



General Topics :: Our Sinful Nature and the Devil

Our Sinful Nature and the Devil - posted by Wildhorse (), on: 2005/9/21 21:41

Hey Guys,
Just a query.

How does the devil influence our sinful nature?
How does he make some people do certain things?

Cheers,
Michael H

Re: Our Sinful Nature and the Devil - posted by Joshua99 (), on: 2005/9/22 0:02

Quote:
-----How does the devil influence our sinful nature?

If you read carefully 2cor. 10:3-5 you will see what paul concludes, starting with thoughts that build and finally result in strongholds of the enemy. If you and I do not have a proper foundation built by the Spirit of God upon the written Word of God, we will have no defense against the wiles (lies against the word of God) of the devil.
Consider these verses found in 2 timothy 2:24-26

2Ti 2:24 And the Lord's servant must not be quarrelsome but kind to everyone, able to teach, patiently enduring evil,
2Ti 2:25 correcting his opponents with gentleness. God may perhaps grant them repentance leading to a knowledge of the truth,
2Ti 2:26 and they may escape from the snare of the devil, after being captured by him to do his will.

Unbelievers are already captured, they are sinners, verse 26 is speaking about Christians, who have fallen away into sin, carried away by their lusts....which started with one seed- a thought. So with that information, you should be able to see how Satan can make people fulfill his will. Blessings :-)

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2005/9/22 8:32

It is interesting Michael that you brought up this subject. It has been raised a few times recently, and so I think it is very important. We need to know answers in order to avoid being led away by deception about the devil (which is what he'd want).

I've been thinking on this a lot. From what I can understand, the devil has no POWER over us in a sense that he cannot FORCE our will, but he influences it through deception. Thus we must ultimately take accountability of all our choices.

I put some more of my thoughts here - as it relates to the fall of man: (<http://www.thewayback.net/articles/devil.htm>) The Devil made me do it - NOT
This is only a beginning, and must be reshaped. I trust that some more thoughts will be shed on this thread.

If we can't apply these concepts into the realities of life, then it is merely a theological discussion.
Diane

Re: Our sinful nature and the devil, on: 2005/9/22 8:36

Quote:
-----who have falling away into sin, carried away by there lusts....which started with one seed- a thought. So with that information, you s
huld be able to see how satan can make people fulfill his will.

There's also this brief synopsis from James.

James 1

13 Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God: for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he a
ny man: 14 but every man is tempted, when **he is drawn away of his own lust**, and enticed.

15 Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.

16 Do not err, my beloved brethren.

Re: - posted by samkma, on: 2005/9/22 9:46

Quote:

roadsign wrote:
I've been thinking on this a lot. From what I can understand, the devil has no POWER over us in a sense that he cannot FORCE our will, but he influen
ces it through deception. Thus we must ultimately take accountability of all our choices.

Satan has no authority over the redeemed ones, so the only way he can get us into sin is by deceiving us by telling us li
es, he is called a deceiver and father of lies. That's what he did in the garden where our fore father Adam and mum Eve
lived. he just made them believe in his words than that of The Most High.

The power of our flesh is great that we lust after the things of this world and sin often.

I disagree with people who blame satan for all the sin that comes to their lives.
As a son / daughter of God the Most High we need to give ear to His voice and obey the Spirit not the flesh.
Blessings
Hoping to hear more from you all.

Re: Our Sinful Nature and the Devil - posted by LetUsPray (), on: 2005/9/22 9:49

Quote:
-----How does the devil influence our sinful nature?

I just wanted to add some of my thoughts to the wisdom of the other respondents.

James 4:7, Submit yourselves therefore to God. Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.

Ephesians 6:10, Finally, my brethren, be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might.

2Cor.11:14,15, And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light. Therefore it is no great thing if his
ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness;

James puts it very plainly: Submit to God and resist the devil. Submitting to God means that Jesus becomes your All in
All. Whatever He taught and teaches, we obey. He quoted three Scriptures when tempted by the devil, and the devil left.

We have to know Scripture. We have to really understand Who Jesus is (which may seem a "funny" thing coming out of my mouth, after a previous thread). As is written by Paul to the Corinthians, Satan is transformed as an angel of light and there ministry workers of various kinds who actually come across as ministers of righteousness. We often think of what is understood as "bad– dirty" things being from Satan, but many things in the Church have the same demonic source.

A study of the book of Ephesians is very helpful, for it is like a long exhortation by Paul in which he addresses a whole range of topics and then writes: **FINALLY...BE STRONG IN THE LORD AND THE POWER OF HIS MIGHT**. All that preceded this statement in Eph.6:10: **FINALLY....** prepares us for what lies ahead as is written in Eph.6:12: For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high (places).

Just the first chapter alone, defines who we are "in Christ." Chosen by the Father, redeemed by the Son, and sealed by the Holy Spirit. A suggestion: when you study this letter, begin with the prayer: "That the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of glory, may give unto you the spirit of wisdom and revelation in the knowledge of him: The eyes of your understanding being enlightened." (Eph.1:17,18).

Paul documents two prayers in this letter. These prayers contain a number of extremely important requests to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. I am preparing a separate post in which I want to address these two prayers, for they contain a wealth of riches, which, if we are sincere in our hearts will help us greatly in "Being Strong in the Lord."

Bottom line:

He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil (1John3:8).

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/1 1:17

Hello there. Am I out of place to ask what is meant by sinful nature? Do you mean the propensities of the flesh? The desires of the flesh? Then Adam and Eve had a sinful nature. And Christ had a sinful nature.

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2005/10/1 2:03

Randy,

Since the fall man has set himself up as his own god (that is the lie of satan, "you shall be as God"). The desires of the "flesh" could rightly be interpreted as the desires of the "self" setting up your own agendas instead of Gods agendas. Romans 8:7 says "the MIND set on the flesh is hostile toward God; for it does not subject itself to the law of God, FOR IT IS NOT EVEN ABLE TO DO SO."

And Eph 4:17" So this I say, and affirm together with the Lord, that you walk no longer just as the Gentiles also walk, in the futility of their MIND, being darkened in their understanding, excluded from the life of God because of the ignorance that is in them..."

When man fell, his spirit, mind and body became separated from God, he set up his own agenda and that is what is meant by the sinful nature or the fleshly desires.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/1 5:01

Quote:

-----Hello there. Am I out of place to ask what is meant by sinful nature? Do you mean the propensities of the flesh? The desires of the flesh? Then Adam and Eve had a sinful nature. And Christ had a sinful nature.

randy

I think this is the key question; what do we mean by...? The problem as it stands is that this is not 'bible language'. The scriptures don't really refer to 'nature' or to 'self'. These are modern definitions of actual Bible phrases rather than true Bible language. For myself, I discipline my mind to ask Bible questions in Bible language; it forces me to shape my experience in Bible language rather than the other way around.

I will illustrate; The NASV has, in Romans 6:6, 'our old self was crucified'. This is already getting us on the wrong track. The concept of the 'self' is from psychology not from Bible revelation, and makes a nonsense of this verse. By implication

n, we have 'new self' on the way, but would a new 'self' be any better than an old 'self'? Some other versions will speak of 'our old nature' but again we have moved away from the language of the Bible.

The Bible word used in this particular verse is 'man' and is a continuation of the thoughts which begin in Rom 5:12 relating to 'two men'; the first man and the second man, the first man is according to Romans 6:6 'the ancient man'; who is this? This is Adam. There is another vital truth in this verse which is that it is 'our old man', not 'our old men' and not 'my old man'. There is a plurality and a singularity mixed together. I do not have 'an old man'; there is no 'an old man', there is only 'the old man' which we all share.

If Christ has dealt with 'the old man' all that is necessary is for me to be truly 'in Christ'. I am not referring to Bible verses here but to the reality of having been 'immersed into Him' and 'abiding in Him'.

What I am trying to do is to drive a wedge in between the ideas of 'the old man' and 'the flesh'; these two Bible concepts are not synonyms. Christ had 'flesh' but he had no 'old man'.

Re: Our Sinful Nature and the Devil - posted by Manfred, on: 2005/10/1 5:24

Quote:
-----I will illustrate; The NASV has, in Romans 6:6, 'our old self was crucified'. This is already getting us on the wrong track. The concept of the 'self' is from psychology not from Bible revelation, and makes a nonsense of this verse. By implication, we have 'new self' on the way, but would a new 'self' be any better than an old 'self'? Some other versions will speak of 'our old nature' but again we have moved away from the language of the Bible.

Excellent point Ron! The NIV makes the same blunder. Ah! these modern versions...

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/1 17:45

Hello there, me again. My version of scripture (kjv) reads thus "For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 Because the 'carnal' mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." My question to honest inquirers is this "Do you yet have a carnal mind?" "Does a Christian have a carnal mind?" "to be carnally minded is death" "to be spiritually minded is life" so then if the so called 'sinful nature' is synonymous with the carnal mind then we are all, assuming we have a sinful nature, partaking of spiritual death.

Quote:
-----When man fell, his spirit, mind and body became separated from God, he set up his own agenda and that is what is meant by the sinful nature

A man setting up his own agenda is what is meant by sinful nature? A man setting up is him doing. A man having a sinful nature is him having something. I can't help but see the inconsistency. Besides 'a sinful nature' is a misuse of the word 'nature'. A man's nature can be sinful, but it is improper to say that a person can have a nature. His nature is what he is not what he possesses. Please reply.

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2005/10/1 18:19

Randy,
I'm no theologian but my understanding would be that when Adam fell the whole of his being became corrupted. So what he is or what he possesses is moot, outside of Christ he is lost.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2005/10/1 18:39

Hi Randy,

Quote:
-----My question to honest inquirers is this "Do you yet have a carnal mind?" "Does a Christian have a carnal mind?" "to be carnally minded is death" "to be spiritually minded is life" so then if the so called 'sinful nature' is synonymous with the carnal mind then we are all, assuming we have a sinful nature, partaking of spiritual death.

There has been much discussion on these points for some time now. You may benefit from a search on the topic. But a short answer to your question is that everything depends on whether or not we are in Christ. If we are in Christ our old man is dead because of the finished work of the cross. This does not mean we cannot be tempted. What it means is that when we are in Christ Sin shall not have dominion over you. Christ is ruling and reigning where Sin once reigned. Where we once had the Spirit of disobedience- we now have the Holy Spirit. Where once we were in Adam and were by nature the children of wrath; we are now in Christ and are children of God by adoption. We have a new ancestor- Christ, therefore we have acquired His characteristics in terms of obedience- where once we had Adam's. So on and so forth.

The problem is that we still have natural desires (appetites that are not in of themselves bad) and yet we live in a sinful world. Temptation is an appeal to the intellect to satisfy a good appetite in a bad way. A good sermon to introduce these concepts is Paris Reidhead's (<http://64.34.176.235/sermons/SID0114.mp3>) Dangers of Third Generation Religion.

The question is - is there any residual Sin left in man once he/she is regenerated and in Christ? I am not asking here if we have a "sin nature" as it is generally understood, but is there somewhat left in the Christian that needs to be dealt with? Is the problem merely that Christians are not yet glorified and because of this they are more vulnerable to sinning than they would be if glorified? Why is death still necessary? Why can't the regenerate live forever without passing through physical death? Why can't we now come under the Law and keep the Law since our mind is no longer at enmity with God? Why do my members need to be continually mortified?

It seems to me that there is something residual left, but I can't get my head around the issue. I don't have enough mental RAM to pull up all the variables at once and come to an understanding. I have to keep compartmentalizing the issues and dealing with them individually.

One thing I know- if you stay FULL of the Holy Spirit- He will helpeth our infirmities. When we cease to be 'filled'- we start having trouble.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/1 18:42

Hello Jimbob, I do not profess to be a theologian either however the doctrine of constitutional sinfulness seems to me to be a stumbling block to sinners and Christians alike. From what I understand of the doctrine Adam's posterity has received from him some ailment of the flesh that makes it difficult if not impossible for him to obey God. What happened with Adam when he sinned? Did some change occur in his physical constitution? I can't see that anywhere in the Bible. I said to a lady once "You say that you sin every day! Why?" "Well it's my sin nature." It seems to be the one-liner excuse for sin.

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/1 18:49

Thanx for your input Robert. It seems as though people have the idea that without a sinful nature temptation would be impossible however Christ was tempted and Adam and Eve were tempted so was the devil neither of which would have had a sinful nature, according to popular theology. When ever a person under popular theology is tempted they always think of their sin nature

Randy

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2005/10/1 20:46

Randy, I hope I didn't imply that a regenerated person has a sin nature!! I believe a Christian has a totally free will to choose right or wrong, but the unbeliever even when he chooses right he himself is still wrong, for he is apart from God. Calvinists call it total depravity (correct me if I'm wrong). Anyway, I don't believe it is possible for Satan to MAKE a believer do anything, he can only tempt. But a temptation is not a sin, for a believer to act on a temptation is.

As far as why we still do sin after conversion, my suggestion would be because the mind has to catch up to what the spirit it already knows is true. We must be transformed by the renewing of our minds as Paul put it.

And yes, we did inherit traits from Adam. The first is spiritual death for God told Adam in the garden "the day you eat from it you shall die". The second is physical death, the evidence for that is all around us.

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/1 21:49

Jimbo. What do you call sin. As far as I know John Wesley's definition of sin is 'a willful transgression or the law'. Is this your definition of sin. I say that I agree with him. I think that many believe that sin can be unwillful. If you hold that sin can be unwillful then I will not object to your suggestion that our mind has to catch up with what the spirit knows is true. However you said that for a believer to act on a temptation is sin. Now an act of an individual implies the involvement of the will. And if the will is free then sin is not necessary. As for receiving traits from Adam I do not believe that physical death is a trait received from Adam. I think it just as proper, if not more, to say that the tree in the garden was needed by Adam and the rest of humanity in order to survive. I believe that God banished

Adam's posterity from the garden foreknowing that they would sin as well. As for receiving spiritual death from Adam I think it erroneous to say that anyone can receive anything moral from anyone else. What is spiritual death? I think it is a moral state of rebellion against God. Can a child be in rebellion against God? I Don't think so. If so then who will argue against the early Calvinists who believed that unconverted children went to hell. I believe that Adam was a type of all humanity even as Christ was a type of the Christian. Now I don't suggest that Adam's relation to mankind was limited to typology neither do I suggest the same of Christ. God told **ADAM** that on the day that he would eat thereof that **HE** would surely die. And a text for light.

"and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned" seemingly implying that the reason that death passed upon all men was their own sin foreknown.

Ready for correction and/or refining. Randy

Re: - posted by jimbo, on: 2005/10/2 8:02

Randy,

Did you ever really have a question in your mind when you started this thread, or were you baiting for a debate for the sake of expressing your own opinion?

So you believe God "foreknew" that the children of Adam would sin, so based on "foreknowledge" he banished them from the garden. Why not just banish Adam immediately after the children were born and give it another go? Surely if God raised the children Himself they would have all the moral upbringing anyone could possibly need to make all the choices so as to avoid sin? Or are you suggesting that God created man with a propensity toward sin and therefore knew they all were just going to do it anyway and so gave them the boot?

In the garden 100% of humanity fell, 100% sinned.

That is a fact. If you are suggesting that unregenerate mankind have some sort of choice NOT to sin, then it would stand to reason that at least some of mankind kind would be born not to sin. But another fact is that 100% of mankind do still sin, and all the arguments in the world will not get you away from the fact that we are spiritually and genetically predisposed to sin.

Can a child be in rebellion against God? Exodus 20:4 "I am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers on the CHILDREN..." Not because He "foresees" their sin but because the children are going to INHERIT the iniquity of their fathers.

Although I'm no Calvinist, I would suggest you read the book Chosen by God (RC Sproul). To me it sounds as if you could use a better understanding of God's sovereignty, man's sinfulness, and God's grace.

Do not be conformed to the image of this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your MIND.

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/2 23:37

Jimbo, I guess you're right about my deep down inclination to speak on this topic. The question, however, is genuine "what do 'you' mean when you say 'sin nature'". I don't think many people have worked out this doctrine to its logical conclusion. I do believe that man is born with a nature that tends toward sin. I do also believe that man's nature can tend toward holiness. Man, I believe, has universally chosen the pleasurable path. I don't think anyone would say that man was so constituted with sin nature that he tends toward homosexuality. The reason for this is that the scriptures plainly declare that such is "contrary to nature". I believe that man was made for God. That the only real satisfaction that can ever come to man is by way of obedience to God. This seems to be an indication that the nature of man is designed to be in obedience. In this way man's nature would tend toward holiness.

Those who suppose that man inherited a sinful nature from Adam think that man has lost the image of God through Adam. The scriptures say "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made after the similitude of God." 'Are made' present tense.

My real quarrel, friend, is that this doctrine seems to imply the necessity of sin. The unavoidableness of sin, if there be

such a word. This spell checker says otherwise. Any doctrine that directly states or even implies the necessity of sin slanders God. It has implied libel against the character of God. What do I mean? Well who is to blame for my sin if my sin is necessitated because of my nature received from Adam? Am I, who gave no consent whatever to the receiving of this nature? I cannot be. And if I could not help but sin because of my nature then God is unjust in damning anyone to hell in the same situation. And is not God responsible for making man in such a way that when Adam sinned his posterity would receive his nature? Any way that a person reasons on the subject of the necessity of sin God is by this doctrine impliedly slandered.

Now I don't know whether you or anyone else on this website actually believes in the necessity of sin. In fact I do believe that your God given intelligence must rebel against the very thought. Now as for as I understand of the doctrine it has its origin in a heathen philosophy, that is Gnosticism. And I do think that Paris Reidhead has mentioned vaguely this very thing in one or more of his sermons.

There is, in spite of its popularity, a surprising lack of clarity, seemingly, surrounding this topic. I am I am not free from this lack of clarity. I know some things. I know from studying the topic that there are three forms of it.

1)The 'Realistic Theory' originated by Augustine, who by the way spent seven years of his life in a Gnostic cult. This theory teaches that man literally existed in Adam when he sinned and is therefore just as blame worthy as he is for his sin. Why man did not exist in him during his reconciliation has yet to be answered. This theory is supposedly verified by Heb 7:9&10

"and as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. 10 For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him."

This I take as a figurative language that is meant simply to defend the superior priesthood of Christ. There is a text, in this regard, that I would bring to the attention of all who read this.

"And not only this; but when Rebecca also had conceived by one, even by our father Isaac; 11 (For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;)" **"neither having done any good or evil"**. And no one could argue against the doctrine that that little children, unsaved, will be in hell if this doctrine were true.

2)The second theory is the 'Federal Theory'. This theory teaches that Adam was the federal representative of the human race. God treats man according to the merits of Adam. This contradicts the 'law of God written upon our hearts' in the plainest fashion. Not to mention that it contradicts the scriptures.

"What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? 3 As I live, saith the Lord GOD, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. 4 Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die. 5 But if a man be just, and do that which is lawful and right, (that...: Heb. judgment and justice) 6 And hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, neither hath defiled his neighbour's wife, neither hath come near to a menstruous woman, 7 And hath not oppressed any, but hath restored to the debtor his pledge, hath spoiled none by violence, hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment; 8 He that hath not given forth upon usury, neither hath taken any increase, that hath withdrawn his hand from iniquity, hath executed true judgment between man and man, 9 Hath walked in my statutes, and hath kept my judgments, to deal truly; he is just, he shall surely live, saith the Lord GOD. 10 If he beget a son that is a robber, a shedder of blood, and that doeth the like to any one of these things, (robber: or, breaker up of an house) (that doeth...: or, that doeth to his brother besides any of these) 11 And that doeth not any of those duties, but even hath eaten upon the mountains, and hath defiled his neighbour's wife, 12 Hath oppressed the poor and needy, hath spoiled by violence, hath not restored the pledge, and hath lifted up his eyes to the idols, hath committed abomination, 13 Hath given forth upon usury, and hath taken increase: shall he then live? he shall not live: he hath done all these abominations; he shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him. (blood: Heb. bloods) 14 Now, lo, if he beget a son, that seeth all his father's sins which he hath done, and considereth, and doeth not such like, 15 That hath not eaten upon the mountains, neither hath lifted up his eyes to the idols of the house of Israel, hath not defiled his neighbour's wife, 16 Neither hath oppressed any, hath not withholden the pledge, neither hath spoiled by violence, but hath given his bread to the hungry, and hath covered the naked with a garment, (hath not...: Heb. hath not pledged the pledge, or, taken to pledge) 17 That hath taken off his hand from the poor, that hath not received usury nor increase, hath executed my judgments, hath walked in my statutes; he shall not die for the iniquity of his father, he shall surely live. 18 As for his father, because he cruelly oppressed, spoiled his brother by violence, and did that which is not good among his people, lo, even he shall die in his iniquity. 19 Yet say ye, Why? doth not the son bear the iniquity of the father? When the son hath done that which is lawful and right, and hath kept all my statutes, and hath done them, he shall surely live. 20 The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."Ezec 18

There are texts that supposedly teach the 'Federal Theory'. Many are found in Romans 5.

"Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world"vs.12

"For if by one man's offence death reigned by one"vs.17

"Therefore as by the offence of one judgement came upon all men to condemnation"vs.18

Now may if you read my signature you will find a law of proper interpretation. The law is that a scripture that is adduced in the proof of a theory **it may not at all be explicable on any other hypothesis**. These verses may be justifiably expounded as meaning all kinds of things for they speak only of the fact that because of Adam's sin man as a whole fell and was therefore treated according to their personal merit. It speaks not one word of the manner in which Adam's sin made the rest of man sin. It is blindly assumed that 'natural generation' was the manner in which they were made to sin in consequence of Adam's sin.

3) The third theory is the 'Naturalistic Theory'. This theory teaches that man has received nature from Adam that necessitates his sin. This plainly places all the blame for sin on Adam. If I am not the author of my own moral nature then I am not to blame for my sin.

And as I said before God would be the author of the connection between Adam and his posterity that makes his posterity to receive his nature.

And, by the way, if sinners beget sinners then why don't Christians beget Christians.

I say all this for the sake of expressing the real ambiguity involved when speaking on this topic. Some mean one theory, some mean another, most mean some kind of mixture of them all. Anyway I'll finish by saying that the doctrine of the 'freedom of the will' is a universal fact of consciousness and is also implied by the scriptures. And the doctrine of the freedom of the will negates every form of the doctrine of the necessity of sin.

I hope you understand where I am coming from and where I am going with all this.

Loving righteousness and hating iniquity, Randy

Re: - posted by jimbob, on: 2005/10/3 2:02

Randy,

God bless your fingers! That would have taken me DAYS to type.

Just a couple of questions;

1. Did you choose Christ or did Christ choose you?

2. If the Lord "does not wish for ANY to perish but for all to come to repentance" 2 Peter 3:9, then why did He harden Pharaoh's heart? Romans 9:14-18

Now please, no lengthy theories, use ten words or less for each answer. Please respond via PM.

The Lord bless you and keep you.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/3 4:15

randyj

Hi,

we have chatted over this topic numerous times in the 'lounge' but I see some new folk have strolled in and the conversation starts all over again. I think that is good; it's the way the lounge works.

I disagree with several of your points. I presume that you are taking a position similar to, if not identical with, Finney. Personally I think Finney's theology is fatally flawed although I know he was powerfully used by God. Many a man is greater than his theology. There are, of course, many more than 3 forms of the doctrine of 'constitutional sin'.

I would like to challenge your thinking with an initial question based on this passage of scripture. "For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body." (Rom. 8:19-23, KJVS)

Why did Adam's sin have such an impact on the world while Eve's did not? Eve's transgression was earlier than Adam's and it is the consistent testimony of scripture that it was Adam's sin which did the damage. Why should this be?

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/4 15:22

Jimbob and Philologos. Hi.

I don't know if I have the capacity to answer two people at once, but here goes. I hope the Lord uses this discussion for the benefit of His kingdom.

Why did God harden Pharaoh's heart? What did this hardening entail?

What does it mean for the creature to be subject to vanity?

Let me start by saying that a person should never hold as absolutely true, anything that has not, as it's basis, facts that undeniably necessitate the conclusion which is held. I say this and wonder at the supposed connection between being subject to vanity and the doctrine of constitutional sinfulness. Likewise I see no real connection between Pharaoh having his heart hardened and the Calvinistic version of God's sovereignty. That the creature is subject to vanity (death if you please) is one thing. A man having such a nature that necessitates his sin is quite another. No doubt man is subject to vanity. Anyone who doubts will soon have his doubts removed. I do not see, however, the connection between this and the doctrine that states that man is incapable of **moral** perfection (never sinning).

Why did God harden Pharaoh's heart? Why did God give those in Romans 1 over to a "reprobate mind" and "vile affections"? I think it is the natural consequence for persistent disobedience. And if you say "no no it wasn't a natural consequence God did it" then I will simply reply that Pharaoh could not therefore be the object of blame. There was a Calvinist man of my acquaintance who was protesting in front of a liberal church. The pastor came out and they had it out. I asked the man if he thought that God made that man to compromise. He said yes. Do you see the contradiction? He was there protesting against the hand of God!

And my question to you. "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"

You know the verse. Does not this verse imply the capacity in man to comprehend what is right? Did not God write his law upon the hearts of men? If God did write his law upon the hearts of men then we are disobedient and out of place to refuse to live according to it's dictates.

And another question (sorry Jimbob for the length) Does not the law say to love with "thy strength"? If the law demands nothing more than that which falls within the realm of our natural ability then there is no more discussion here. "Oh" you say "but it is a moral depravity that man received from Adam". Then how was it transferred by way of 'natural generation'?

I better quit before I discontent our beloved Jimbob.

With plenty of love from the Lord Jesus, Randy

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/4 16:09

Hi randyj

I think that answer must have been aimed at jimbob as you do not seem to have said much about the unique effects of Adam's sin.

Quote:

----- man having such a nature that necessitates his sin is quite another.

This is not a necessary implication of the doctrine of original sin. A bias is not the same as a predetermination. The section of Romans beginning at Rom 5:12 speaks of two men; count the times it refers to 'one man'. In fact, the phrase 'one man' relates to 'two men'; the 'one man' - Adam, and the 'one-man' Christ. Adam is said to be a figure of the 'coming one'. Those who are of and in Adam share his nature while those who are of and in Christ share Christ's nature. As a result of Adam's disobedience 'sin' entered the world and 'death' followed. This passed through to all men...

Nor is it necessary to regard constitutional sin as being hereditary. This has to do with what is usually called 'transmission' and a belief in constitutional sin is not necessarily a belief in hereditary transmission. Sin passed immediately to all the race at the moment of Adam's disobedience. This is why I asked why Eve's sin did not have the same consequence. The answer is that Eve was not the federal head of the race.

A new race has begun and its federal head is Jesus Christ. A man in either in the one or the other. He cannot be in both at the same time.

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/4 18:13

:-) Philologos. Thanx, I did thoroughly enjoy your reply. And I get the feeling that we are getting somewhere. I do realize that not all people believe that a man's sin nature necessitates his sin. I will have you know however that almost every single person I have had discussion with on this topic have believed that very thing. I am now vexed with the question now "what was the manner in which a sin nature passed upon all men if not natural generation? You say because he was our federal head. What is meant by 'federal head' anyway. Do you mean that he was the representative of the human race? If so, then in what way was he our representative? I do believe that he was our representative of sorts. He was what all men are and did what all men have done. However all this is completely separate from one's physical constitution. I do think that a person can heighten their propensities to sin by sinning. No doubt every one of us knows full well that the sins that we are most tempted to commit are the ones that we have already committed in the past. We may also rightly observe that a person is far more likely to commit a sin when someone else is committing an act of sin in our presence, and I might add, the sins that those people are committing.

Quote:
-----This is why I asked why Eve's sin did not the same consequence. The answer is that Eve was not the federal head of the race.

Now may I say that this is pure speculation. I might with just as much propriety say that it was because he was a far greater influence on the human race. I do not hold to such a statement for I have not weighed it.

Quote:
-----by one man sin entered into the world

"by one man a sin nature entered into the world"

Quote:
-----and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned

"and so death passed upon all men for that Adam sinned"

One is the Bible and one is man's opinion. Can you tell which one is which?

Now as for sharing the nature of another I think it quite possible. I do not, however, ascribe to the teaching that it is an involuntary sharing of natures. Those who follow Christ willingly take part of his moral nature. Those who follow in the steps of Adam do so willingly.

Quote:
-----This is not a necessary implication of the doctrine of original sin. A bias is not the same as a predetermination

O.K. you now say that our sin nature produces a bias in us toward evil. I ask 'Was not Christ "in all points tempted like a sinner, yet without sin"? How can this be so if he did not have the same bias toward sin?

Waiting a reply, Randy

P.S. Sorry for the way I did the scripture quote vs the made up quote. I don't know how to fix it

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/5 7:03

Quote:
-----You say because he was our federal head. What is meant by 'federal head' anyway. Do you mean that he was the representative of the human race? If so, then in what way was he our representative?

As I use the term it means more than a 'representative'. Here is some obscure verses from Daniel in which Daniel addresses Nebuchadnezzar: "Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory." (Dan. 2:37, KJVS)

And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thine hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold. Dan. 2:38 (KJVS) Most would say that this 'head of gold' prophecy related to the Neo-Babylonian Empire but Daniel illustrates a Bible revelation. Nebuchadnezzar's behaviour will determine the fate of his empire. (There is an interesting current issue which springs from this. The alliance forces claim that Saddam Hussein has betrayed his country and must be held accountable. Saddam claims that he is no

t accountable to his country but that his country is accountable to him because he is its head. This is a fascinating collision of Western and Eastern concepts of rule. Biblically, Saddam is right. That should get me some mail!) In a similar way Adam's behaviour impacts upon the whole of 'his kingdom'. It impacts upon his wife and upon the earth itself which comes under a curse, not because of what either Satan or Eve has done but because of what Adam has done. The enmity resulted from Satan's work, the earth-curse resulted from Adam's work.

Genesis has a definite cause and effect with regard to Adam's transgression. "And the LORD God said unto the serpent, Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle, and above every beast of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life: And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel. And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast not hearkened unto the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, of which I commanded thee, saying, Thou shalt not eat of it: cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken: for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." (Gen. 3:14-15,17-19, KJVS) Modern versions which do not distinguish between the singular 'thou/thy/thine' will obscure this, but the older versions will make it very plain that God held Adam uniquely responsible for the events recorded here. This is confirmed in Paul's later statement in which he differentiates the nature of Eve's and Adam's behaviour; "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1Tim. 2:14, KJVS) It was because the 'curse' came into our world by a man, that it had to be removed by a man.

Quote:
-----O.K. you now say that our sin nature produces a bias in us toward evil. I ask 'Was not Christ "in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin"? How can this be so if he did not have the same bias toward sin?

I think we would do better to pursue the federal headship of Adam and Christ before moving onto this, but in a sentence or two... who is the 'we'? of this scripture? It is the shared experience of the writer and those to whom he wrote. Those who received the letter were those who had been "...once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come," (Heb. 6:4-5, KJVS)... that is to say 'the regenerate'. True regeneration unites us with Christ's co-crucifixion of the 'old man' and puts the 'man in Christ' into an entirely different spiritual context to the 'man in Adam'. I do not believe in the co-existence of 'the old man' and 'the new man' in a regenerate man's life. Still, I think we would do better to pursue the 'federal headship' theme first.

ps
any folks struggling with (<http://homepage.ntlworld.com/ronbailey/theethine.pdf>) Ye Old Englishe will find a little help available.

Re: - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/6 11:57

Hello Philogos, It looks like Jimbob will get his request on this occasion for I wish only for clarity on your part. I wish to know specifically whether or not you believe that Adam's posterity is treated according to the merits of Adam. There is no doubt on my part and hence no quarrel as to whether or not there are consequences for Adam's sin that have impacted the rest of the race in some way or another. I wish to narrow the discussion, if I may, to this particular query, to wit, whether or not man is treated according to the merit of Adam.

A scripture for thought before answering.

"What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? 3 As I live, saith the Lord GOD, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. 4 Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die." Eze 18:2

Randy

Re: Our Sinful Nature and the Devil - posted by letsgetbusy (), on: 2005/10/6 13:55

"How does the devil influence our sinful nature?"

Romans 7:

For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not.

For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me.

We must be honest with Paul, and admit that evil is present in the flesh, our flesh, my flesh. Flesh can be overcome by His Spirit when we surrender our will. I don't know about any of you guys, but I have a long way to go with this. The devil has our flesh to tempt. Our flesh has no good thing, but the Spirit within in us has no sin. The devil can only tempt the flesh, and God can only use of us what we surrender to Him. The less we surrender to God, the more we can be tossed about by Satan.

I believe there is a multitude of Christians who are being choked down by the cares of this world. We will all come to judgment, though we are saved, and give an account of whether or not we loved this present world. I am in the process of searching my heart and being honest with myself to clean up each and every aspect of my walk with the LORD, God willing.

"How does he make some people do certain things?"

Ephesians 2:

Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.

After we are saved, there is now the matter of our Christian walk. Christians will not be judged for how well they were converted, but how well we walked. What we did with the gifts and abilities He gave us. What we did not do with these, as well. The devil is given the ability by God to try us. There is no need to be fearful, as God will not allow him to do anything that is not for the LORD's glory.

Here are just some of the tragedies that were seemingly Satan's victory, but ended, or will end with the LORD's glory:

The fall of Adam and Eve

Cain's murder of Abel

The enslavement of the Jews

The killing of Jewish children (Exodus / Gospels)

Fall of David

Babylonian capture of Israel

Murder of Christ

Slaughter of Christians under Saul

Deception of the world by Satan

Obviously Satan has stirred many people to do much evil, but the end result is our LORD's victory. Satan's ability is only as much as the LORD gives permission for him to do, and as much as our human flesh gives in to Satan's influence.

The LORD uses Satan like a pawn, and Satan tries to do the same with us. It is only by us relying on the Spirit of God that Satan is repelled. If we try to fight Satan in the flesh, we are going to get beaten up (Jer 12:5). But by turning from sin, denying ourselves and the lusts of our flesh, and relying upon God's Spirit to do the work, we then become a vessel of His will.

EDIT: Duncan Campbell has a great testimony about the devil invading his church service, and what they did to repel him. Campbell openly admits he was himself completely bound at that moment, and had to rely upon someone else to pray for him.

y Satan out of the meeting.

And the Country was Filled with Water:

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/singlefile.php?lid=1316&commentView=itemComments>

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2005/10/7 5:41

Quote:

----- I wish to know specifically whether or not you believe that Adam's posterity is treated according to the merits of Adam. There is no doubt on my part and hence no quarrel as to whether or not there are consequences for Adam's sin that have impacted the rest of the race in some way or another. I wish to narrow the discussion, if I may, to this particular query, to wit, whether or not man is treated according to the merit of Adam.

Using the traditional language of this topic I would say that 'I believe in original sin but not original guilt'. I am not trying to support Calvinism in my posts. The consequence of Adam's sin was that the threatened sentence was carried out; death. Adam died in the day he sinned. There was a consequence of that which we see in the physical death with over shadows our 'cosmos'. But the vital point made in Romans 5:12 is not that Adam sinned but that Adam's disobedience opened the door to Sin's entrance. From this point in Romans 'sin' is usually preceded by the definite article, lit 'the sin'. This is a Greek way of producing the effect of a relative pronoun. It signifies 'the sin' ie 'the sin that we have just mentioned'. This Greek idiom is constantly used in the NT. When the topic, for example, of 'Jesus' is introduced it will normally be without the definite article, but subsequently the definite article will be added. I will try to give a literal translation of a couple of verses to illustrate. ¶ A roll of the birth of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham. Matt. 1:1 and Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom was begotten Jesus, who is named Christ. Matt. 1:16 ¶ And of the Jesus Christ, the birth was thus: For his mother Mary having been betrothed to Joseph, before their coming together she was found to have conceived from the Holy Spirit, and she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins. ¶ Matt. 1:21

When we come to Romans 5:12ff this 'definite article used as a relative pronoun' is very evident. ¶ "because of this, even as through one man the sin did enter into the world, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death did pass through, for that all did sin; ¶" (Rom. 5:12, YNG) This is not 'sin' as a single transgression, but SIN as a dynamic. Consequently in Romans Paul develops the truth to show SIN as a person sitting upon a throne. The vital revelation here is that we are seeing not just Adam's first transgression but the 'entrance' of SIN into the cosmos.

Paul develops this by saying ¶ "for as through the disobedience of the one man, the many were constituted sinners: so also through the obedience of the one, shall the many be constituted righteous. ¶" (Rom. 5:19, YNG) This plain states that through a single offence of one man something happened to 'the many'. The 'thing' that happened is that 'the many' were 'constituted sinners'.

I know the Ezek verses well. They are part of the build up to the revelation of the New Covenant in which the consequences of 'sin being visited on the third and fourth generation' are cancelled in Christ.

Re: Philologos - posted by RandyJ (), on: 2005/10/8 8:08

Quote:

-----Using the traditional language of this topic I would say that 'I believe in original sin but not original guilt'.

Great statement! This statement leads me to say that it is utterly repugnant to God given human reason, the scriptures, and the nature of our good God to say that death as it follows from the transgression of Adam is a punishment. God does not and did not punish mankind for Adam's sin. And as for visiting transgression to the third and fourth generation I don't think that can properly be called punishment. Punishment, especially as it is pure punishment, does not have the corrective element. That which carries the corrective element is 'chastisement'. Physical death which was delivered unto man as a whole falls, I think, falls under the 'corrective' category.

As for the reason why Adam was considered to blame for the original transgression was likely because he was the head or ruler over his wife. " For Adam was first formed, then Eve." 1st tim 2:13

Quote:

-----I know the Ezek verses well. They are part of the build up to the revelation of the New Covenant in which the consequences of 'sin being visited on the third and fourth generation' are cancelled in Christ.

The consequences of sin, or the natural tendencies of sin are not the topic at issue here in Eze 18.

" Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die ."
Eze 18:4

Death is the punishment for sin. So what the verse is saying is that punishment shall not be inflicted on an individual who did not that which is worthy of death. Now I know you might think to yourself that I am in contradiction with myself because I have just said that death was inflicted on the human race as corrective and not penal. But it does well for us to consider the fact that those who are forgiven still die. This settles all queries about whether or not physical death is penal. If physical death is penal then it follows that we are not at all forgiven. I don't think there could ever be in the mind of a person who believes in eternal retribution the thought of partial forgiveness. I don't think you would believe in partial forgiveness anyway so I leave this. Physical death is not penal. The death spoken of in Ezekiel 18 is penal. Enough said. As to the original quote, I don't think that any punishment can follow anything but real personal guilt. This could open up another can of worms regarding Finney's controversial beliefs about the atonement. Wow, I can sense the onslaught. In Christ, Randy