Christ). This clause is inserted on the  
first mention of the name Adam, the *one  
man* of whom he had been speaking, to  
recall the purpose for which he is treating  
of him,—as *the figure of Christ*. It is not  
*of him that was* to come, as in A. V., but is  
spoken from the Apostle’s *present* standing,  
‘*who is to come.*’ The fulfilment of the  
type will then take place completely, when,  
as 1 Cor. xv. 22, *in Christ all shall be  
made alive*.

**15—17.**] *Though Adam  
and Christ correspond as opposites, yet  
there is a remarkable difference, which  
makes the free gift of grace much more  
eminent than the transgression and its  
consequences, and enhances the certainty  
of its end being accomplished.* **Howbeit  
not** (in all points) **as the trespass** (of  
Adam, as the cause inducing sin and death  
on his race), **so also is the gift of grace**(i.e. justification: not a direct contrast,  
as *obedience* in ver. 19: the Apostle has  
more in mind here the *consequence* of the  
*trespass*, and to that opposes the *gift of  
grace*).

**15.**] **For if, &c.** *Distinction  
the first*, in DEGREE:—and in the form of  
a hypothetical inference, from the less to  
the greater. **For if by the trespass of  
the one** [**man**] **the many died, much more  
did the grace of God and his free gift  
abound unto the many by the grace of the  
one man Jesus Christ.** (1) The first question regards the expression **much more**. Is it the *à fortiori* of logical inference, or is it  
to be joined with **did abound** as quantitative,  
describing the *degree of abounding*? Chrysostom and others adopt the former, and provided only *the same thing is said here  
as in ver.* 17, the usage there would decide  
it to be so: for there it cannot be quantitative. But I believe that not to be so.  
Here, the question is of *abounding*, a  
matter of *degree*, there, of *reigning*, a  
matter of *fact*. Here (ver. 16) the contrast is between the judgment, coming of *one* sinner, to condemnation, and the free  
gift, of (see note below) *many* offences, to  
justification. So that I think the quantitative sense the better, and join **much more** with *did abound*, in the sense of  
**much more abundant** (rich in diffusion)  
**was the gift**, &e. (2) **grace**, not the grace  
*working in men*, here, but the grace which  
*is in, and flows from*, God. (3) *The grace  
of our Lord Jesus Christ* (His self-offering  
love, see 2 Cor. viii. 9) is the medium by  
which the free gift is imparted to men.  
(4) The *past* tense, **did abound**, should  
here be kept to its indefinite historical  
sense, and not rendered, as in the A. V., by  
a *perfect*, however true the fact expressed.  
may be: *both* are treated of here as *events*,  
their time of happening and present reference not being regarded.

**16.**] *Distinction the second*, in KIND, The former  
difference was quantitative: this is modal.—**And not as** [**it was**] **through one that sinned, so is the gift**.—It is a question,  
the words [*it was*] not existing in the  
original, whether any thing, and what, is  
to be supplied before the clause, **through  
one that sinned**. Meyer and others would  
understand it as if nothing was to be supplied, ‘And not as through one that sinned,  
so is the gift.’ But this has against it,  
that since the **for** following *gives the reason* for this sentence, this must *contain  
implicitly all* that that next expands in  
detail ; which is not merely the distinction  
between springing from *one man* and out of  
*many offences*, but much more. Others have  
supplied the *condemnation*, or the words  
*death entered*—but inasmuch as it is purposely left indefinite, to be explained in the next verse, it is better to supply in the  
thought an indefinite phrase which may be  
thus explained: as, ‘*that which took place*,  
through one;’ or, ‘as [it was] through one.’