

The Human Jesus, Sarx, and Adam's First Sin

When the apostle Paul preached to the Jews the gospel that Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified and rose again, is the Lord and the Christ, this was “a stumbling block” to the Jews (1 Cor 1:23). The Greek word *skandalon* (σκάνδαλον), translated here as “stumbling block,” means “snare/stone of stumbling” and is the root of the English word “scandal.” According to Jewish law, anyone hanged on a tree is under God’s curse, so it was not easy for the Jews to accept Jesus as Messiah. Yet, most paradoxically, by taking that curse upon Himself, Jesus opened the way of salvation for all who believe in Him.

There is a scandal now also in Yulbang Church and Zoe Ministry: namely, the matter of the human Jesus, *sarx* (σάρξ, “flesh”), and the first sin committed by Adam. Why does the seemingly sound biblical statement “Because He loved us, Jesus came to this earth in the same flesh (*sarx*) as ours (Phil 2:6–8)” become problematic? This brief essay offers a concise answer and is organized as follows: about Jesus who came as a man under the same conditions as we (sections 1, 2); about Paul, who uses the expression *sarx* (“flesh”) to refer to that Jesus (section 3); further, about the issue between this human Jesus and Adam’s first sin (sections 4, 5); and in section 6, a synthesis of the content and the benefits brought by the new perspective presented by Zoe Ministry; finally, in section 7, questions that have been raised within Zoe Ministry regarding the human Jesus are arranged in a Q&A format.

1. The Gospels testify to the fact that Jesus, as a human like us, ministered on this earth in the fullness of the Holy Spirit. This is the fulfillment of the prophecy concerning the Messiah in Isaiah 42:1: “Behold my servant, whom I uphold, my chosen one in whom my soul delights; I have put my Spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice to the nations.” The Messiah and the Spirit are inseparable, and Jesus the Messiah fulfilled this. The Gospels proclaim that Jesus, who lived a Spirit-filled life as a man, is the Messiah, and they also teach that He is the model for our lives.

In Mark—the first of the four Gospels to be written—Jesus refers to Himself as the Son of Man, that is, the son of a human being. Only the demons recognize that He is the Son of God and attempt to expose this, but each time Jesus commands them to be silent, keeping it hidden until He bears the final purpose of His human ministry—the cross (the “Messianic Secret,” the secret of the Son of God). Only when Mark reaches 15:39 does he show the Roman centurion who, looking at Jesus hanging in horrific agony on the cross, makes the paradoxical confession, “Truly this man was the Son of God¹.”

Jesus made it clear that the source of all His power was the Holy Spirit. It was not the divine power He already possessed as the Son of God. Matthew records Jesus saying, “But if it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons...” (Matt 12:28). Jesus, as a human like us,

cast out demons by the power of the Holy Spirit.

Luke shows repeatedly that Jesus was continually filled with the Spirit: He was conceived by the Spirit (1:35), was filled at His baptism (3:22), was full of the Spirit during His temptation (4:1), and was filled as He launched His public ministry by proclaiming Isaiah's words (4:18). These four accounts of Jesus being filled with the Spirit imply that He lived in continual fullness of the Spirit—and at the same time tell us, His disciples, that we too must live continually filled with the Spirit. If Spirit-filled disciples are the central theme of the book of Acts, then even the arrangement of the New Testament—Acts following the Gospels—encourages us that Jesus is the model for our lives, and that we are to follow the example He has shown.

However, the perspective of the Gospel of John is somewhat more comprehensive. That is, while the Synoptic Gospels (Matthew, Mark, and Luke) focus more on Jesus as man, the Gospel of John more thoroughly reveals Jesus as God. This does not mean that the Synoptic Gospels centered on Mark portray only the human Jesus, nor that John portrays only the divine Jesus. Mark also clearly proclaims Jesus' divine identity from the very beginning, declaring, "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (1:1). On the other hand, John 1 testifies that the Word, who was with God from the beginning, became flesh (*σάρξ*, *sarx*) and dwelt among us (John 1:1, 14). In the end, what they seek to emphasize is different.

The Gospel of John—written around AD 100, roughly seventy years after Jesus bore the cross and rose again, thereby proving His identity as the Son of God and the Messiah—is a Gospel that, on the firm foundation of the early Church's established belief in the "human Jesus," clearly proclaims the truth that "Jesus is the Son of God."

2. How, then, do other parts of Scripture speak about the fact that Jesus came as a human in the same bodily condition as we are?

The genealogy of Jesus testifies that He came as a "man," born through human lineage. Matthew begins his Gospel by presenting Jesus' genealogy (Matt 1:1–17). Through this genealogy, he shows that Jesus came as the descendant of King David, and therefore as the King of the Jews, and ultimately as the Messiah. The fact that Matthew's genealogy begins with Abraham, the ancestor of the Jewish people, would have further highlighted for them that Jesus is their true King and Messiah.

Meanwhile, Luke's genealogy clearly shows that Jesus came as a human, for Luke traces His line all the way back to the first man, Adam (Luke 3:38). Moreover, the sequence from David down to Heli (3:23–31) is entirely different from Matthew's, and biblical commentators point out that Luke is presenting Mary's lineage². Thus, although both Matthew and Luke describe Jesus as Joseph's legal son, Luke's genealogy places a stronger

emphasis on Jesus' human lineage³.

Hebrews likewise declares repeatedly, and in very clear language, that Jesus came in the flesh: "He Himself likewise shared in the same nature of blood and flesh (σάρξ, *sarx*)" (2:14), "Therefore He had to be made like His brothers in every respect" (2:17), and "In the days of His flesh (σάρξ, *sarx*)" (5:7).

First John 4:2–3 also shows that the fact that Jesus was a human like us was clearly an issue in the early Church: "By this you know the Spirit of God: every spirit that confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh (σάρξ, *sarx*) is from God, and every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God. This is the spirit of the antichrist."

3. God caused Paul to write more than half of the New Testament. Therefore, examining how Paul understood the human Jesus is an essential matter that must not be overlooked in our discussion.

We must first note that, regarding the human Jesus, Paul uses the term *sarx* (σάρξ, "flesh"). He states that Jesus came in the flesh: "concerning His Son, who was descended from David according to the flesh (σάρξ)" (Rom 1:3); "when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth His Son, born of woman" (Gal 4:4); "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (σάρξ)" (Rom 8:3). In other words, he is saying that Jesus was a human being like us. What must be recognized here is that Paul, while fully affirming that Jesus is the Son of God, intentionally uses the term *sarx*(σάρξ) to say that He became human under the same conditions as we are. This point is supported by the well-known British Pauline scholar James D. G. Dunn, who explains that although the primary meaning of *sarx* is the human body, the most significant function of the term from Paul's perspective is its implication of "human mortality."⁴ With this in mind, let us look more closely at Paul's use of the term *sarx*.

We must remember, in order to understand the term *sarx*, that it refers to the fallen flesh that no longer aligns with God's original intention after Adam's sin. "My Spirit shall not abide in man forever, for he is flesh (Heb. בָּשָׂר; LXX: σάρξ)" (Gen 6:3). And based on the following verse, "every intention of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (v. 5), we may define *sarx* as "ontological weakness," or, more simply, "a tendency that draws in sin."

By Jesus' time, the Septuagint (LXX—the Greek translation of the Old Testament from the third century BC) already existed, and Paul was familiar with it. With that in mind, the fact that Paul deliberately chose the word *sarx* is quite significant. It is well known that he could have chosen the more neutral term *sōma* (σῶμα) to indicate that Jesus was a human being. See how Paul uses *sōma* when expressing the excellence of Jesus' divinity: "For in Him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily (σῶμα)" (Col 2:9). Yet Paul chose the term *sarx*

because he wished to emphasize that the human Jesus came under the same conditions as we do.

That He came in *sárx* means that He began His human life from the same starting point as we do. In other words, the human Jesus did not come in the position of Adam before the fall but in the position of Adam after the fall. As the second Adam, the last Adam (1 Cor 15:45, 47), He resolved and restored everything at the very point where the first Adam failed. He did not merely “act” human, nor did He come with better conditions than we have. Rather, because the Son of God laid aside His divine nature and became human, the weight of life He bore was immeasurably heavier than ours. Hebrews 5:7 vividly shows us His condition:

“In the days of his flesh (sárx), Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to him who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverence” (Heb 5:7).

Considering that Jesus was fully aware that if He yielded for even a moment to the fierce waves of the *sárx* that lead to sin, the way of salvation for humanity would be completely cut off, we can never say that He lived an easier life than we do. Rather, it is far more accurate to say that He willingly chose suffering because of His love for us.

Let us return to Paul’s use of the term *sárx*. This time, let us look at Romans 8:3, where Paul speaks in very strong terms about the fact that Jesus came in *sárx*, that is, in the same condition as we are:

“...sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh...” (Rom 8:3).

Paul adds the bold descriptor “sinful” before *sárx*. In doing so, he makes his intention in using the term unmistakably clear: he is emphasizing that the very nature of the *sárx* in which the human Jesus participated is a state of ontological weakness, a condition that draws in sin. Many biblical commentators and theologians do not hesitate to interpret this verse as meaning that Jesus entered into fallen human nature⁵. Yet at this point we must not overlook an essential truth: despite this, the Lord never committed sin, as Hebrews 4:15 declares:

*“For we do not have a high priest who is unable to sympathize with our weaknesses, but one who in every respect has been tempted as we are, **yet without sin**” (Heb 4:15).*

4. As we have seen so far, the claim that Jesus came as a human in precisely the same condition as we are is an undeniable truth supported by Scripture. Yet when this claim is viewed through the colored lens of the doctrine of “original sin,” the truth that the human Jesus came in *sárx* becomes difficult to accept. This is because, under that doctrine, original sin is understood as the sin that became mine as a result of Adam’s fall. Thus, to say that

Jesus became human in the same condition as we are—in other words, that He became *sárx*—can sound as if He too possessed original sin.

The doctrinal concept of original sin has its roots in Augustine's (AD 354–430) interpretation of 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." Although Augustine was not the originator of the doctrine of original sin, he is said to have played a major role in systematizing it and spreading its influence.

Augustine interpreted this verse to mean that when Adam sinned, all of us who were "in Adam" sinned as well. Although the Korean Bible translates the phrase correctly as "because all sinned," Augustine, relying on the Latin translation available to him at the time, understood the Greek relative clause to mean "in whom (that one man, Adam) all sinned⁶."

This interpretation naturally led to the understanding that "the sin Adam committed" was passed down to us, and this trajectory had a significant influence on the Reformer Calvin as well. As a result, a great many biblical commentators and theologians today have come to accept the idea that Adam's sin is inherited by all people.

However, a careful examination of this verse shows that what Paul intended to say was not that "the sin Adam committed" is inherited by us, but rather that Adam died because of the sin he himself committed, and we die because of the sins we ourselves commit. The verb in the statement "all have sinned" is in the active voice. In other words, it is not that Adam's sin was passed down to us, but that every person comes to death through the sins they have personally chosen. Ezekiel 18:20 also illustrates this point clearly:

"The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, nor the father suffer for the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon himself."

Thus, if Romans 5:12 is understood to mean that every person comes to death through the sin each one has committed, then the following verses (5:13–21) are not focused on the inheritance of Adam's first sin but on death as the result of sin. This, in turn, becomes an appropriate groundwork for Paul's discussion of sanctification in chapters 6–8. Based on this interpretation, when referring to the first sin Adam committed against God, it is more accurate to use the expression "Adam's first sin" rather than "original sin," since the latter easily leads to the misunderstanding of a "hereditary transmission of sin."

5. Then does Jesus, who came in the *sárx*, have Adam's first sin or not? As we have already seen, the "inheritance of original sin" is not a biblical teaching that can be drawn from Romans 5:12. However, because the primary cause of the *sárx* is Adam's first sin, the relationship between the *sárx* and Adam's first sin does need to be clearly defined.

Human Jesus came in the *sárx*. Because the primary cause of the *sárx* is “Adam’s first sin,” we can say that the *sárx* includes the effects of that first sin. However, we must keep in mind that “Adam’s first sin” is not a sin Jesus Himself committed, nor one for which He was condemned. As Romans 5:12 states, sin is that which leads to death. Jesus bore Adam’s first sin and went up to the cross, paying the price for Adam’s sin and thus saving him. He did not commit sin Himself because of Adam’s first sin included in the *sárx*, nor was He reproached, judged, and put to death on the cross for it. Therefore, even if Adam’s first sin is included within the condition of the *sárx*, Jesus still remains the One who committed no sin.

The reason confusion increases at this point is because of the widely held Augustinian–Calvinist doctrine of the “inheritance of original sin.” The Calvinist understanding of original sin holds that original sin consists of both the sinful nature and guilt. Thus, humanity is understood to be born already evil because both the sinful nature and the guilt are believed to be inherited from Adam. When we say that Adam’s first sin is included in the *sárx* that Jesus took on, viewing this through the lens of Calvinist doctrine leads to the conclusion that Jesus possessed guilt—that is, a sin deserving condemnation—and this becomes problematic. Once again, saying that the human Jesus came in the *sárx*, which includes Adam’s first sin, means that the second Adam, Jesus, nevertheless did not commit sin. It does not mean that He possessed guilt.

Jesus never once yielded to the influence of the *sárx*, nor did He commit sin. Rather, He accepted upon Himself the judgment of Adam’s sin as well as the sins of us all (“God condemned sin in the flesh,” Rom 8:3), and by choosing death on the cross, He saved us.

“For even the Son of Man came not to be served but to serve, and to give his life as a ransom for many” (Mk 10:45).

Therefore, through Jesus Christ who came in the *sárx*, we have been restored to a right relationship with God and are now able to stand before Him as holy and blameless beings: “He has now reconciled you in his body of flesh by his death, in order to present you holy and blameless and above reproach before him” (Col 1:22).

6. Now let us summarize the discussion thus far and then consider the benefits that this line of understanding provides.

The term “human Jesus” means, in short, that Jesus, as a man, lived on this earth in the same condition of flesh (*sárx*) that we possess, yet remained in complete obedience to God and never chose sin. In doing so, He fulfilled the conditions necessary for the salvation of humanity and became the model for our lives. God’s purpose in creating humanity was not centered on salvation; He did not create mankind anticipating their fall. Human beings were originally created in God’s image as partners of love, meant to grow continually. God’s intention is that we grow “to the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ” (Eph 4:13–

15). Therefore, it is essential that the human Jesus—who embodies the model of ontological restoration fitting the very purpose of human creation—be emphasized.

However, as noted earlier, the doctrine of “original sin” becomes a major obstacle in a life of faith that seeks sanctification while looking to the human Jesus. It exerts negative influence in both directions—between Jesus and us as believers.

First, the doctrine of original sin, even if unintentionally, ends up distorting the image of Jesus. As long as the doctrine of original sin is operating, Jesus cannot be a human who lived a life under the same conditions as we do. He is a being who, from birth, has neither a sinful nature nor guilt. As a result, His life becomes one we cannot take as our model, and although we call Him human, it turns Him into a different kind of human from us. In the end, this closes the path to encountering Jesus personally and creates the possibility of relating to Him as an impersonal idol.

Second, it intensifies in us as believers a kind of fatalistic powerlessness, making it impossible to live a life of sanctification. Even after being born again, we still possess the flesh. Namely, the conflict between the old self and the new self continues. Under such conditions, as long as the doctrine of inherited original sin remains, the old self can never be truly free from the problem of sin. The doctrine makes us focus on the inherent weakness of our flesh, so that even while we are told to imitate Jesus—who, as one like us, lived a life of perfect obedience—it ends up functioning as an excuse for our failure to live such a life. Thus, in a life of faith that must pursue sanctification, the doctrine of original sin inevitably reveals its limitations.

In contrast, the alternative perspective presented by Zoe Ministry is as follows:

1. **Christological dimension:** Jesus incarnated as a human with the exact same conditions we possess (Phil 2:6–8). God sent Jesus into the world in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom 8:3). Yet the human Jesus was a man filled with the Holy Spirit (Isa 42:1), and He never once chose sin (Heb 4:15). In this way, Jesus fulfilled the conditions necessary to save us and became the model for the sanctification we pursue.
2. **Anthropological dimension:** After Adam’s fall, we became flesh (Gen 6:3). Strictly speaking, this is a state of the possibility of sinning, not a state of already having sinned and come under judgment. Since “flesh” is free from the dilemma of original sin—that is, the contradiction of being a sinner even without having committed sin—it can more readily be subdued by the new self. Thus, within the conflict between the old self and the new self, we too can be filled with the Holy Spirit and continually cause the new self to flourish, just like the human Jesus.

Such a perspective, which overcomes the doctrine of original sin, first restores the true image of Jesus and encourages us to live as He did, choosing, as people of the new self, not

to walk according to the flesh. It also removes the possibility of fatalistic defeatism that can arise in the process of sanctification, thereby resolving the spiritual powerlessness that stems from it.

7. Finally, we will examine in a Q&A format whether the explanation of “the human Jesus, *sárx*, and Adam’s first sin” has any points of conflict with the existing truth system and ministry of Zoe Ministry.

Q. Is there any conflict between this concept of “the spirits that flow through a family line” and our position that rejects the inheritance of original sin?

A. For example, in the past, many grandmothers lived in loneliness and isolation and did not receive proper love from their husbands, so the influence of immorality was strong. It is only natural that such an influence would affect later generations. In this sense, an individual who remains under that influence acquires and learns such sin; it is not that the sin itself is inherited and therefore repeated.

Q. If, in the ministry of the Heavenly Sanctuary, we understand that the problem of Adam’s first sin has already been resolved, then is it not unnecessary to say that Adam’s first sin is included within the *sárx*?

A. There can be no ministry of the Heavenly Sanctuary without first passing through the cross. On the cross, Jesus bore the judgment for the sins of humanity; He descended to Hades and liberated the righteous; He rose again; and then He entered the Heavenly Sanctuary and, with His own blood, completely erased and perfected what had been defiled in the code of the conscience (Hebrews 9–10). Through the cross of Jesus we are made holy, and through His ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary we are made complete. After the sacrifice that made us holy, there was yet another act of priestly work—this was Jesus’ ministry in the Heavenly Sanctuary.

Q. What is the relationship between John the Baptist’s declaration about Jesus—“the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world”—and the *sárx*?

A. When John the Baptist saw Jesus coming toward him and said, “Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world” (John 1:29), he was describing Jesus as the atoning Lamb who bore all the sins of humanity—including Adam’s first sin. When Jesus received baptism from John, He said that doing so was “to fulfill all righteousness” (Matt 3:15). By doing this, all sin was condemned in Him (Rom 8:3), and through His death on the cross He

paid the price for our sins and satisfied the righteousness of God. Although Jesus lived in the *sárx*, He never sinned even once, and therefore He could become God's sacrificial Lamb who could bear the sins of all humanity.

Q. We, who live within the limitations of the flesh (*sárx*), sometimes choose sin even in childhood—indeed, even young children commit sin. Since Jesus spent His infancy and childhood under the same human conditions we do, wouldn't He have been the same?

A. Jesus came in the *sárx*, so there was a real possibility that He could have sinned. But He did not sin. If Jesus had committed sin at any point, He would not have fulfilled the conditions necessary for our salvation. Therefore, the very fact that we have all received salvation means that He did not sin even in His childhood. Mary, who received the angel's visitation and knew that the child conceived in her by the Holy Spirit was the Son of God, would have carried and raised Him in an extraordinary way. The fullness of the Holy Spirit she experienced likely enabled her to live without choosing sin throughout her pregnancy. And the account of Jesus at twelve years old (Luke 2) testifies that He lived without sin both before and after that time. What we must remember is that being conceived by the Holy Spirit does not mean He was unaffected by sin. That is evidence of His identity—namely, His being the Son of God—and is not what determines His sinlessness. Through Mary, He came in the same flesh as we have.

Q. Were Adam and Eve also in a state of *sárx* at creation? And is that why, instead of holding to God's word, they fell into Satan's temptation and committed sin?

A. At creation, Adam and Eve were precisely in the original state God intended. It was by their own free will that they chose sin. As a result, humanity fell into the state of flesh (*sárx*). And it was to save humanity in that condition that Jesus came as the second Adam.

Q. Whether or not Adam's sinful act and its corresponding guilt are inherited by humanity, believers are ultimately forgiven of all sins through Jesus. In that case, why is it important to show that the "inheritance of original sin" is a mistaken doctrine?

A. Even believers, as long as we live on this earth in the flesh, still possess the old self and therefore face constant temptations and challenges of sin (Rom 6–8; Gal 5). This inevitably raises the question, "If we have been set free from Adam's sin, why do we still sin and struggle with it?"—a question that produces spiritual confusion and contradiction, which ultimately leads to powerlessness. The reality of having been freed from Adam's sin seems not to match our ongoing struggle with sin. By contrast, the explanation given by Zoe Ministry—namely, that Adam's sin resulted in the weakness of human existence represented

by the *sárx* (the old self), and that as long as we live in the flesh we inevitably come under the influence of the *sárx* that draws us toward sin—makes clear both why we continue to face the problem of sin while living on this earth as believers and, at the same time, how we, like Jesus, can overcome the influence of sin by relying completely on the Holy Spirit (as the new self) and through repentance and the grace of Jesus' blood (Rom 8:13). Furthermore, the doctrine of the inheritance of Adam's sin portrays God as one who condemns people on the basis of sins they did not commit, leading to a misunderstanding of His justice—for example, viewing even an unborn child as already a sinner (Rom 2:6–11: "He will render to each one according to his works...").

¹ Of course, Mark clearly declares at the very beginning of his Gospel (1:1) that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. However, the narrative that follows shows that, until He bore the cross, Jesus concealed His divine identity—He set aside the exercise of His divinity—and carried out His ministry entirely as a human, as the Son of Man.

² “Luke had a particular interest in Mary. This is clear from the amount of space Luke allocates to her, and especially from Luke 2:19 and 2:51, which say that Mary treasured these things in her heart.”

Robert H. Stein, *Difficult Passages in the Gospels*, trans. Jung Chung-ha (Seoul: Sae Soon Publishing, 1991), 56. Stein argues that Luke recorded Mary’s genealogy (pp. 54–56).

³ Of course, the Gospel of Matthew also states that Jesus was born of Mary (Matt 1:16).

⁴ James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*, trans. Park Moon-jae (Seoul: Christian Digest, 2003), 125.

⁵ The person particularly noteworthy in this regard is Edward Irving, a Scottish Presbyterian pastor and theologian of the early nineteenth century. He strongly argued that Jesus came in the “sinful flesh” (Rom 8:3) that is the same as ours. His claim greatly influenced the Christology of modern theologians such as Karl Barth (*Church Dogmatics* I/2, Korean trans. Shin Joon-ho [Seoul: Korean Christian Publishing House, 2010]); T. F. Torrance (*The Mediation of Christ* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983], 48); and Colin Gunton. Biblical commentators have long discussed whether the Greek word *ὁμοιώματι* (*homoiómati*), meaning “likeness,” in the phrase “likeness of sinful flesh” (*ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*) in Romans 8:3 refers (i) to a resemblance to the human flesh that is vulnerable to sin, while simultaneously implying a difference, or (ii) to real identification, that is, complete sameness. Paul uses *ὁμοιώματι* (*homoiómati*) in Philippians 2:7 when speaking of the incarnation as Christ’s self-emptying, and since Paul’s point in Philippians 2:6–8 is Christ’s perfect humiliation through the incarnation, *ὁμοιώματι* (*homoiómati*) can be understood as indicating His complete becoming the same as humanity. Therefore, since Romans 8:3 also alludes to Christ’s incarnation in the same way as Philippians 2:7, it is appropriate to interpret *ὁμοιώματι* (*homoiómati*) according to the second view. The following scholars support such an interpretation: (a) J. D. G. Dunn, *Romans 1–8* (Waco: Word, 1988), 420–21 (“Jesus came and ministered in the form of the sinful flesh possessed by all humanity”); (b) C. K. Barrett, *Romans* (London: A & C Black, 1991), 147 (“Jesus assumed the same fallen nature as ours. Nevertheless, He remained without sin because He continually overcame the sinful tendencies arising from that fallen nature”); (c) Vincent Branick, “The Sinful Flesh of the Son of God (Rom 8:3): A Key Image of Pauline Theology,” *CBQ* 47 (1985), 246–62 (“In Rom 8:3, *ὁμοιώματι* does not at all point to any distinction or difference between Jesus and ‘sinful flesh’” [p. 250] / “By choosing the word ‘flesh,’ Paul evokes the solidarity between Christ and sinful humanity. Christ, as one of us, even shared our sinfulness. He bore our very same

sinful flesh” [p. 260]); (d) N. T. Wright, “Romans,” in *The New Interpreter’s Bible* 10 (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 578, who likewise refers to Philippians 2:7 and argues that the central point of the phrase “likeness of sinful flesh” in Romans 8:3 is that Jesus was truly human and possessed full human identity.

⁶ Augustine interpreted the Latin relative clause *in quo*—found in the Latin translation he used—as “in whom,” that is, “in Adam,” thereby arguing that all humanity sinned together with Adam when he committed his sin. Although the Greek relative pronoun ὃ and its Latin equivalent *quo* can be taken not only as neuter but also as masculine (as Augustine did), Augustine’s interpretation is not valid, since there is no masculine antecedent nearby in the sentence (Fitzmyer, *Romans* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008], 414), and because Paul uses the active verb ἁμαρτάνω to describe actual sin (for example, Rom 3:23 [πάντες γὰρ ἥμαρτον]) (C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans* 1 [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975], 278). The phrase ἐφ’ ὃ appears four times in Paul’s letters (Rom 5:12; 2 Cor 5:4; Phil 3:12; 4:10), and in the cases of 2 Cor 5:4 and Phil 3:12, ἐφ’ ὃ can be translated as the causal conjunction “because,” which shows the same usage found in Rom 5:12. Thus Rom 5:12 parallels the fact that Adam’s sin brought about death and, in the same way (οὕτως), the sins of all people also bring about death. In this respect, the focus of 5:12 is not the inheritance of original sin, as Augustine and later theologians argued, but the correlation between sin and death (Dunn, *Romans* 1–8, 290). Interestingly, even so, some scholars still remain within the interpretive framework of Augustine. For example, see Douglas J. Moo’s commentary on Rom 5:12 in *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT), Korean trans. Son Joo-cheol (Seoul: Solomon, 2011).