



## Two Gardens, Two Trees, Two Adams... Selected Verses

In God's sight, there are two men—Adam and Jesus Christ—and these two men have all other men hanging at their girdle strings.<sup>1</sup>

That's how I started our lesson last week on the Covenant of Works. And the idea was that all are tied to one or the other of these two great archetypes...Adam or Christ. The Apostle Paul makes the point in Romans 5 that Jesus Christ is the second Adam. He does that by comparing the ministry or contribution of the first Adam and Jesus as the second Adam and his purpose is, I think, to show the great federal headship or representative principle of Scripture. Obviously the first Adam brought sin and death and all our woe into the world while Jesus, the second Adam, brought life and peace and righteousness.

Now a great many people find that idea...the idea that anyone in general or Adam in particular should have functioned as our God appointed representative...they find that idea offensive. Our modern culture, especially our modern American culture, does not especially like the idea of having Adam as its representative. They are a bit like my grandson...they want to do whatever is for

themselves. They do not want someone shoveling ice cream down their face...they want to do it themselves even if it destroys a perfectly good shirt or booth or restaurant. And that's not just true of the secular culture either. A good many Christian ministers these days preach and teach that we become sinners only as we actually sin ourselves. Oh, they do believe that everyone becomes a sinner...that we all do actually get around to sinning for ourselves. But they believe that we are born much as Adam was created...in a state of moral equipoise and that the only sin we are responsible for before God is the sin we ourselves bring to the table. It is right to say that such people do not accept the historic, biblical doctrine of original sin. You will remember, I hope, that the doctrine of original sin is the idea that the guilt of Adam's sin was imputed or charged to us as Adam's seed by God. The implicit argument behind the dislike of having Adam as its representative is that the whole affair is unfair. Such people tend to believe that they might have fared better than Adam did. They believe to have someone's sin...anyone's sin...imputed to us would be patently unfair...un-American. They remind me of Lancelot in the musical *Camelot*. Listen to the lyrics of this song *C'est moi...It's me...* made famous by Robert Goulet.

*The soul of a knight should be a thing remarkable  
His heart and his mind as pure as morning dew  
With a will and a self-restraint  
That's the envy of ev'ry saint  
He could easily work a miracle or two  
To love and desire he ought to be unsparkable  
The ways of the flesh should offer no allure  
But where in the world  
Is there in the world  
A man so untouch'd and pure*

*[spoken] C'est moi*

*C'est moi! C'est moi!  
I blush to disclose, I'm far too noble to lie  
That man in whom these qualities bloom  
C'est moi, c'est moi, 'tis I*

*I've never stray'd from all I believe  
I'm bless'd with an iron will  
Had I been made the partner of Eve  
We'd be in Eden still<sup>2</sup>*

Of course, we can laugh at the boastful naiveté of such a song in a stage production. But I think it is remarkable just how theologically in tune the writers were when they wrote these particular lyrics for Camelot. They seemed to have had a real flash of insight into the whole idea of our deluded sense of inherent goodness...If you think about it...in many ways Camelot was just like the Garden of Eden. It was a perfect kingdom ruled by a perfect king and queen that was brought to a perfect state of ruin by a perfect intruder. In other words, the writers took the archetypes of the garden story and applied them to the fall of Camelot.

But I digress.

The point I was making is that many modern bible teachers reject the idea of the federal headship of Adam.<sup>3</sup> They reject the idea of original sin and the reason they do is because they think it is unfair...that perhaps they might have done better. Of course, implicit in such an argument is the idea that God is unfair...unfair in assigning us guilt based upon what Adam did. It is an argument that is as old as Pelagius himself.

Pelagius was a fourth century monk who argued against St. Augustine when heard Augustine's famous prayer, "Grant what Thou command, and command what Thou will."<sup>4</sup> He was horrified that Augustine would hint that man was in any way unable to fulfill God's commands. His logic was that God would never command something that man was unable to do. Of course, Pelagius had a problem...the problem of human sin. So Pelagius' solution was to reject the whole idea of an inherent fallenness...he rejected outright the idea of original sin and he argued that the only thing Adam did was to provide us with a bad example...in much the same way that Jesus provided us with a good example. Pelagius believed all that was necessary for a man or woman to attain salvation was to stop sinning.

And the same idea was picked up some thirteen centuries later by the famous American evangelist Charles Finney.<sup>5</sup> In one place he says this:

The Bible once, and only once, incidentally intimates that Adam's first sin has in some way been the occasion, not the necessary physical cause, of all the sins of men. Rom. v. 12—19. It neither says nor intimates anything in relation to the manner in which Adam's sin has occasioned this result. It only incidentally recognizes the fact, and then leaves it, just as if the quo mode was too obvious to need explanation.<sup>6</sup>

That is Finney's way of saying, "You know the Bible only mentions the fact once and that is hardly sufficient to make the point for original sin." Now the whole idea behind Finney's assertion is wrong. If the Bible mentions it once and it is sufficiently clear to be understood that is more than adequate. And the passage in Romans that Finney cites is nothing if not clear.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Romans 5:12**...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-- <sup>13</sup> for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. <sup>14</sup> 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. <sup>15</sup> But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift by the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many.

You can see the idea I think. Death came thorough one...life came through one. These two great archetypes represent those found in them and they have communicated to those found in them either life or death. Now as Reformed men and women we argue that both Adam's guilt and Christ's righteousness are imputed...credited to...put to the account of...their followers. That is the whole point of Paul's argument for the idea of imputation in Roman's chapter four where he uses the word for "λογίζομαι"..."to put to one's account"..."to count" some eleven times.<sup>7</sup>

You see Paul argues in Romans 4 that Christ's righteousness is imputed to believers...put on their account...not on the basis on their works but on the basis of His work on the cross. And then when Paul gets to Romans 5 he makes a comparison between Adam and Christ...arguing that in the representative relationship with Adam all men are declared guilty and die...whereas in the representative relationship with Christ all in him are declared righteous and granted eternal life.

But like I said earlier, there are many people who do not like that idea of imputation or representation. I mentioned Charles Finney earlier...listen to what he wrote about the idea of representation or imputation.

The doctrine of a literal imputation of Adam's sin to all his posterity, of the literal imputation of all the sins of the elect to Christ, and of his suffering for them the exact amount due to the transgressors, and of the literal imputation of Christ's righteousness or obedience to the elect...*is* better befitting a romance than a system of theology.<sup>8</sup>

What it means, of course, is that it is a fairy tale.

Now I wish I could say that these two views, the views of Pelagius and Finney, were exceptions. But they have become more and more the rule. I had friend call me just last night and tell me that the associate pastor of his church...and it's a large evangelical church over in Arlington...told him that he didn't mind the imputed righteousness of Jesus so much but that he very much disliked the idea of Adam's imputed guilt...and as a result rejected the idea.

Now I'm wondering when these great historic doctrines of the faith managed to become something we could simply pick and choose as if they were a part of a doctrinal buffet. You know, "I'll take a little eternal security but I don't like original sin...so I'll leave that...oh, I don't mind too much the idea of ultimate glorification so I'll take that but a long drawn out progressive sanctification...that takes too long and is too painful...I don't like...so none of that please."

But you see the work of God in bringing about our great redemption in Christ is wonderfully complex...in the same way that a beautiful diamond is complex. It has so many facets...so many beautiful angles that can be contemplated and appreciated and if we want to be faithful followers of Jesus we ought to come to love the contemplation of such things...both because they reflect what is true for

us theologically and because they reveal something of great triune God's marvelous wisdom and kindness in Jesus.

That is why we have been thinking our way through the biblical doctrine of the covenants and of covenant theology because God has chosen to reveal Himself to man through means of the covenant. Now last week we began to look at what is called the covenant of creation or the Adamic covenant or the covenant of works.

The Westminster Confession of Faith describes it like this:

The first covenant made with man was a covenant of works, wherein life was promised to Adam; and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect and personal obedience.<sup>9</sup>

Now you can the component parts of the covenant: (1.) life based on personal and perfect obedience, (2.) an explicit connection between the condition of his posterity and his obedience.

Now the Confession explains the connection this way. It says:

God permitted their sin in order to magnify His own glory...

Our first parents, being seduced by the subtilty and temptations of Satan, sinned, in eating the forbidden fruit. This their sin, God was pleased, according to His wise and holy counsel, to permit, having purposed to order it to His own glory.<sup>10</sup>

That their sin cost them their original righteousness and relationship with God...

By this sin they fell from their original righteousness and communion, with God, and so became dead in sin, and wholly defiled in all the parts and faculties of soul and body.<sup>11</sup>

That their sin tainted all mankind with original guilt...

They being the root of all mankind, the guilt of this sin was imputed; and the same death in sin, and corrupted nature, conveyed to all their posterity descending from them by ordinary generation.<sup>12</sup>

You see the placement in the garden probationary. If Adam had persevered in obedience he would have been confirmed in righteousness and would have been permitted to eat of the Tree of Life. Now we've already seen, I think, the biblical basis for this last point that the confession makes in Romans 5. That is, that all mankind suffers from the imputation of Adam's original sin and thus stands guilty before God is prone to death.

What I would like to do with the rest of time this morning is go back to the story on the Garden in Genesis 2 and 3 and work through the text and perhaps draw some analogies to the work and life of Christ. The reason I want to do that is because in a very real sense the covenant of grace in which God covenants with us to save us on the basis of our faith in Christ's redemptive work on our behalf is also a covenant of works. It is just not a covenant based on our works. It is based on the work of Christ.

That having been said let's look at Genesis 2 together.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 2:8**...And the LORD God planted a garden in Eden, in the east, and there he put the man whom he had formed. <sup>9</sup> And out of the ground the LORD God made to spring up every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food.

The tree of life was in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

The primary point that I think can be gathered from these verses is that man's original design did not include a life of toil bent over digging in the dirt. You see the emphasis of verses 8-9 is that Garden of Eden was really the Orchard of Eden...the Garden of God and that man is placed there to tend it and to there meet with God. Rather than looking down to sustain life man in the dirt man would have been looking up to God. Man is viewed full of nobility rather than as a toiling slave. It is only after the fall, that man is sentenced to a life of drudgery and toil.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 2:10**...A river flowed out of Eden to water the garden, and there it divided and became four rivers. <sup>11</sup> The name of the first is the Pishon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold. <sup>12</sup> And the gold of that land is good; bdellium and onyx stone are there. <sup>13</sup> The name of the second river is the Gihon. It is the one that flowed around the whole land of Cush. <sup>14</sup> And the name of the third river is the Tigris, which flows east of Assyria. And the fourth river is the Euphrates.

Now the problem of locating the ancient Orchard of Eden is twofold. First, two of the rivers are impossible to identify with certainty. Secondly, it is possible that the ancient pre-flood world looked quite different than it does now. The only thing we can go by for certain is the location of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers. I think we can make an educated guess and say somewhere is northern Iraq or southern Turkey.

Anyway, the Lord placed Adam in the Orchard of Eden and gave him a command to take care of it. The phrase "keep it" is the word שָׁמַר the same

word used when God later commanded the priests to guard and protect the Tabernacle and even the Temple. There are serious implications for Adam associated with the word. That is that he should have been on guard, to defend, to protect, to keep safe the Garden of God. We'll talk more about that in a bit. But here also is the first prohibition. Look at verse 15-17.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 2:15**...The LORD God took the man and put him in the garden of Eden to work it and keep it. <sup>16</sup> And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, "You may surely eat of every tree of the garden, <sup>17</sup> but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die."

Now that phrase, "you shall surely die" is particularly interesting in Hebrew.

Now the idea is the certainty of the death to follow....dying you shall die. If you disobey, you will die and that is certain. I don't think the emphasis is on the time as much on as it is the certainty although, it can be construed that way as well.

I think 1 Kings 2:37 is quite instructive here. You will remember that David was insulted by Shimei when David's son Absalom tried to take over the throne from David. Shimei threw rocks at David and insulted him as he left Jerusalem. Anyway, after David returned in victory he called Shimei to him and warned him that his punishment was that he had to live in Jerusalem and not leave. To that warning, he appended a threat in the exact same language we have here in Genesis.

<sup>ESV</sup> **1 Kings 2:36**...Then the king sent and summoned Shimei and said to him, "Build yourself a house in Jerusalem and dwell there, and do not go out from

there to any place whatever. <sup>37</sup> For on the day you go out and cross the brook Kidron, know for certain that you shall die. Your blood shall be on your own head."

Next, the story turns to the fact that Adam needed something to be complete. He was alone in the sense of being incomplete.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 2:18**...Then the LORD God said, "It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him." <sup>19</sup> Now out of the ground the LORD God had formed every beast of the field and every bird of the heavens and brought them to the man to see what he would call them. And whatever the man called every living creature, that was its name. <sup>20</sup> The man gave names to all livestock and to the birds of the heavens and to every beast of the field. But for Adam there was not found a helper fit for him.

Now the point here is that Adam had dominion over the animals. He named them and exercised his authority over them. But additionally, the point is that Adam saw all the animals and how they were complete with their mates and that he had none. There was no animal suitable as a helpmeet, something was lacking.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 2:21**...So the LORD God caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man, and while he slept took one of his ribs and closed up its place with flesh. <sup>22</sup> And the rib that the LORD God had taken from the man he made into a woman and brought her to the man. <sup>23</sup> Then the man said, "This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man."

She was not made to be his slave or his servant. She was made to complete man. I love the way Matthew Henry puts it, "That the woman was *made of a rib out of the side of Adam*; not made out of his head to rule over him, nor out of his feet to

be trampled upon by him, but out of his side to be equal with him, under his arm to be protected, and near his heart to be beloved."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 3:1**...Now the serpent was more crafty than any other beast of the field that the LORD God had made. He said to the woman, "Did God actually say, 'You shall not eat of any tree in the garden?'" <sup>2</sup> And the woman said to the serpent, "We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, <sup>3</sup> but God said, 'You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.'"

Now you will notice that the text never says that Satan entered the serpent.<sup>14</sup> It is understood but not said. Time and again afterwards in Scripture Satan is called that "old serpent" and the allusion is always back to here. Still it is not said in the text. Calvin says that Satan simply chose the most suitable beast to accomplish his design.<sup>15</sup>

I love the way Milton puts it in Paradise Lost. He says Satan searched and searched for a suitable animal to possess in order to approach Eve and then finally settled on the serpent because it was so inconspicuous...so subtle. Milton has Satan enter the serpent while he is sleeping...and then lie there till daybreak bemoaning his fate...fallen from so high an estate to one of bestial slime.<sup>16</sup> The idea of the serpent approaching Eve standing up also comes from Milton...from Milton and from the curse God will later pronounce upon the serpent.<sup>17</sup>

Now I want you to notice the structure of the serpent's temptation of Eve. His first comment is very shrewd...very subtle. He says, "Did God actually say, 'You shall not eat of any tree in the garden?'" You see in that question the serpent is implying that God is withholding something good from them.

Eve responds, "'We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, <sup>3</sup> but God said, 'You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.'"

Now you ought to notice that she changes what God forbade. She now says that they may not touch the fruit. There was no such command given by God and that if they touch it that might die. You can see also that she seems to remove the certainty of death and changes it to a possibility.

The serpent, of course, seizes upon the opportunity and flatly rejects the Word of God in verse 4.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 3:4...** "You will not surely die. <sup>5</sup> For God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil." <sup>6</sup> So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate.

Do you see the serpent's point? First he questions God's goodness and provision. He plants a seed that God might be withholding something from Eve simply out of spite and when he sees that the message has resonated with Eve he quickly moves to reject outright what God has said. And my question is, "Where is Adam?" Where was he when Eve is tottering right there on the edge? Wasn't he given the duty, the privilege, to tend and protect and guard the garden? He was indeed and yet he is nowhere to be seen until it is too late. In Adam's absence, Eve succumbs to the temptation and eats of the tree.

I think it is particularly telling that she succumbs along the very lines described in 1 John 2.

**ESV 1 John 2:16**...For all that is in the world--the desires of the flesh and the desires of the eyes and pride in possessions--is not from the Father but is from the world.

You see she saw the tree was good for food...the desire of the flesh. She saw that it was a delight to the eyes...the desire of the eyes. And she saw that it was to be desired to make one wise...pride in possessions...she ate.

Now I think it is instructive that when Jesus was tempted by Satan after being in the wilderness for forty days with bread or water, he faced the exact same sort of temptation to which Eve succumbed. Satan used the same sort of questioning of God's goodness...but to no avail.

First was the lure of the flesh...

**ESV Luke 4:1**...And Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was led by the Spirit in the wilderness <sup>2</sup> for forty days, being tempted by the devil. And he ate nothing during those days. And when they were ended, he was hungry. <sup>3</sup> The devil said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command this stone to become bread." <sup>4</sup> And Jesus answered him, "It is written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'"

Second was the lust of the eye...

**ESV Luke 4:5**...And the devil took him up and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time, <sup>6</sup> and said to him, "To you I will give all this authority and their glory, for it has been delivered to me, and I give it to whom I will. <sup>7</sup> If you, then, will worship me, it will all be yours." <sup>8</sup> And Jesus answered him, "It is written, "'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve.'"

Third was the pride of possession...

<sup>ESV</sup> **Luke 4:9**...And he took him to Jerusalem and set him on the pinnacle of the temple and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here, <sup>10</sup> for it is written, "'He will command his angels concerning you, to guard you,' <sup>11</sup> and "'On their hands they will bear you up, lest you strike your foot against a stone.'" <sup>12</sup> And Jesus answered him, "It is said, 'You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.'"

And yet the Lord Jesus never wavered...he passed the test. But Adam and Eve did not. Genesis 3:7 says:

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 3:7**...Then the eyes of both were opened, and they knew that they were naked. And they sewed fig leaves together and made themselves loincloths.

And of course mankind has been trying to manufacture some sort of righteousness for himself ever since.

Now most of you know the rest of the story. Most of you know that God came down and sought them out and found them naked. Most of you know that Adam blamed Eve and Eve blamed the serpent and God passed judgment on all three. The snake was condemned to crawl on its belly in the dust and was to become the enemy of man. The woman was to bear children in great sorrow and suffering and was to fall under the dominion of man. The man was to earn his bread by the sweat of his face. His labor was no longer a noble looking up; it is no longer guarding over the trees of the orchard; it is now a toilsome, grueling enterprise, accomplished on one's knees in the dirt. Still there is mercy in the face of judgment. Even in that judgment God was gracious. Instead of causing them to die outright he delayed their deaths and showed them mercy and killed a couple of animals and covered over their nakedness.

Now I want to come back to that in a minute but I wanted to take just a minute and show you something you might not have noticed before. On Jesus' last night before the crucifixion he found himself in a garden. The next day he hung on a tree in fulfillment of the Scripture that says:

<sup>ESV</sup> **Galatians 3:13**...Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us--for it is written, "Cursed is everyone who is hanged on a tree"--

And when Jesus hung on that tree we know he hang there naked...exposed for Adam's sin...suffering Adam's shame...though He himself was blameless.

But I want you to think for just a moment about that garden. Jesus went there and poured out his heart and soul to the Father and Jesus kept watch. Unlike Adam Jesus guarded the garden he was in.

We know from John 13:27 that the night Jesus was in the garden, Satan entered Judas. Are you surprised that the Bible says it just that clearly.

<sup>ESV</sup> **John 13:26**...Jesus answered, "It is he to whom I will give this morsel of bread when I have dipped it." So when he had dipped the morsel, he gave it to Judas, the son of Simon Iscariot. <sup>27</sup> Then after he had taken the morsel, Satan entered into him.

Anyway, Judas...Judas possessed of Satan...came to the garden just as the serpent had...but unlike Adam Jesus saw them coming and Jesus determined to protect what he had been given.

<sup>ESV</sup> **John 18:3**...So Judas, having procured a band of soldiers and some officers from the chief priests and the Pharisees, went there with lanterns and torches

and weapons. <sup>4</sup> Then Jesus, knowing all that would happen to him, came forward and said to them, "Whom do you seek?" <sup>5</sup> They answered him, "Jesus of Nazareth." Jesus said to them, "I am he." Judas, who betrayed him, was standing with them. <sup>6</sup> When Jesus said to them, "I am he," they drew back and fell to the ground. <sup>7</sup> So he asked them again, "Whom do you seek?" And they said, "Jesus of Nazareth." <sup>8</sup> Jesus answered, "I told you that I am he. So, if you seek me, let these men go." <sup>9</sup> This was to fulfill the word that he had spoken: "Of those whom you gave me I have lost not one."

Adam failed to guard his garden and all his descendants were lost but Jesus is a different kind of Adam. He guarded his garden and none of those that the Father gave him were lost and brothers and sisters that includes you and me. You see we are covered over by the righteousness of Christ. In his death, Jesus not only turned aside the wrath of God by paying the penalty for sin that we owed but he also fully obeyed God's law and gained for us the righteousness that Adam failed to gain. That's why I love this last little passage here in Genesis 3.

<sup>ESV</sup> **Genesis 3:21**...And the LORD God made for Adam and for his wife garments of skins and clothed them.

I think this is one of my favorite passages in the book of Genesis. It reminds me all over again of the beauty of the imputed righteousness of Christ. Some nine years ago on a spring break weekend, Gage and I had the privilege of going up to Colorado Springs to attend a Bible conference in which Dr. James Montgomery Boice was the plenary speaker. It was a conference on covenant theology. At one point Dr. Boice was talking about the Adam and Eve's first full realization of the impact of their sins. He said, "You know I can just imagine what it must have been like when Adam and Eve had their sin exposed. God had come down and killed a couple of animals to cover them. I don't know whether

the animals killed were lambs or goats. But as far as I know I think it must have been the first time they had ever seen anything killed". Dr. Boice said (and I don't think I will ever forget this), "You know I just imagine in my mind's eye Adam and Eve saying to themselves, 'Oh, that is what you meant by death. We certainly never thought that is what it would be like. We never knew our sin would lead to something like that.'"

I have never forgotten that and every time I come to the communion table I am reminded all over again of the same thing. That it was my sin that caused his body to be broken but in that he secured my salvation. You see there were two Adams, two gardens and two trees and a whole world of difference between them.

Let's pray.

---

<sup>1</sup> F.F. Bruce, *Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Tyndale Press, 1963), 127.

<sup>2</sup> Alan Jay Lerner and Frederick Loewe, "C'est Moi" from the musical *Camelot*, 1967.

<sup>3</sup> Horton's analysis of Joel Osteen on this particular point is absolutely is dead on.

<http://www.whitehorseinn.org/osteenreview.htm>

<sup>4</sup> R.C. Sproul, *Willing to Believe: The Controversy over Free Will* (Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1997), 34.

<sup>5</sup> See my paper on Finney at monergism.com.

<http://www.posttenebraslux.com/adobe%20pdf%20files/articles/Finney%20Article.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> Charles Finney, *Finney's Lectures on Systematic Theology*, (Edited by J.H. Fairchild), Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951, pg. 253.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas Browning, "The Gospel According to Abraham" from my series on Romans, p.17.

<http://www.posttenebraslux.com/adobe%20pdf%20files/romans/Romans%2003.27-4.25.pdf>

---

<sup>8</sup> Charles Finney, *Finney's Lectures on Systematic Theology*, (Edited by J.H. Fairchild), Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1951, pg. 397.

<sup>9</sup> WCF, 7.2.

<sup>10</sup> WCF, 6.1

<sup>11</sup> WCF, 6.2

<sup>12</sup> WCF, 6.3

<sup>13</sup> Matthew Henry, *Complete Commentary of the Bible*, Notes on Genesis 2:21.

<sup>14</sup> Bruce K. Waltke, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing, 2001), 90.

<sup>15</sup> John Calvin, *Commentary on Genesis*, 3:21. Calvin writes: For when Moses says that the serpent was crafty beyond all other animals, he seems to intimate, that it had been induced to deceive man, not by the instigation of Satan, but by its own malignity. I answer, that the innate subtlety of the serpent did not prevent Satan from making use of the animal for the purpose of effecting the destruction of man. For since he required an instrument, he chose from among animals that which he saw would be most suitable for him: finally, he carefully contrived the method by which the snares he was preparing might the more easily take the mind of Eve by surprise. Hitherto, he had held no communication with men; he, therefore, clothed himself with the person of an animal, under which he might open for himself the way of access.

<sup>16</sup> John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 9, Lines 157-166.

*I dread; and, to elude, thus wrapt in mist  
Of midnight vapour glide obscure, and pry  
In every bush and brake, where hap may find  
The serpent sleeping; in whose mazy folds  
To hide me, and the dark intent I bring.  
O foul descent! that I, who erst contended  
With Gods to sit the highest, am now constrained  
Into a beast; and, mixed with bestial slime,  
This essence to incarnate and imbrute,  
That to the highth of Deity aspired!*

<sup>17</sup> John Milton, *Paradise Lost*, Book 9, Lines 497-503.

*So spake the enemy of mankind, enclosed  
In serpent, inmate bad! and toward Eve  
Addressed his way: not with indented wave,  
Prone on the ground, as since; but on his rear,  
Circular base of rising folds, that towered  
Fold above fold, a surging maze! his head*

*Crested aloft, and carbuncle his eyes;*