and the sin of Adam and the sin of all*. Those are going to be our basic three points.

I want us to think about introductory matters, though. I want us to think about some things that are really important when we think about this idea. Now I want to tell you right now that we have had the opportunity through the book of Romans to talk about some things that have been experiential—for instance really helpful things, like that whole progression of rejoicing in our sufferings. Why? Because all the way through the progression they lead to hope. And it’s been very practical and I think in some ways encouraging to us.

But you need to realize that for at least this part of Romans we need to put on our theological thinking caps because there is some work to be done here if we’re going to understand what’s being taught. And I’m not going to get into it too deeply unless you want to take us a little deeper. But I’m trying to give you at least this introduction, a surface level understanding of some of the concepts that you’ll need in order for you to make your way through this passage in a meaningful way.

So there are two questions that we need to start with. What type of union are we dealing with here? And what’s the nature of imputation? What type of union are we dealing with between Adam and Christ? And so as it relates to me, what does that union mean for me? And what is the nature of imputation? And you may or may not know what imputation means at this point; that’s okay. But these are the fundamental questions that we’re asking, okay?

And for instance I’ll just say this right now. Imputation—to impute something—is to reckon, to count it, to give it; that sort of thing, right? So when we impute something we’re reckoning it to someone else; we’re considering it theirs. So what’s the nature of that reckoning? That’s what we’re asking. So what’s the nature of the union, and what’s the nature of imputation?

Well first of all, we need to understand that when we look at this passage, one of the things that we’re seeing pretty clearly is that there is a solidarity here. There’s a solidarity between the first Adam and all his posterity, and the second Adam and those who belong to Him out of that.

Now if you think about it, it looks something like this. We might draw it like this. Here’s Adam and his posterity, okay? All right. Now the question that we have to ask is: what’s the nature of this union between Adam and his posterity? And that’s a question of solidarity.

But we have to think about the second Adam. And for instance the second Adam is in this circle, but doesn’t encompass all of this circle. And yet He too, as the second Adam, has a solidarity with His people. So we have to ask this question. What is this solidarity all about? What is it?

And you might think of solidarity as a communion of interest or responsibility. Now I want you to think about that for just a minute. I know that this isn’t an easy thing to think about. But I want you to think about some of the different ways that we often think about solidarity.

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

For instance, think about hockey. When you have a shoot-out at the end of the game, when the game is over there’s a shoot-out. Each guy from each team, right? That game-winning goal is not credited to the individual player; it’s a team goal.

Okay, so solidarity. Crosby scores a goal in a shoot-out. It’s a team goal. Okay, so think about that for just a minute. It’s an interesting way of thinking about solidarity.

We oftentimes struggle with that today because we say things like this: “He’s not my President,” or something like that. And we have this idea that we can extract ourselves from the whole. And that’s impossible to do. So we need to think about solidarity, to sort of re-educate ourselves in that way of thinking.

And God deals with us in a corporate way. Think about the way He deals with us. He deals with us in terms of family, in terms of the state, in terms of the church. For instance, think about this in the Old Testament. When He punishes a nation He often personifies it, doesn’t He? He personifies the whole nation as if it were an individual that He is about to punish.

What is He doing there? He is treating that entire nation as if they are in solidarity with one another, as if they have a common interest as people living in that particular geographical region with that particular leader, and so on. And so God often treats people out of this same principle. You see it repeatedly in the Scriptures.

Now there’s a prototypical solidarity in Adam. And we see it in the Scriptures. In other words, there is a solidarity that runs before the solidarity of family and state and church and all of that. And it’s a solidarity that we see here; it’s in Adam. 1 Corinthians 15:22 says, *“In Adam all die.”*

Okay. Now when you think about that you have to ask yourself, what’s the nature of this solidarity? Here’s what we’re asking. What’s the nature of the union? Because you know this as well as I do. People will say things like this: I don’t understand why in the world that I should be held accountable for Adam’s sin? I don’t know why some guy dying in a garden because he disobeyed is my problem. See, that’s the question. And that’s part of our individualistic mindset.

But Scripture talks about solidarity. And prototypical solidarity is in Adam. *“In Adam all die.”*

So now let’s think about this for a minute. There are two views. There is a variety of other views. But the two going views—and I can’t even say in evangelicalism; I’ve got to say that in the Reformed world there are two views about the nature of solidarity, okay?, because evangelicalism usually doesn’t think a lot about the nature of solidarity from this particular perspective. I’m giving you these out of the Reformed world.

The first one is a *realistic* view. And the second one is a *representative* view: a realistic view and a representative view.

Now what’s the realistic view? The realistic view is what we call *undifferentiated humanity*. Think about it like this. When we think about Adam, when we think about humanity in Adam, we think about a humanity that is encapsulated, contained in Adam.

And think about it seminally. In other words, in his seed is all humanity. All right. Now you’re going to see, for instance, how this connects to some other concepts. For instance, let me think ahead with you. You’re going to ask the question. How is it that sin is communicated from me to my child?

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Well in one particular view it's called *traducianism*. And this is basically the idea that I communicate it biologically. I communicate sin biologically. Why? Because in Adam humanity was present in him seminally—in his seed—and it's passed down by my seed.

Matt: That's why Jesus had to be born of a virgin.

Jeff: Well, if you take this view, (*Laughter*) I mean really, if you take this view, that might be something that one would say for sure. Yes, Gary.

Gary: I've heard that said by some preachers, that sin is transmitted from the man. I don't really see that because it would have been transmitted from Adam. But once Adam had daughters they would have sinned also.

Jeff: So when you begin to hear these different kinds of views, that this is the explanation for that, everybody is trying to deal with these people who are trying to deal with solidarity issues. They're trying to work with this concept: how is it that humanity was in Adam? It's simple and basic, and yet very complex. So the realistic view says that humanity was present in Adam.

Hebrews 7:9-10 is an interesting text. Why? Because it tells us an interesting story about Melchizedek and Abraham. And that story is this. *“In the case of tithes, tithes are received by mortal men, but in the other case by one of whom it is testified that he lives. One might even say that Levi himself who received tithes pays tithes through Abraham. For he was still in the loins of his ancestor when Melchizedek met him.”* So it looks like oh, okay. So the idea of a realistic view has some traction in Scripture.

All right. What about the representational view? The representational view says no. Biology is a fact, it's a given. But it's not the reason. Biology is a given, but it's not the reason for sins' transmission. In other words, sin was transmitted because Adam was our federal representative. He was a representative for us, just as Joe Biden, for instance, is biologically related to us as a human being, and yet nothing more than that; that's a given. He could be a human being in any other context and he wouldn't be our representative. But because he holds office he's our representative.

Now there are a couple of things that I want to give you for this one. Think about Romans 5:17. We're in a context in Romans, where if we read something like this we can read it in a representational way. Verse 17: *“For if because of one man's trespass”—in other words, what one man did--, “death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one Man, Jesus Christ.”*

In other words, it's a matter of what Adam did and what Christ did. Okay, so it's representational. Adam did this as a representative for us; Christ did this as a representative for His people.

Now there are a couple of things one might say. First of all, the union of representation is not a union of identity. In other words, one may say from the representational view that one may look back to the realistic view and say that if there is really a relation of identity between Adam and his people, how is he a representative?

For instance, take what I just said about Joe Biden. He's a human being just like I'm a human being. What is it that makes him a representative of anyone by virtue of just sharing in the identity of humanity? He's got to have something more in order to be a representative. And that is, he has to be appointed as a representative to represent us. It can't just be that he shares our humanity.

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

Matt: He also has to be a citizen of the United States.

Jeff: Right, yes.

Matt: We have that common bond and we are part of God’s image. So we have the significance of the blood. That’s why Jesus had to spill His blood. The blood washes away our sin. So the blood of Christ makes us free from Adam’s sin in the Fall on that basis.

Jeff: Yeah, for sure; 100%. But again I would say to you that Jesus shared in the likeness of Adam’s posterity, right? As you’re saying, it was His shed blood.

Matt: He was perfect and sinless, the sinless sacrifice.

Jeff: That’s right. It was His shed blood that cleansed a portion of Adam’s posterity. But it was because of what He did. But it wasn’t necessarily because we were in Jesus’ loins like Hebrews 7:9-10.

Matt: But we’re related; we’re connected.

Jeff: Right.

Matt: Jesus had the same blood as Adam.

Jeff: Yeah. But here’s what we have to ask ourselves. We don’t have that same sinless gene, right?

Matt: Right. That’s because we were born as men.

Jeff: Right; we were born in Adam. So we were born in Adam and Christ had to save us. So we’re asking the question. How could Adam be our representative? In other words, how do we think about that solidarity that says that I am a sinner in Adam; in Adam all die? And so I would say that the representational view has a point at this juncture when it says yes, biology is a given; it’s a fact of the matter. But there has to be something more in order for him to be a representative. And if Adam and the race were one and the same, he was not their representative necessarily. He was their representative because of God’s appointment to be their representative. In other words it was God who created Adam and said, “You are going to be a representative at the head of the human race,” right? It was God’s appointment; it wasn’t just by virtue of biology.

Matt: That’s the difference between humanity and angels. There is not a Redeemer for the angels who are fallen. They were all created; they are not of a common blood. We all come from one blood.

Jeff: Yeah.

Matt: And that leads to diversity. You know, we’re all one race; there’s only the human race.

Jeff: Yes, all are fallen in Adam. Somebody has got to redeem fallen man in Adam; that’s right.

Matt: So to me it’s both. *(Laughter)*

Jeff: Well it is both. Biology is a given; blood is a given. But the question is: If in Adam all die, is that just a biological statement, or is there something more? Is he representative? And we’re going to build on that.

Matt: Yes; it’s biological and spiritual.

Jeff: Yeah.

Matt: Because He’s the second Adam.

Jeff: That’s right. So imputation does not make a thing imputed to us inherently and subjectively in ourselves. Let me put it like this; let me give you an example: Christ as

“Revival & the Sin of Adam”

the Bearer of our sins, because here’s the thing. We’re thinking about Adam and his sin imputed to us, and Christ. I think we have to think about this in a parallel way.

And how is our sin imputed to Christ? That may help us to think about how Adam’s sin is imputed to us. And so Christ’s righteousness is imputed to us, and our sin imputed to Christ. How is that?

Well let me put it this way. To impute sin is to impute guilt. Let me put it this way. We are not liable to blame for Adam’s sin, but we are liable to punishment for his sin. In other words he is blameworthy. He is the one who took the fruit in the garden and ate it. But because he is our representative that guilt, that liability to punishment, goes down from him to the rest of us, okay?

Now you say, well wait a minute. I’m not sure that I’m getting all this. Are you saying no biology and just representation? No. What I’m saying is, biology is a given. But the question we’re going to have to ask is this. We’re going to have to ask this, and here it is. And we should probably end. But here’s the question we’re going to be asking. Could doctors find the sin gene and remove it from humanity? If it’s just a matter of biology, can they so narrow it down to find the sin gene and yank it, and then humanity would be good?

And the answer that we’re giving has to take that into consideration. So what I’m saying is, biology is a given. But what I’m asking is, is it only biology, or is there more? That is, is Adam a representative? And if he’s a representative by means of God’s appointment, then we’re going to ask the question: how is sin passed down?

So we’ve just been thinking about solidarity right now. But as we keep moving into this area in this introduction, we’re going to have to ask the question. Could a doctor for instance remove the sin gene and we would all be good? Okay, let us pray.

Matt: I won’t be here next week, so the answer to that is yes. God gives us a new body.

Jeff: My answer to you would be no. *(Laughter)* Because I don’t believe that anybody can do that.

Matt: My sin by Christ has been imputed to Him and washed clean. But I still have this body of sin.

Don Maurer: But a doctor can’t do that.

Matt: Dr. Jesus can.

Jeff: *(laughing):* Dr. Jesus can. Hey, let’s pray. *(Laughter)* Father, thank You for this day, from the time You’ve given to us. Lord, bless us as we work through this topic. Help us to think about it, Lord, according to Your word. We ask that You’ll bless us, Father, as we think about this topic—not just so we can think about doom and gloom, but so that we can think about the greatness and the victory of the gospel. Lord, help us to cast our eyes upon the Lord Jesus Christ, for we ask it in His name. Amen.

Brave Men: Amen.