

Main Idea: In Genesis 2:4-17 we learn God’s intent for mankind by considering three things regarding the first man.

- I. Consider man's origin (4-7).
 - A. God formed the earth *for* man (4-6).
 - B. God formed man *from* the earth (7).
 1. He used existing material to make us.
 2. Our worth is derived, not inherent.
- II. Consider man's environment (8-14).
 - A. It was a real paradise (8-9).
 1. There was beauty.
 2. There was food.
 3. There were two special trees.
 - B. It was a real place (10-14).
- III. Consider man's purpose (15-17).
 - A. We were created to *serve* God (15).
 1. We're supposed to work in God's world.
 2. We're supposed to take care of God's world.
 - B. We were created to *obey* God (16-17).
 1. One option is to choose God's way.
 2. The other option is to choose your own way.

The Bottom Line: We must give our attention to two Adams...

1. To understand what we lost, look at the first Adam.
2. To regain what we lost, look to the second Adam.

Scripture Reading: Psalm 127

This evening we are going to vote as a church to amend our By-Laws by adding a paragraph to our Articles of Faith. Our intent is to clarify what we believe regarding marriage, and why.

“Is this really necessary?” you ask.

I read something in Thursday’s news that removes any doubt, if there was any. According to the headline that caught my attention, a well known actor said that affairs are good for marriage. Hugh Grant says he "admires" those who take their unions "extremely seriously" but still meet up to have sex with other people and just don't acknowledge their behaviour to their partners.”

The MSN article also went on to say, “The 55-year-old actor...branded marriage "unromantic" and doesn't believe in the institution because he doesn't think human beings are meant to be faithful to just one person.”

"Do I think human beings are meant to be in 40-year-long monogamous, faithful, relationships? No, No, No. Whoever said they were? Only the bible or something. No one ever said that was a good idea.”

There’s a worldview shift happening right before our eyes. It wasn’t long ago that even the secular world operated on a Judeo-Christian foundation of truth and morality. That is no longer the case. The common mentality today is that there is no objective foundation for truth and morality. You are free, in fact, *encouraged* to establish that foundation for yourself.

**Note: This is an unedited manuscript of a message preached at Wheelersburg Baptist Church. It is provided to prompt your continued reflection on the practical truths of the Word of God.

¹ For an earlier development of this passage, see the Genesis series preached at WBC in 2000.

So this creates a wonderful opportunity for those of us who believe we are here because the Creator made us, that He is good, and that He has established good guidelines for life that result in great joy when obeyed and great heartache when disobeyed.

We're going to take a couple of weeks to go back to the foundation. We're going to remind ourselves again (or perhaps see it for the first time) of God's intent for man (this week's message) and marriage (next week's message).

So let's start with this question. *Who are we?* Mankind is facing an identity crisis these days. And the "experts" are doing little but add to the confusion.

R. C. Sproul explains,² "I have talked to college students who no longer sense that they are being educated in the confines of a university, but rather that their experience is of a pluriversity, a multiversity, where there is nothing to unify the various approaches to knowledge to which they are exposed. They go into the psychology department and hear man described in psychological categories. They say, 'Oh, yes, that's interesting; that's correct.' Then they go to the biology department and are led to understand man from a totally different perspective. Indeed, statements are made about man that are not only different but in many cases contradictory to what they have just learned in the psychology department. From there they go to the theology department and hear man's existence defined in terms of social activity and behavioral patterns, again in ways that are contradictory to what they have heard elsewhere. They go to the history department, the philosophy department, the chemistry department, and so on down the line of the various disciplines, and by the time they are finished they have Excedrin headache number nine. They have no idea how to put this together. They cannot integrate these various views of man into one single, coherent view. And the reason why they cannot integrate it is not because the students are muddle-headed but because the information is itself contradictory."

Is Sproul right?³ Think carefully. From the zoological perspective we are told by Desmond Morris that man is merely one of some eighty-odd varieties of primate apes, his distinguishing characteristic being his nakedness. Man is an ape, like every other ape except that man is not covered with a hair-coat.

Then we go to the biologist and hear that man is a mistake of nature. He has oozed from the slime as a result of a cosmic accident. Edward Carnell once put it like this, "In the modern man's view of man, man is a grown up germ sitting on a cog of a wheel of a vast cosmic machine which is destined ultimately to blow itself up."

Then we go to the social historians. We listen to people like Karl Marx as they analyze man. Marx tells us that the essence of man is found in man's labor. If we are to understand man properly, we must do so in terms of economic forces.

You say, "We don't believe in Marx any more."

Really? Ask most people the question, "Who are you?" and what do you hear in return? "Hi, my name is Mike Jones. I'm a school teacher." Or, "I'm Billie Smith. I'm a nurse." We do tend to define ourselves by our work.

So...*who are we?* While there's confusion in the world, I have good news. I can tell you who we are because I can show you in the *owner's manual*. It's called the Bible, and in it our Maker tells us who we are, how we got here, why we are here, how we can

²"Images of Man in Contemporary Culture," taken from *Our Savior God*, ed. by James Boice, pp. 29-30.

³The following comments are paraphrases from Sproul's insightful comments on p. 30.

experience life to the fullest, and most of all, what He has done in His grace through His Son Jesus Christ to make that possible.

In Genesis 2:4-17 we learn God's intent for mankind by considering three things regarding the first man.

I. Consider man's origin (4-7).

Verse 4 begins, "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created." Notice the phrase, "This is the account" (or "These are the generations," if you have the KJV). The word translated "account" (or "generations") occurs ten times in Genesis, each time beginning a new section.⁴

Which raises the question: what's the relationship between Genesis 1 and Genesis 2? Genesis 2:4 states, "This is the account of the heavens and the earth when they were created." But wait. Isn't that what chapter one was?

Yes, but Genesis 1 gives the panoramic view of creation, whereas Genesis 2 puts the spotlight on man's creation. In Genesis 1, equal attention is given to what God did on all six days, but in Genesis 2 the material revolves around the arrival of man on Day 6. Genesis 1 gives us the telescopic view of God's creative work, whereas Genesis 2 offers us the microscopic look into the apex of God's creation, man.

Even the name of God changes in chapter 2. Throughout Genesis 1, it's *Elohim*, a title which extols God's transcendence and greatness as Creator. He is *God*. But in chapter 2 He is the "LORD God," *Yahweh Elohim*. Yahweh--that's His covenant name, the name by which He revealed Himself to Moses at the burning bush.

In the 1800's Old Testament higher critics said, "Here's the solution to the dilemma. Moses didn't write the Pentateuch. The Pentateuch is the compilation of the works of at least *four* men. We don't know who they are, but we'll call them *J, E, D, & P* to represent the different name of God used in their respective portions of the Pentateuch. So said proponents of the "Wellhausen" (or documentary) theory.

Julius Wellhausen (who lived from 1844-1918) was deeply influenced by the teaching of evolution spreading in his day. He did to Old Testament study what Darwin did to biology. He denied that Moses wrote the Pentateuch in the 15th century B.C., and asserted that it was the product of a process that happened over time. The *J* source wrote his material in the ninth century B.C., *E* in the eighth century, *D* (which stands for Deuteronomy) came in the seventh century, and *P* (which was a priestly source) came in the fifth century B.C. It wasn't until around 200 B.C., according to Wellhausen, that some editor compiled these four sources into the Pentateuch as we have it today.

You say, "Pastor, why did you take the time to tell us all that? It doesn't affect our lives, does it?" It sure does. If you go to a secular university (and sadly, many so called "Christian" universities) and take a basic course in biblical studies, chances are good your professor will espouse some form of what I've just explained as *fact*. And why? Because your professor's evolutionary bias affects his theology, just as it did Wellhausen's.

Your view of origins affects every other aspect of study. If you believe man is on the planet today as the result of random acts of chance over time, and not because of the creative act of God, you will have no problem asserting that we got the Bible the same way, through a man-made process over time, and not by the inspiration of God.

⁴We commented last time about the unfortunate chapter break. The first three verses of chapter two actually belong with the narrative of chapter one.

So, according to Genesis, what is true of our origin? Based on verses 4-7, we can affirm a couple of important truths.

A. God formed the earth *for* man (4-6). "When the LORD God made the earth and the heavens--and no shrub of the field had yet appeared on the earth and no plant of the field had yet sprung up, for the LORD God had not sent rain on the earth and there was no man to work the ground, but streams came up from the earth and watered the whole surface of the ground."

So the Lord God formed the earth. And here's how He made it. Does this account sound different than the one in chapter one? Sure.

Someone has observed, "The first account has a lofty dignity about it, while the second is much more simple and down-to-earth. The first narrative has stylized expressions and repeated formulas, while the second is lively and full of surprises... In the first story God is the transcendent and all-powerful Creator, while in the second 'the LORD God' is closely and intimately involved in the life and experiences of the people He has created."⁵

But the differences aren't contradictions. They have to do with emphasis or perspective. Keep in mind that in Genesis 2 the spotlight is on God's creation of man.

And verses 4-6 inform us that God formed the earth *for man*.

The verses are actually difficult to translate. There seems to be a parenthesis of thought in verses 5 & 6, as reflected in the use of the hyphens in the NIV. Moses is describing what was true of the earth when God first made it. *Before* man appeared.

Certain types of plant life were missing, namely, the "shrub of the field" and the "plant of the field." The earth was lacking these. Why? Because two other things were lacking at this point: a water source to nourish the plant life, and man to cultivate the ground for the plant life.

God is about to take care of both needs. In verse 6 He meets the water need by providing sub-cavernous streams (or possibly "a mist"), and in verse 7 the need for a cultivator by creating man.

The evolutionist asserts that present processes are the key to understanding the past. But notice carefully how very different the created world was from our world. It didn't rain there. According to 1:6 there was some sort of water canopy in the atmosphere.

Creation-scientist, Henry Morris, remarks, "The 'greenhouse effect' of this blanket would have prevented strong temperature differences or rapid temperature changes anywhere on the earth. This in turn would have prevented strong winds and storms. The present hydrologic cycle, which waters evaporated from the ocean, are moved inland by winds, finally to condense and fall to the earth again, would have been impossible under these conditions. Rather, the waters evaporated daily from the many 'seas' (Genesis 1:10) would have moved only short distances from their source before condensing again at night on the adjacent land surfaces (Genesis 2:6)."⁶

So the weather patterns *then* were quite different from the ones we see today on *The Weather Channel*.

You say, "What accounts for the change?" The answer is, *the flood*, as Genesis 6-9 explains. But that's beyond our focus today.

⁵Ronald Youngblood, *How It All Began*, p. 37.

⁶Henry Morris, *The Beginning of the World*, p. 37.

For now, don't miss this. When God formed the earth, He did so *for man*. He created this world with mankind in mind. In terms of man's origin, that's truth #1.

Here's #2...

B. God formed man *from the earth* (7). "The LORD God formed the man from the dust of the ground and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and the man became a living being."

Follow the text carefully. Yahweh God formed *the Adam*--that's the literal Hebrew rendering of the word "man."

From what? The "dust of the ground." The term "ground" is the related Hebrew word *adamah*. So the literal reading of this text goes like this, "Yahweh God formed the Adam out of the dust of the adamah."

The play on words emphasizes man's relationship to the land. He was created from it, his job will be to cultivate it, and when he dies he will return to it. Someone has well said, "It [the land] is his cradle, his home, his grave."⁷

Perhaps you've heard the story about the little boy who in Sunday School learned about Adam. His teacher explained that man is made from the dust of the ground and that when he dies, he returns to the dust of the ground.

Later that week the boy was playing in his room, and looked under his bed for a toy. What he saw shocked him, so much so that he yelled for his mother in the other room, "Mommy, I think there's a man under my bed, but I can't tell if he's coming or going."

We can make a couple of deductions about ourselves based on verse 7...

1. *God used existing material to make us.* Back in Genesis 1:27 we're told, "So God created man in his own image." Now Genesis 2:7 tells *how* He did it. He used existing material, namely, "the dust of the ground."

There are about fourteen chemical elements which are the basic components of living flesh, including hydrogen, carbon, and oxygen. The same elements are found in the dust of the ground. It's noteworthy that 1 Corinthians 15:47 states, "The first man is of the earth, earthy."

Notice that God *formed* the man. The verb carries the idea of a potter shaping his clay. And the descriptive "breathed into his nostrils" indicates the warmly personal, face-to-face intimacy, as it were, involved in God's forming of man.

2. *Our worth is derived, not inherent.* Friends, apart from God we are "nothing but dust and ashes." That's how Abraham put it in Genesis 18:27. I read that from a strictly financial standpoint, the chemicals in the average human body are worth a mere \$7.28!⁸

Please don't misunderstand me. Human life is sacred, yes, but why? Our worth is not inherent, but *derived*. It's not what we possess independently, but linked to what we have received. *God* made us, and He made us to reflect *His* image.

That's why Michael Phelps could say, as he did in an interview this past week, that winning gold medals in three Olympics didn't prevent him from spiraling down into a dark hole in which he says he didn't care if he even lived. We are created in God's image, which means life is meant to be lived in relationship with our Creator.

⁷in Gordon Wenham, *Genesis*, p. 59.

⁸ So says Youngblood, p. 40.

This text says that God made the man and then God gave something to the man. What was it? Life, the breath of *life*. And what was merely lifeless material moments before now became a *living being*.

So when we go back to Genesis we discover three insights about man. The first has to do with his origin. God formed the earth for man, and God formed man from the earth.

II. Consider man's environment (8-14).

It is said that man is a product of his environment. Is that true? Let's take a close look at man's first environment which God's Word describes in verses 8-14. Two things were true of that environment.

A. It was a real paradise (8-9). "Now the LORD God had planted a garden in the east, in Eden; and there he put the man he had formed. And the LORD God made all kinds of trees grown out of the ground--trees that were pleasing to the eye and good for food. In the middle of the garden were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil."

You get the sense that in the created world man was sheltered but not smothered.⁹ God tailor-made a home for Adam.

The text states that God *planted* a garden. Not *created*, but planted. It was a perfect environment. Indeed, it was *paradise*.

Notice the garden was located in the *east*. East of what? East from the standpoint of Moses, apparently. Moses was in the Sinai wilderness, en route to the Promised Land.

Moses states the garden was "in Eden." The meaning of the name "Eden" is uncertain. It may be related to the Hebrew term for *bliss* or *delight*, or to another term that simply means *a plain*. It's not quite right, then, to refer to the garden itself by the name Eden. The garden was located in the region known as Eden.

Just where was the Garden of Eden? Supposedly there's a plaque on a tree stump in southern Iraq that designates the spot as the home of Adam.¹⁰ But the fact is, we don't know *where* the garden was. However, we do have information as to what it was like. Moses highlights three features of the first paradise.

1. *There was beauty.* Verse 9 indicates that the Lord caused a variety of trees to grow in the garden, trees that were "pleasant to the eye." Beauty comes from God. Beauty is experienced when we appreciate what God has made.

2. *There was food.* The trees were "good for food." God is so generous. Here He supplies the man he created with what he needs. And this is some garden! Not a weed in sight, but rather luxurious, fruitful vegetation.

But that's not all. In the centerpiece of the garden...

3. *There were two special trees.* They were right in the middle of the garden. Moses calls the first "the tree of life," and the second "the tree of the knowledge of good and evil." Interesting names for trees, huh?

This is the first mention of "evil" in the Bible. According to Genesis 1:31, God created a *very good* universe, so what's the purpose of this tree that contains the knowledge of good and evil? The answer will come shortly.

What else was true of man's first environment? First, it was a real paradise...

⁹ Kidner, p. 61.

¹⁰ Youngblood, p. 41.

B. It was a real place (10-14). "A river watering the garden flowed from Eden; from there it was separated into four headwaters. The name of the first is the Pishon; it winds through the entire land of Havilah, where there is gold. (The gold of that land is good; aromatic resin and onyx are also there.) The name of the second river is Gihon; it winds through the entire land of Cush. The name of the third river is the Tigris; it runs along the east side of Asshur. And the fourth river is the Euphrates."¹¹

The skeptic says, "Ah, come on now! You don't believe there really was a garden of Eden, do you? The whole thing's just a man-made myth, isn't it? It's just a story, right?"

But it's not just a story. The biblical narrative goes to great length to show that the garden was a *real* place.

As I prepared for this message I pondered why God included verses 10-14 in this account. Why does He want us to know about this river that flowed out of garden, and that broke into four tributaries? And why does He record their names? And why does He tell us features of the lands through which the headwaters flowed?

There may be other reasons, but this one strikes me as predominant. This is no make-believe story. This is no *Treasure Island*. The garden of Eden was a *real place*.

So is man simply a product of his environment? If he is you'll have a hard time explaining what happened to Adam and Eve. The first couple lived in a *perfect* environment. They had everything (I mean *everything*) they could ever want.

What went wrong? The answer comes in chapter three, when the tempter entices the woman and then the man to act independently of God. But for now, don't miss this. Good or bad, our environment may affect us, but it does not dictate what we will be.

There are implications here. For how we approach education, and deal with criminals, and even how we view the problem of poverty. Genesis helps us think rightly concerning the relationship between man's origin and his environment.

In verses 15-17 we discover insight #3...

III. Consider man's purpose (15-17).

"The LORD God took the man and put him in the Garden of Eden to work it and take care of it. And the LORD God commanded the man, 'You are free to eat from any tree in the garden; but you must not eat from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die.'"

Why are we here? For two reasons spelled out right here.

A. We were created to *serve* God (15). God put Adam in the garden and gave him a very specific task. He was to *work it* and *take care of it*.

That's interesting. Why *work it* if it's already perfect? If I was God (that's a frightening thought!), I'd have put a sign up in my perfect garden that read, "LOOK BUT DON'T TOUCH."

But not God. He's so gracious. He gives us all things to enjoy (1 Tim 6:17).

Consider a couple of lessons from verse 15.

1. *We're supposed to work in God's world.* And specifically...
2. *We're supposed to take care of God's world.* Work it and take care of it--those were God's instructions for the first man.

What does that tell us? Work is good. Work existed before sin and before the Fall.

¹¹It's possible to translate *Pishon* and *Gihon* as the common nouns, *gusher* and *spurter*.

A lot of people have an unbiblical attitude towards work. Work is bad. Work is something to try and get out of. We even joke about the problem.

A fictitious company posted the following notice: "The management regrets that it has come to their attention that workers dying on the job are failing to fall down. This practice must stop, as it becomes impossible to distinguish between death and the natural movement of the staff. Any employee found dead in an upright position will be dropped from the payroll.

One statistic from several years back estimated that deliberate waste and abuse of company time cost the U.S. economy over \$120 billion a year. That loss was three times more than for recognized business crime.¹²

The fact is, we were created to work. Our usual idea of "paradise" often isn't very biblical. We think that paradise is having *no* work. But in the paradise of the garden, Adam had God-given work to do. And I believe the same will be true in the paradise of the new heaven and earth in eternity. It will be a perfect place, but there will be work to do.

In fact, if you want an idea of what eternity for the believer will be like, look at Genesis 2. In Genesis 2 we see paradise. We see man in perfect relationship with God, worshiping God and reflecting His image *by working*.

Work is good. It's not more important than worship which is why we need to *stop work* on day seven (as we learn in 2:1-3), and observe a day of worship and rest each week. Why? Again, it's not because work isn't good. It's because work isn't to be our god. We were created to *serve God*.

There's a second purpose...

B. We were created to *obey God (16-17)*. At this point God gave the first man a test. The test involved two options, and in essence, the same two options face us.

1. *One option is to choose God's way.* I want you to notice three important characteristics of God featured in verses 16-17. First...

•God is God. Notice how verse 16 begins, "And the LORD God commanded the man." He *commanded*. That doesn't set too well in a society that glorifies man. We want a God who exists *for man*. We don't want a God that tells us what to do.

We've been sold a bill of goods that says that man is autonomous. He can rule himself. We want a domesticated "god."

But that most certainly is not the God of the Bible. God commands because He knows best. To not command would not be loving. Can you imagine a mother not giving instructions to her precious two year old? "Just eat whatever you want, honey. I can't tell you what to do. You need to decide for yourself."

No way. God commands precisely because God loves. God is *God*.

•God is generous. Listen to His generous offer, "You are free to eat from *any* tree in the garden." Is man free? Yes, but he's a creature. He is free to do only what the Creator says is appropriate.

Some people feel God is harsh and restrictive, and view the Christian life that way. "I don't want to be a Christian. It's no fun. You can't do anything."

That's not true. The fact is, a gracious God gives us the freedom to do *everything* that's truly good for us. And how do we know if something is good for us? He graciously tells us. Where? In His Word.

¹²"Creative Management," in *Homemade*, May, 1985.

•God is good. Verse 17, "But you must not eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, for when you eat of it you will surely die."

You say, "How does that warning demonstrate God's goodness?" In this manner. God is so good that He gives us a fair warning. He told the first man, "You can eat from any tree in the garden. Except one. If you eat from that tree you will surely *die*. The Hebrew is *moot tamoot*, the penalty of dying is stressed by double emphasis.

When a doctor says, "If you keep smoking, you're going to destroy your lungs," is that doctor being harsh or good?

When a mechanic says, "If you don't change your oil, you're going to burn up your engine," is he trying to rob you of some fun, or does he have your good in mind?

When a teacher says, "If you don't study for this test, you won't pass this class," is she being unkind or good?

My friend, we can be glad that in His goodness, God tells us ahead of time the consequences of sinful actions. So God says, "Don't let the sun go down on your anger; if you do you'll give Satan a foothold (Eph 4:26-27)." And God says, "Don't slander your brother with hurtful words; if you do you are in danger of hell fire (Matt 5:22)." And God says, "Don't rob Me by withholding your tithes from Me; if you do you will experience a severe penalty (Mal 3:9)." And God says, "Don't sow to the flesh; if you do you will reap destruction (Gal 6:8)."

Is that being harsh? No. That's love. God, the Person who designed and made us, knows far better than we do what's best for us. The question is whether we're going to believe Him or not, choose to live His way or our way.

Those are the two--and only two--options. They're the same options that first man faced. One option is to choose God's way...

2. *The other option is to choose your own way.* Those are the only two options on the test. If you choose God's way, you'll be free. If you choose your own way, you'll remain a slave.

You say, "*Remain a slave? Aren't we free like Adam?*"

No, and here's why. Answer this. What did God say would happen to Adam if he ate from the forbidden tree? He would *die*. Did he eat? Yes. And what happened? He *died*. He became a slave to sin, and enslaved the entire human race to sin (Rom 5:12).

So the fact is, we are not free like Adam. When God placed Adam in the garden, he was morally neutral. Is that true of us? No. The Bible says we were conceived in sin, born in sin, and enter this world as slaves to sin.

We are plagued by the problem of sin, first, what theologians call the problem of *original sin*, and then secondly, our *own sin*. If you don't understand this, you won't understand why all the good you think you're doing in life doesn't seem to quiet your anxious soul.

Rosario Butterfield was a lesbian activist whom Jesus rescued and is now using to minister hope to others in bondage. In the article she wrote for Ligioneer Ministries entitled, "Ministering to the Sexually Broken," Butterfield says the following, and as you listen, consider the striking contrast with Hugh Grant's earlier comments that affairs are good for marriage.

Every day, a believer must face the reality that original sin distorts us, actual sin distracts us, and indwelling sin manipulates us. This distortion, distraction, and manipulation create a wedge between us and our God. We are in a war, and the sooner we realize it, the better.

Sexual brokenness comes with boatloads of shame, as sexual sin is itself predatory: it hounds us, traps us, and seduces us to do its bidding. Sexual sin won't rest until it has captured its object. When our conscience condemns us, we sometimes try to fight. But when shame compels isolation, we hide from the very people and resources that we need. We whiteknuckle it until Satan deceptively promises that sweet relief will come only from embracing that lustful glance, clicking that Internet link, or turning off the lights to our bedrooms and hearts and embracing the fellow divine image-bearer that God forbids us to embrace.

We sexually broken sheep will sacrifice faithful marriages, precious children, fruitful ministries, productive labor, and unsullied reputations for immediate, illicit sexual pleasure.¹³

She's right. *Sin* is our problem. Our own sinful choices, yes, but the death-producing effects of original sin too.

Rosaria Butterfield sheds more light on this problem of sin in her book, *The Secret Thoughts of an Unlikely Convert*:

Pride combined with wealth leads to idleness because you falsely feel that God just wants you to have fun; if unchecked, this sin will grow into entertainment-driven lust; if unchecked, this sin will grow into hardness of heart that declares other people's problems no responsibility or care of your own; if unchecked, we become bold in our sin and feel entitled to live selfish lives fueled by the twin values of our culture: acquiring and achieving.¹⁴

Is there hope for sinners who have inherited the problem of original sin? Because of God's mercy, yes, indeed! Listen to 1 Corinthians 15:21-22, "For since death came through a man, the resurrection of the dead comes also through a man."

What man? Verse 22, "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ all will be made alive."

Who dies? All who are *in Adam*. Who is made alive? All who are *in Christ*.

The Bottom Line: We must give our attention to two Adams...

1. *To understand what we lost, look at the first Adam.* If you want to know why life is what it is, look to the first Adam. You'll see who you are, why you are here, what you're meant to do, and why it's not working.

But don't stop there...

2. *To regain what we lost, look to the second Adam.* The second Adam came to undo what the first Adam did. The second Adam lived a perfect life, died to pay the penalty of our sin, and then conquered death and the consequences of original sin.

Listen to Romans 5:17, "For if, by the trespass of the one man, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive God's abundant provision of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ."

So if you want to regain what the first Adam forfeited, then look to Christ! Put your total trust in Him, get to know Him, and begin to experience life as God intended.

¹³ <http://www.ligonier.org/learn/articles/ministering-to-the-sexually-broken/>

¹⁴ https://www.goodreads.com/author/quotes/6151151.Rosaria_Champagne_Butterfield