

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Original Sin

**Original Sin - posted by RevKerrigan (), on: 2006/9/1 19:43**

I have been hearing a lot of things lately going for and against the idea of Original Sin. A little bit on this message board and some on another message board. I would like for the brothers and sisters in Christ to give me Scriptural backing for or against this idea. Please use Scripture only and not your opinion as that is all that matters. God Bless and I look forward to this...

P.S.

Let's keep this thread Godly. No personal attacks on anyone...Ok? :-)

**Re: Original Sin - posted by ChrisJD (), on: 2006/9/1 20:44**

Evening RevKerrigan and all. I'm glad for the opportunity to learn more about this subject.

I do believe the doctrine of *original sin* and I thought of these verses in connection with it:

**So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.**

**And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig leaves together, and made themselves aprons.**

**And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image; and called his name Seth:**

**Some observations**

Adam was created in the Image of God.

Seth was born with Adam's image but something happened in between.

Any thoughts?

**Re: Original Sin - posted by JoeA (), on: 2006/9/1 20:46**

I won't give my opinion on this matter, because my opinion is worthless. Let us allow God to do the talking.

Romans 5:12 "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

13 "(For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

14 "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

15 "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.

16 "And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

17 "For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

18 "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of

one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

19 "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

**Original Sin - posted by crsschk (), on: 2006/9/1 20:55**

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id4634&forum35&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id4634&forum35&post_id&refreshGo)) The Nature of sin - WHAT IS SIN???

For some reference.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/2 5:06**

JoeA on 2006/9/2 1:46:58

Quote:

-----my opinion is worthless  
-----

that would depend on how you got it. ;-) If 'opinions' were worthless this would render most of the forum redundant. :-)

edit: 10:40 2nd Sept

BTW we have 'touched' on this topic before...

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id9369&forum36&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id9369&forum36&post_id&refreshGo)) What is sin?

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id11300&forum36&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id11300&forum36&post_id&refreshGo)) Sin and the Sin Nature

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id9433&forum36](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id9433&forum36)) The difference between sin and sins

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id9297&forum36](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id9297&forum36)) Original Sin. Adam or me?

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id6325&forum34](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id6325&forum34)) MacArthur on One Nature

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic\\_id5558&forum36&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order0&topic_id5558&forum36&post_id&refreshGo)) Adam's Sin

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id4634&forum35](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id4634&forum35)) The Nature of Sin

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id4634&forum35](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id4634&forum35)) Our sinful nature and the devil

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic\\_id4634&forum35](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?topic_id4634&forum35)) Did all mankind fall with Adam?

and there are one or two chapters on the topic in

([https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order1&topic\\_id1664&forum40&post\\_id&refreshGo](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?viewmodeflat&order1&topic_id1664&forum40&post_id&refreshGo)) Next Door to Heaven

..but, by all means, let's talk some more... :-D

**Re: - posted by W\_D\_J\_D, on: 2006/9/2 7:39**

Gday all aussies.....and perhaps the poms, kiwi's, yanks and all other anglo-saxon and other gentiles. hahaa.

j/k. Gday to all Gentiles and Jews!

God bless u all!

Thankyou for raising this point.

Firstly i would love to ask the following question in regards to Leonard Ravenhill.

L. Ravenhill once said "I like Finney, you know why? Because he didnt believe in original sin." (exact quote?)

How exactly does Finney differ from the belief in original sin?

Why do so many Calvinists hate Finney? (i sought of know why lol)

Why does L. Ravenhill like Finney for this reason?

Thank you! Awating some educational lesson on the issue.

God bless u all. ciao

**Re: Original Sin, on: 2006/9/2 9:48**

Revkerrigan, please define for me the "idea" of original sin. What do you mean by it? Then I can give scripture concernin g it. Thanks and God bless you for being a full time evangelist!

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/2 10:52**

W\_D\_J\_D on 2006/9/2 12:39:45

Quote:

-----L. Ravenhill once said "I like Finney, you know why? Because he didnt believe in original sin." (exact quote?)  
-----

Can you tie down this quotation for me? I would like to know the context in which it was said. I must say it surprizes me knowing Ravenhill's UK background. It would not surprize me if Reidhead said it but I would like to know where you heard it.

**Re: - posted by JoeA (), on: 2006/9/2 13:16**

Quote:

-----Can you tie down this quotation for me? I would like to know the context in which it was said. I must say it surprizes me knowing Ravenhill's UK background. It would not surprize me if Reidhead said it but I would like to know where you heard it.  
-----

Did Paris Reidhead not believe in original sin?

**Re: Original Sin - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/2 13:52**

The standard definition of original sin which was first developed by St. Augustine, is the idea that all men inherit the guilt of Adam. This definition of original sin is the fountainhead of Calvinist theology. Without it the Calvinist system of theology falls apart.

Since the idea that children inherit guilt from their fathers is not a commonly held belief in any society, theologians have posited 2 major theories for how this could actually be. One says that all men actually pre-existed in Adam's loins and thus we were actually doing the sinning with Adam. Another says that Adam is legally the federal head of all mankind and therefore all mankind is legally held liable for the sin of their federal head.

Charles Finney was an aggressive activist against this idea of original sin and was very lucid in his objections. Finney was as such an avid activist against original sin, because he saw the doctrine as an attack on the justice of God and as a hindrance to the salvation of men.

Finney taught that men sin and rebel against God because they freely choose to. The doctrine of original sin teaches that men sin because they are constrained to by a necessity of their sin nature which they inherited at birth. Finney observed that this idea gave men the opportunity to pass the blame of their own sin and guilt on to their ancient forefather.

Finney held that the Bible and Biblical doctrine must adhere to sound reasoning. Sinners would point out that, if their sinful state and guilt was inherited, then God had no reasonable grounds on which to judge them responsible for their sins.

I have found that the most ardent defenders of the doctrine of Original Sin (besides Calvinists) are sinners who love their sin. They constantly and fervently insist that their sins are acceptable because "they are only human." Their guilt is appeased because they have been reassured by the Christian community that they are only doing what comes naturally to them.

I believe that the Bible teaches that Adam's "original sin" did in fact affect the world and the lives of his children. (It is commonly accepted that the sins of fathers invariably affect the lives of their children). But, the Bible is absolutely insistent that GUILT is NEVER inherited or passed from father to son. God holds men responsible for their own sins and NEVER for the sins of their fathers.

The entire 18th chapter of Ezekiel is a rebuke to those that teach otherwise. (Eze 18:20 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. )

**Re:, on: 2006/9/2 14:20**

sorry I can't get this to clear

**Re:, on: 2006/9/2 14:22**

See next post, Thanks.

**Re:, on: 2006/9/2 14:27**

Thank you nrambeck for that excellent definition and rebuttal. RevKerrigan, as the brother has pointed out Ezekiel 18 is most important. I would like to add that we inherit the "knowledge of good and evil", (the ten commandments written on our heart). We inherit it from Adam and Eve but we do not inherit "their guilt". Then because we are weak we inevitably sin and thus justly deserve condemnation from God. However as we on this site know, "God is not willing that any perish but that all come to repentance" God bless, John

**Re:, on: 2006/9/2 14:36**

Again sorry for the multiple post something happened with the server

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/2 18:29**

nrambeck on 2006/9/2 18:52:04 posted...

Quote:

-----I have found that the most ardent defenders of the doctrine of Original Sin (besides Calvinists) are sinners who love their sin.  
-----

This is a disgraceful comment. One of the most ardent defenders of the doctrine of original sin was John Wesley and if you think him a Calvinist you are much mistaken, nor did he 'love his sin'. Try a dose of his sermon on (<http://gbgm-umc.org/UMHistory/Wesley/sermons/serm-044.stm>) Original Sin.

It includes this famous comment where Wesley used the doctrine as a litmus test of Biblical Christianity... "that all who deny this, call it original sin, or by any other title, are but Heathens still, in the fundamental point which differences Heathenism from Christianity. They may, indeed, allow, that men have many vices; that some are born with us; and that, consequently, we are not born altogether so wise or so virtuous as we should be; there being few that will roundly affirm, "We are born with as much propensity to good as to evil, and that every man is, by nature, as virtuous and wise as Adam was at his creation." But here is the shibboleth: Is man by nature filled with all manner of evil? Is he void of all good? Is he wholly fallen? Is his soul totally corrupted? Or, to come back to the text, is "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually?" Allow this, and you are so far a Christian. Deny it, and you are but an Heathen still."

Let me make it clear that I am talking about congenital sin and NOT genital guilt. The two are separable.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/2 18:34**

thingsabove on 2006/9/2 19:27:02 posted...

Quote:  
-----Thank you nrambeck for that excellent definition and rebutal. RevKerrigan, as the brother has pointed out Ezekiel 18 is most important. I would like to add that we inherit the "knowledge of good and evil", (the ten commandments written on our heart). We inherit it from Adam and Eve but we do not inherit "their guilt".  
-----

Your misunderstanding of the doctrine seems to be tied in to your concept of 'inheritance' as the method of transmission. The method of transmission is understood in different ways by many who hold the fundamental concept of 'Original Sin'. This is the reason I prefer the phrase 'congenital sin' implying that we are born with it but not necessarily by inheriting it.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/2 18:46**

nrambeck on 2006/9/2 18:52:04 posted...

Quote:  
-----The standard definition of original sin which was first developed by St. Augustine, is the idea that all men inherit the guilt of Adam. This definition of original sin is the fountainhead of Calvinist theology. Without it the Calvinist system of theology falls apart.  
-----

I am no supporter of the Calvinist system but this statement is wildly inaccurate and the doctrine of original sin is much older than Augustine. Tertullian 197-220 AD (Augustine of Hippo was later 354-430 AD) was one of the ante-Nicene fathers. He wrote...

"NOTWITHSTANDING THE DEPRAVITY OF  
MAN'S SOUL BY ORIGINAL SIN, THERE IS YET LEFT  
A BASIS WHEREON DIVINE GRACE CAN WORK FOR  
ITS RECOVERY BY SPIRITUAL REGENERATION

There is, then, besides the evil which supervenes on the soul from the intervention of the evil spirit, an antecedent, and in a certain sense natural, evil which arises from its corrupt origin. For, as we have said before, the corruption of our nature is another nature having a God and father of its own, namely the author of (that) corruption."

And there are others, but as Tertullian is the best I will leave it at that. Augustine defined the issues much more precisely as a result of his writings against Pelagius, and prescribed 'infant baptism' as its solution! BUT the concept is much older than Augustine.

**Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/3 22:27**

Quote:  
-----This is a disgraceful comment. One of the most ardent defenders of the doctrine of original sin was John Wesley and if you think him a Calvinist you are much mistaken, nor did he 'love his sin'. Try a dose of his sermon on Original Sin.  
-----

Yes, I'm familiar with Wesley's defense of Original Sin. I just disagree with him. Wesley probably had in mind Unitarian/Universalism when writing on this topic, because of their teaching that men are generally good with occasional bad streaks and as generally good are not worthy of the wrath of God.

Finney also fought hard against the Unitarians because he, like Wesley, believed in the universal depravity of men. He taught that men were corrupt at their very core because of the motives and intention of their hearts. He simply dismissed the idea of sin nature and original sin, because those ideas assume that sin and guilt are constitutional traits rather than moral traits. Men cannot be held accountable for something that is, of necessity, a part of their nature.

I, of course, didn't say that all who believe in the doctrine of Original Sin are "sinners who love their sin." There are lots of really great Christians that hold to this particular doctrine (yet, I've found that many have never fully considered the idea).

I just wanted to point out that the vast majority of unrepentent sinners, will quickly and ardently excuse their sin as a result of human nature instead of taking responsibility for their free moral choices.

Concerning congenital sin and genital guilt, I believe you may have made a bad reference to terms. Congenital mean "following from reproduction" which would correctly define the standard doctrine of sin nature, that sin is passed via the reproductive process. Genital is just a term that references reproduction. Maybe you could elaborate.

**Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/3 23:01**

Quote:  
-----I am no supporter of the Calvinist system but this statement is wildly inaccurate and the doctrine of original sin is much older than Augustine. Tertullian 197-220 AD (Augustine of Hippo was later 354-430 AD) was one of the ante-Nicene fathers.  
-----

I'll accede your point that others before Augustine held to an idea of original sin. I think it is somewhat dramatic though to call my statement "wildly inaccurate." Augustine is usually the one credited with developing the doctrine because of his debate with Pelagius. Augustine used his political power to have Pelagius declared a heretic, thus codifying Original Sin as undisputable orthodoxy.

Some assert that Augustine defended and developed the doctrine of Original Sin in order to uphold the longstanding tradition of infant baptism. I've never looked at the evidence myself.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/4 5:21**

Quote:  
-----Some assert that Augustine defended and developed the doctrine of Original Sin in order to uphold the longstanding tradition of infant baptism. I've never looked at the evidence myself.  
-----

!!! in which case is it not a little premature to brand him as you do?

Tertullian's dates and the way he approaches the topic makes it clear that it was an axiom of Christian belief already. Tertullian did not invent the teaching he is merely commenting on it.

Quote:  
-----Concerning congenital sin and genital guilt, I believe you may have made a bad reference to terms. Congenital mean "following from reproduction" which would correctly define the standard doctrine of sin nature, that sin is passed via the reproductive process. Genital is just a term that references reproduction. Maybe you could elaborate.  
-----

Words change their meanings in ordinary life and a word's derivation is not always an indication of its current use.

congenital |k&#601;n&#716;d&#658;&#603;n&#618;t(&#601;)|  
adjective (esp. of a disease or physical abnormality) present from birth : a congenital malformation of the heart.

and from an online medical dictionary...congenital

Existing at and usually before, birth, referring to conditions that are present at birth, regardless of their causation.

Origin: L. Congenitus = born together

and from the Cambridge Dictionary...congenital Show phonetics  
adjective

1 SPECIALIZED describes a disease or condition that exists at or from birth:  
a congenital abnormality/disease

2 describes someone who always shows a particular bad quality:

a congenital liar

and from the online Merriam-Webster congenital

One entry found for congenital.

Main Entry: con-ġen-ġi-tal

Pronunciation: k&n-'je-n&-t&l, k&ŋ-

Function: adjective

Etymology: Latin congenitus, from com- + genitus, past participle of gignere to bring forth -- more at KIN

1 a : existing at or dating from birth b : constituting an essential characteristic : INHERENT c : acquired during development in the uterus and not through heredity

2 : being such by nature

But I am happy to switch to "Constitutional Sin" if you would prefer. My point is that the term 'hereditary sin' implies physical transmission which is a theological speculation.

#### **sins or Sin? - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/4 11:53**

It has been a pattern among most evangelicals for many years to distinguish between "Sin, the nature" and "sins, the actions". Perhaps this would be a more useful place to start. Do you recognize that the scripture doesn't only use the word 'sins' for specific transgression but also as a dynamic power?

If we can agree with this we can then move on to where Sin; the dynamic power comes from.

#### **Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/4 11:55**

If congenital means "from birth" whether inherited or not, then I think that word still miscommunicates your intention. The doctrine of original sin specifically makes the point that sin and guilt are passed from Adam on to each generation.

If I understand correctly, the only distinction you are making is that sin is not necessarily inherited as a physical trait. Correct me if I'm wrong, but you do believe that sin and guilt are inherited, just possible in some non-corporeal way.

Finney and others during his day used the word constitution to describe both the physical and non-physical makeup of a person. You would be more likely to reject that sin and guilt are inherited aspects of a person's physical constitution, but accept the idea that sin and guilt are inherited aspects of a person's non-physical constitution. In other words, all men have had passed onto them, from conception, actual sin and guilt which is a part of their very nature.

The doctrine of Original Sin teaches that men can't but sin, because it is a fixed part of their very nature. Homosexuals say, "I was born this way," and Christians all over the globe concur. They deny genetic transmission of a "gay gene", but gladly commend the pervert for his good theology because they believe his homosexuality is a fixed part of his nature. I have heard this over and over again about homosexuality, yet the Bible specifically says of homosexuals that they do what is against nature. (Rom. 1:26)

#### **Re: sins or Sin? - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/4 12:07**

Sure, I'm willing to consider the ideas of sin and sin nature with you.

I believe sin only consists in sinning. So I would reject any idea of a sin nature. Since I don't agree with your original assertion we will have to start with you making a case for a sin nature.

By the way, thanks for your calm and reasoned demeanor throughout this conversation. It makes for a much more edifying discussion.



**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/4 12:15**

nambeck on 2006/9/4 16:55:51 posted:

Quote:  
-----If congenital means "from birth" whether inherited or not, then I think that word still miscommunicates your intention. The doctrine of original sin specifically makes the point that sin and guilt are passed from Adam on to each generation.  
-----

No, it does not. That is one view of 'original sin' only. The question as to how 'original sin' has become transmitted to members of the human race is a separate but related topic of study. In fact, I think you illustrated two possible routes but only one of those routes relates to sin passing from 'generation to generation'.

Quote:  
-----The doctrine of Original Sin teaches that men can't but sin, because it is a fixed part of their very nature. Homosexuals say, "I was born this way," and Christians all over the globe concur. They deny genetic transmission of a "gay gene", but gladly commend the pervert for his good theology because they believe his homosexuality is a fixed part of his nature. I have heard this over and over again about homosexuality, yet the Bible specifically says of homosexuals that they do what is against nature. (Rom. 1:26)  
-----

Whoah, there. You cannot jump from the general to the particular in this way. Christians all over the world do NOT concur that homosexuals are 'born that way'. I could introduce to you hundreds of Christians who would never 'concur' such a thing.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/4 12:31**

nambeck on 2006/9/4 17:07:05 posted:

Quote:  
-----I believe sin only consists in sinning. So I would reject any idea of a sin nature. Since I don't agree with your original assertion we will have to start with you making a case for a sin nature.  
-----

Happy to oblige! :-D

In Romans 5 Paul presents 'sin' as a king upon a throne. Rom. 5:21 That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Rom. 6:12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Paul also claims that 'death' reigns. Rom. 5:14 (KJVS) Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

Rom. 5:17 (KJVS) For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

In the same section he refers to sin being a master in that he describes some as 'bondslaves to sin' Rom. 6:6 (KJVS) Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

Rom. 6:16 (KJVS) Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

Rom. 6:17 (KJVS) But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.

Rom. 6:20 (KJVS) For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.

So here is my question, is this one monster or many? Does every transgression create the despot? If so, how many times will God have to deal with it in my life?

Is the 'old man' of Rom 6:6 constantly recreated with every individual transgression? If so how many times will it have to be 'co-crucified with Christ'?



Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/6 12:21

Quote:

-----  
In Romans 5 Paul presents 'sin' as a king upon a throne.

Rom. 5:21 That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.

Rom. 6:12 Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof.

Paul also claims that 'death' reigns.

Rom. 5:14 (KJVS) Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.

Rom. 5:17 (KJVS) For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

In the same section he refers to sin being a master in that he describes some as 'bondslaves to sin'

Rom. 6:6 (KJVS) Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin.

Rom. 6:16 (KJVS) Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?

Rom. 6:17 (KJVS) But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you.

Rom. 6:20 (KJVS) For when ye were the servants of sin, ye were free from righteousness.

-----

All of these scriptures you gave portray sin and death as persons (both a king/ruler and a slavemaster). Since I am sure you don't believe that sin is actually a person, wouldn't a simple reading of these scriptures assume that Paul is personifying the guilt of sin?

Quote:

-----So here is my question, is this one monster or many? Does every transgression create the despot? If so, how many times will God have to deal with it in my life?  
-----

Sin is not a monster. The people who do the sinning are the monsters. Also, the sins people commit don't create a despot. Sinning simply incurs guilt.

Quote:

-----Is the 'old man' of Rom 6:6 constantly recreated with every individual transgression? If so how many times will it have to be 'co-crucified with Christ'?  
-----

The 'old man' of Rom 6:6 is a reference to the Christian's guilty state before being washed by the blood of Jesus. While a Christian may continue to commit sins, he is to "reckon" himself dead to sin and to the law. The guilty man therefore cannot be revived. Christians who have submitted themselves to the gospel have had all their sins forgiven; past, present and future. They are no longer subject to the condemnation of the law, nor its consequence, which is spiritual death.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/6 12:21**

For myself a key truth is to be found in Rom 5:12. This passage comprises a series of aorist tenses. Aorist is usually translated as a past tense and some of its forms has the sense of a single action as compared to multiple or continuous action.

The KJV has translated this as "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:" (Rom 5:12 KJVS) which has caused some to make a distinction between 'entered/passed' and 'have sinned'. To get the repetitive sense of the verse it is helpful to check out Youngs Literal Translation "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) He makes the point well by adding the word 'did' in each instance.

The 'have sinned' would be the usual translation for the Perfect tense and to switch as the KJV has done has led some to separate the 'all have sinned' to a separate time zone as though other men share the consequences of Adam's sin only when they have added their own to it. This, as I understand it, was Finney's position. In his view it was a covenant established by Adam's action but which we enter only by the act of our first conscious sin. In this view, men are only 'in Adam' as a result of their own transgression.

The Youngs Literal above makes another point clearer. Adam's transgression was the route 'through which' Sin entered the world. This is a startling statement. Why was Eve's sin not the route by which Sin entered the world? Chronologically, her sin preceded Adam's.

It is instructive to see the way in which God holds Adam uniquely responsible for the events in Eden. The consequences of Eden are expressed in two parallel passages: Gen. 3:14 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:

Gen. 3:17 And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast 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;

Gen. 3:18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

Gen. 3:19 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. There are consequences for the woman although they are never referred to as a 'curse' but the consequences for the Serpent and for Adam are causal. The sentence passed on the Serpent and upon Adam are very clear. It is helpful to read this passage and see how the woman's destiny is ultimately determined by the man's. You need to do it in a KJV so that you can see the 'thees' and 'thous' where God speaks not to the couple but to Adam expressly. In the section from v17 God says that the ground is 'cursed' for Adam's sake. Adam is held responsible and not Eve. Adam's sin impacted upon Eve too. It was Adam who was specifically expelled from Eden. Of course, Eve followed him but the expulsion order was addressed to Adam alone.

It all focusses upon this 'one man' and his 'one sin'. This is the truth that Paul picks up in Romans 5:15,17 "But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

(Rom 5:15-19 KJVS) Just see how this whole thing rests on Adam's action in those verses. As a result of the 'one' man y died. It was 'one' that sinned. Through 'one' man's offence death reigned by 'one'. By the 'offence of one' judgment came upon all. By 'one man's disobedience' many were made sinners.

I struggle to see how these verses can be interpreted in any other way that to see that one man's action had a race-wide consequence. Perhaps, I'll pause to hear how you would explain them.

**Re: Romans 5 - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/6 13:31**

Romans chapter 5 is usually used as the major proof text for original sin and sin nature. For the longest time, I couldn't understand why Romans 5 would seem to teach that sin and guilt were spread to the entire race through the sin of Adam. Especially since Ezek. 18 teaches explicitly that that cannot happen.

Then I saw it. The only possible way to interpret Rom. 5 as teaching the universal transmission of sin and guilt from Adam to all mankind is if you are a Universalist. Universalism teaches that the atoning death of Jesus Christ is applied to all men passively. Calvinist theology teaches that the atonement is applied to some men passively. Arminian (Free Will) theology teaches that the atonement is available to all men, but only applied to those who receive it.

Rom. 5:12-21 is a simple repetition of the same parallelism, which is this (in my own words): In the same way that Adam sinned and paved the way for others to follow him in sin, Jesus performed a righteous act that paved the way for others to follow him in righteousness.

Rom. 5:19 summarizes the parallelism like this: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

If you believe as a Universalist that righteousness is passed on to all men regardless of whether they accept it, then it is perfectly reasonable to teach from the above verse that sin and guilt is passed on to all men through Adam regardless of whether they follow in sin or not.

If you believe as a Calvinist does that righteousness is passed on to only some men regardless of whether they accept it, then it would not be reasonable to teach from the above verse that sin and guilt is passively passed on to all men through Adam.

If you believe as I do (Free Will) that righteousness is offered to all through the atonement, but only passed to those who receive it; then it is not reasonable to teach from the above verse that sin and guilt is passively passed to all men regardless of whether they following in sin or not.

Romans 5 teaches thus: That Adam sinned and death entered the world through his sin. Then death was passed on to all men, because all followed in sin (Rom. 5:12). Jesus was the anti-type of Adam. He came to redeem men from their sin and guilt. He provided the example of righteousness and a way to follow him in it (through the atonement). The example and the way of righteousness was provided by Jesus Christ, but only those who receive the gospel are made righteous.

Since you disagree with my conclusions, let me know how you believe I've misinterpreted the scriptures here.

**Re:, on: 2006/9/6 15:27**

Sin is a relationship. It is wrong "being" for which I am not responsible. Why? Adam did it. He placed this curse upon us for which we can do nothing about. Thank God, the Man Jesus, did.

The guilt trip forced upon us by Augustine and Calvin, has been a measuring device wrongly used by them. In other words, one must "feel" and express guilt. He must confess his sin even though he may be a righteous God fearing man, blameless before God. A more reasonable expression from this man would be one of Joy rather than guilt. Does this make sense to some?

Respectfully,

Ormly

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/6 15:36**

nrambeck on 2006/9/6 18:31:00 posted:

Quote:  
-----Romans chapter 5 is usually used as the major proof text for original sin and sin nature. For the longest time, I couldn't understand why Romans 5 would seem to teach that sin and guilt were spread to the entire race through the sin of Adam. Especially since Ezek. 18 teaches explicitly that that cannot happen.  
-----

You persist it joining 'sin and guilt' together although I have made it clear that I am not defending that position. I believe in 'original sin' but NOT 'original guilt'. Ezek 18 is declaring a well established truth that 'guilt is not hereditary'. It is also t

rue, by implication that 'sins' are not hereditary. You have set up a straw man. I am not defending these propositions.

Quote:  
-----Then I saw it. The only possible way to interpret Rom. 5 as teaching the universal transmission of sin and guilt from Adam to all mankind is if you are a Universalist. Universalism teaches that the atoning death of Jesus Christ is applied to all men passively. Calvinist theology teaches that the atonement is applied to some men passively. Arminian (Free Will) theology teaches that the atonement is available to all men, but only applied to those who receive it.  
-----

I had hoped that we were going to have a discussion on this topic. This will be difficult if you begin it by calling me names. If I was forced into one of your three categories I would take my place with Wesley as 'Free Will'. I am NOT Universalist and neither was Wesley. This is a slur which warrants an apology.

Quote:  
-----Rom. 5:12-21 is a simple repetition of the same parallelism, which is this (in my own words): In the same way that Adam sinned and paved the way for others to follow him in sin, Jesus performed a righteous act that paved the way for others to follow him in righteousness.  
-----

These are certainly your words and certainly not those of Paul. I think perhaps you did not read my previous posting before posting this. You are missing the repetition of the Aorist in Rom 5:12. Paul is not saying that 'men have sinned' nor that 'men do sin' but that all men 'did sin'. He is referring to a specific point in time not a human pattern.

In this passage of scripture Paul frequently has a definite article before the word 'sin' and before the word 'death'. He is not referring to sin as a single infringement or to sin in general but to 'The Sin'. As a result of Adam's disobedience 'The Sin' entered the world, and through the agency of 'The Sin'... 'The Death' followed. and so The Death passed through to all men, for that all did sin. He is recounting, of course, the history that we read in Gen 3. God had declared his sentence, in advance, on the transgressor of his one law. "and of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou dost not eat of it, for in the day of thine eating of it thou shalt die." (Gen 2:17 YNG) This doubling up of words, 'dying thou dost die' is a Hebrew idiom of intensification. This 'death' was not physical death. Adam did not die physically in the day that 'the day of his eating'. But The Death did enter the human race on the day that Adam transgressed.

Paul declared the history of our race and makes Adam responsible for what happened. This is exactly what we read in Gen 3. God hold the Serpent and Adam responsible for what occurs and to both says 'because you have...'. He does not use this language with Eve. Her transgression did not have the same effect on the human race that Adam's did. This is very plain if the story is read in the KJV and the 'thees and thous' carefully noted. Even in the exclusion from the Eden it was the man who was expelled. Eve certainly followed him but it was the man who bore the guilt.

This is what we find again in Romans. "by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one;" (Rom 5:17 ASV) This says quite plainly that The Death reigned as the result of a single trespass by Adam. It continues to make it clear that the sentence that came on the human race was the result of one man's sin;...Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men... **Rom 5:18 ESV The Sin entered and as a result of The Sin, The Death sentence came on the race'. I hope you note that I am not talking about 'guilt'. 'Guilt' is blame-worthiness and as far as I can see the Bible nowhere suggests that 'guilt' is transmitted from Adam to his progeny. I am talking about The Sin which entered the race and The Death which followed it.**

Quote:  
-----Romans 5 teaches thus: That Adam sinned and death entered the world through his sin. Then death was passed on to all men, because all followed in sin (Rom. 5:12).  
-----

Romans 5 does not teach this for the reasons expressed above. If it were so my single act of sin would make me a sinner and my single act of righteousness would make me righteous. Neither are biblical revelations.

Quote:  
-----Jesus was the anti-type of Adam. He came to redeem men from their sin and guilt. He provided the example of righteousness and a way to follow him in it (through the atonement). The example and the way of righteousness was provided by Jesus Christ, but only those who receive the gospel are made righteous.  
-----

You broken your own pattern here. If your position were the case my righteousness would be my own work. Adam is the ant

i-type of Christ because those who are 'in him' share his nature. Hence 'in Adam' all die, 'in Christ' shall all be made alive.

Every individual of our race is either in Adam or in Christ. The two different states cannot coexist. Those in Adam share his nature, those in Christ share his.

The corporate nature of these things is illustrated very wonderfully in Â“And, so to say, through Abraham even Levi, who receiveth tithes, hath paid tithes; for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him.Â” (Heb 7:9-10 ASV) Levi was 'in Abraham' when Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek and, from God's perspective, Levi 'hath paid tithes'. Levi did not pay his own tithes. He became a 'tithe-payer' to Melchizedek in Abraham's action. There is a corporate reality which the western mind struggles with. Levi did not become a 'tithe payer' as a result of heredity. He was 'in Abraham' and he shares Abraham's history. By first birth I was in Adam. I did not receive 'sinner-hood' from my father but from Adam. This is why I do not like the language of 'hereditary sin'. I do not believe in transmission through the male line. The only way to change my congenital nature is for me to have a re-generation. By that miracle I am 'in Christ' and in Christ I have a new history.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/7 9:05

Quote:  
-----nrambeck's: Christians who have submitted themselves to the gospel have had all their sins forgiven; past, present and future. They are no longer subject to the condemnation of the law, nor its consequence, which is spiritual death.  
-----

Pardon my interruption here, but I seem to be hearing a case against Original Sin coupled with the above quote. Finney would never have concurred with this. Since many of your arguments are much in line with Finney's, I wonder how you are mixing these together? Perhaps you don't hold Finney's view of Original Sin and I'm mistaken, but for clarity sake I wish to give a short quote from Finney:

*You must seek supremely to please Christ, and not yourself. It is naturally impossible that you should be saved until you come into this attitude of mind -- until you are so well pleased with Christ in all respects as to find your pleasure in doing His. It is in the nature of things impossible that you should be happy in any other state of mind, or unhappy in this. For, His pleasure is infinitely good and right. When, therefore, His good pleasure becomes your good pleasure, and your will harmonizes entirely with His, then you will be happy for the same reason that He is happy, and you cannot fail of being happy any more than Jesus Christ can. And this becoming supremely happy in God's will is essentially the idea of salvation. In this state of mind you are saved. Out of it you cannot be. (C.G.F)*

Finney did not accept the doctrine of justification and imputed righteousness as we know it. His views are very complex, but suffice it to say, that in my understanding of Finney, he did not believe a person's sins are forgiven, "past, present, and future" in the modern day unconditional eternal security sense.

Just throwing this in...

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/7 9:27

Quote:  
-----nrambeck's: Finney also fought hard against the Unitarians because he, like Wesley, believed in the universal depravity of men. He taught that men were corrupt at their very core because of the motives and intention of their hearts. He simply dismissed the idea of sin nature and original sin, because those ideas assume that sin and guilt are constitutional traits rather than moral traits. Men cannot be held accountable for something that is, of necessity, a part of their nature.  
-----

I have studied Finney's view of the origin of temptation to compare it to the concept of 'Sinful nature'. I have noticed that Paris Reidhead may have taken Finney's concepts and built his own from them as they are similar. Here is a quote from Finney's 'Christian Warfare'

*Because the constitutional appetites and susceptibilities would have existed. They did exist before the fall, otherwise our*

first parents could not have fallen. In our mother Eve, for example, these appetites could be excited into a temptation by their appropriate objects; otherwise, objects of temptation might as well be presented to this table. These excited susceptibilities had no moral character in themselves, they were excited in her, in her pure state, and if she had resisted them she would not have sinned. So they would have existed in all the race if we never had fallen, and in presence of their appropriate objects would have invited the will to seek their gratification. They are an inherent part of the constitution, and all moral beings, doubtless, find it necessary to curb them in conformity to the demands of their higher nature. Satan and all his angels actually fell under the temptation which they presented to them; and, as I showed in my last lecture, every child, in beginning to act morally, does the same.

2. Temptation, under some form, may, and doubtless will exist forever. As long as moral beings have constitutions, this must be so always, and in all worlds. As we have already said, Satan and all his angels, and our first parents were actually tempted in their holy state, and we know that Jesus Christ was, and had a mighty warfare--to such a degree as to have no appetite for food, and to seek the wilderness in his distress, just as you and I have often, under similar circumstances, gone into the woods or some other seclusion to be alone. What Christians has not often felt so? They are beset so tremendously, and such a struggle created, that they can have no peace day nor night, and often seek a place where they can give vent to their prayers or groans alone. Thus was Christ tempted, and thus, in his warfare, did He fly from the face of man and seek the solitude of the wilderness, where He might contest the point even unto death. He seems to have been assaulted in all the weakest points of human nature, and when, in his agony, He had fasted till He was well nigh famished, then He was besieged through his appetite for food, and in every other way the devil could invent, until he saw it was all in vain and left Him. The apostle says, 'He was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin.' It is in vain then, to think that temptation is peculiar to a fallen state, and if men had understood this, they never would have fallen into the ridiculous blunder, of calling their constitutional susceptibilities indwelling sin. They would have taught men to control and regulate, rather than call the nature God has given them, sinful.

#### VI. Several causes that have aggravated this warfare.

1. The sensibility originally responded with equal integrity to all the perceptions of the mind, whether of sense or reason. It was alike susceptible to all its objects. We all know that when we look at certain objects, corresponding feelings begin to glow in the sensibility. For example, if we look at a beautiful object, the corresponding feelings will naturally be awakened. Now all the susceptibility of the constitution, were naturally equally linked to their objects, and excited with equal ease, by the perception of these objects. The sensibility responded with equal readiness, to an affirmation of duty, as to an object of sensual desire. It was not clamorous, and uproarious, in any thing, but duly and sweetly balanced.

2. But it is capable of sudden and monstrous developments in any given direction. To explain myself; Suppose a mother loses her child. There is a sudden crash, and in a moment her little blooming babe, lies before her face pale in death. Now what will be the effects of this? Why, always afterwards, the sight of a dead child will produce a greater effect on her sensibility, than it ever did before. She indeed used to be affected--even to tears; but now such a sight seems to absorb her whole sensibility--she stands convulsed whenever she looks upon it, and sobs, and pours forth her scalding tears like rain. Now why is this? Because there is such a development of her sensibility in that direction as to overbalance every thing else. She sits, thinking and weeping, and goes sighing about the house, and every object her eye rests on connected with her darling, opens up anew the subject of her grief. Just so it is in other things. The susceptibility to fear may be instanced. A man is thrown from a horse, or run away with his wagon, in circumstances of great danger, and he is peculiarly fearful in similar circumstances all his life after. Perhaps his house is enveloped in flames when he awakes in the night, and it is with great difficulty he makes his escape. Now this event may bring his sensibility into such a relation to fires, that all his life after, whenever the fire bells ring, he is thrown into a tempest of agitation, and finds it as much as he can do to control himself. It is said of a young man, one of those who escaped from the Erie, which was burnt on Lake Erie several months since, that he cannot even hear it named, without going well nigh distracted. I am now speaking of facts which every one knows respecting monstrous developments of the sensibility, and these facts incontestably prove that the balance of the sensibility may be destroyed. Now whenever such a development exists, it seems to put out the eyes of the sensibility on other subjects, so that such persons don't feel as much respecting them as formerly. The mother, in the case supposed, will never feel towards multitudes of other things as she formerly did, and so it is in every case, in exact proportion to the strength of this absorbing peculiarity of feeling.

One would need to be familiar with his use of terms, but this is a good snapshot. The question in this thread that to me needs to be answered is "what are the characteristics of 'the Sin'?" In other words, what is the objective of the Sin nature? Is it to sin against God for the sake of rebellion? Would there be 'temptation' if God had NEVER said "Thou shalt not?" Does the "Thou shalt not's" force the 'sin nature' to the surface? In other words, we had not known lust except God had said "thou shalt not covet". Did the commandment excite in us the sin nature and bring with it a desire to rebel against th

e commandment? Is this the 'spirit' of the spirit of disobedience that now works in the children of wrath? OR is FINNEY and Reidhead right in their nearly 'Psychology' type version of why men are tempted? Is it in the nature or is it the environment and its inputs? How did Sin become a nature?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/7 11:30**

RobertW on 2006/9/7 14:05:50 posted:

Quote:

-----Pardon my interruption here...  
-----

Robert, this is a market place; it used to be called the Forum on SI, so please pitch in. I do value your perspective on Finney and your history in this. Am I right in thinking that Finney believed that our personal sin in some way attached us to Adam's fate?

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/7 13:07**

Hi Ron,

Quote:

-----Am I right in thinking that Finney believed that our personal sin in some way attached us to Adam's fate?  
-----

I would have to say that I don't know for sure. I cannot recall reading him give any real sympathy to the concept of imputed sin or Sin nature. In fact, he spoke often of how man has a sense of justice and righteousness and that man cannot be held accountable for something he cannot control. He had a little saying if I recall it right:

*You shall - you shant*

*You can - you can't*

*You will - You won't*

*and you'll be damned if you don't*

This was his retort to the idea that a person has a sin nature that prevents them from repenting. He saw this as 'theological fiction'. I think it was more of a position he took to answer objections folk had to the justice of God in condemning helpless sinners. Not that I don't think he really believed it, because he likely did all the way to the end of his life. The reason I say that is that he corrected his memoirs late in life (say age 75 or so) and did not seem to correct this view. He rather used examples of throwing off the concept of Original Sin as a means of some men coming to Christ. He rebuts the doctrine of Original Sin and the person comes under conviction, etc. Mr Smith was one such person that he mentions in section on Revival at Gouvenier (sp?). We have to remember that Finney studied to be a lawyer and his sense of justice was directly effected by his understanding of criminal law. He did not believe in 'substitution' as we know it or 'imputation.' He simply could not come to terms with how a person could actually suffer for someone else for any reason. One person's death cannot satisfy justice for another person. One person's sin cannot be transferred to another person.

Further he believed that we have certain inclinations or constitutions that have no moral sense. They are 'blind' impulses that just act. A person is hungry- they see food and that is that. The law puts a constraint on these impulses so the mind can control the actions through the will (something to that effect).

I'll think on this more...



Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/8 9:06

Finney's Systematic Theology

Moral Gov't.

1851 (age 59 + -)

II What is not implied in disobedience to the law.

*I. It does not necessarily imply an intention to do wrong. The thing intended in selfishness is to gratify self as an end. That is wrong; but it is not necessary to its being wrong, that the wrongness should be aimed at or intended. There may be a state of malicious feeling in a moral agent that would be gratified by the commission of sin. A sinner may have knowingly and intentionally made war upon God and man, and this may have induced a state of the sensibility so hostile to God, as that the sinner has a malicious desire to offend and abuse God, to violate his law, and trample upon his authority. That his state of feeling may take the control of the will, and he may deliberately intend to violate the law and to do what God hates, for the purpose of gratifying this feeling. This, however, it will be seen, is not malevolence, or willing either natural or moral evil, for its own sake, but as a means of self-gratification. It is selfishness, and not malevolence (desire to do evil, ed. rw).*

In summary Finney viewed sin as an act caused by selfishness. The natural desires came into conflict with God's law and because of that *alone* the person committed the sin. In his view folk are not gratified by committing sin. In other words, folk are not gratified by doing something simply because God said NOT to do it (or vice versa). I take issue with this strongly as it is certain that our Lord stated that His 'meat' was to do the will of Him that sent Him. Ephesians also tells us that there is a spirit that now works in the children of disobedience and they are by 'nature' the children of wrath. God worketh in us (the regenerate) both to will and to do His great pleasure. With the un-regenerate it is not so.

And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; 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. (Ephesians 2:1-3)

The regenerate walk in the spirit as not to fulfill the lusts of the flesh, but the un-regenerate walk according to a 'different' spirit. That spirit apparently leads them to fulfil the desires of the flesh and of the mind. I think the key word here is 'fulfil'. This is Teleioo and means to accomplish or fully complete. It is interesting that it is used in John 4:

Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

I do not dispute with Finney or Reidhead that men have natural desires that are good, etc. They are certainly right, I think. They are also right that selfishness is the reason why folk ultimately commit sins. What they ignore is the whole issue of the 'spirit' that is working in a person. The Holy Spirit works in us to 'finish His work'; the spirit of the enemy works in the unregenerate to 'finish' (fulfil) the lusts of the flesh. I see in this a full on pressing to 'complete' or 'fill up' the natural desires of the flesh. He wants a person to 'feed' their natural desires until they become unnatural lusts. I think Finney would concur with that also. What they seem to ignore, again, is the 'spirit' that is at work in a person. And that, to me, is what separates the saved from the lost. The saved have the indwelling Holy Spirit pressing upon the will, the lost have the spirit of disobedience.

That 'alien spirit' (as I have heard it called) is at the root of a 'sin nature' in my thinking. This spirit has to be put out and the Holy Spirit brought in. If a person were born again they could not relate to having a sin nature any longer because it is no longer part of their experience. This is vital, I think, to understanding why Finney may have missed this. It was not his *present* experience. And because it had been believed by many that the sin nature was present until death, he certainly rejected the thought, again, because he had thoroughly examined his own experience (my theory). BUT, he would not know this sin nature as the regenerate. He would then have simply put together a theory that was based more on his experience than on the word of God.

My conclusions about the sin nature were not taught me that I can recall. I came to them myself as a result of reading Paul's writings primarily and then adding what others had said here and there. The Jews often reject the idea of a sin nature. They view the whole conflict of spirit and flesh as dualism. But I was not about ready to abandon my views. I think I had a part of the picture and not the whole picture (still do). However, I think the 'pieces' I have are good and right. I am just not seeing it all at once yet.

I have often wondered what the struggle to temptation is? Why is a believer tempted to commit sin? My answer was that we had a sin nature to wrestle with. I think this is wrong now, but not totally wrong. We no longer have the spirit of disobedience, but we still have the natural desires as Finney and Reidhead saw them. I cannot believe I am tempted to sin because I am 'craving' sin. Any such craving was gone at regeneration. However, I may crave things that are sinful, not because it is sin, but because it is what the flesh desires. That was always my confusion. It was a category mistake.

Finney put it this way:

*But again. It is not true that sinners have a constitutional appetency and craving for sin. They have a constitutional appetite or desire for a great many things around them. They crave food, and drink, and knowledge. So did our first parents; and when these desires were strongly excited, they were a powerful temptation to prohibited indulgence. Eve craved the fruit, and the knowledge which she supposed she might attain by partaking of it. These desires led her to seek their indulgence in a prohibited manner. She desired and craved the food and the knowledge, and not the sin of eating. So, all sinners have constitutional and artificial appetites and desires enough. But not one of them is a craving for sin, unless it be the exception already named, when the mind has come into such relations to God, as to have a malicious satisfaction in abusing him. But this is not natural to man, and if it ever exists, is only brought about by rejecting great light, and inducing a most terrible perversion of the sensibility. But such cases are extremely rare; whereas, it has been strangely and absurdly maintained that all sinners, in consequence of the fall of Adam, have a sinful constitution, or one that craves sin, as it craves food and drink. This is false in fact, and absurd in philosophy, and wholly inconsistent with scripture, as we shall see, when we make moral depravity the special subject of attention. The facts are these: men have constitutional desires, appetites, and passions. These are not sinful in themselves; they all terminate on their respective objects. Selfishness, or sin, consists in choosing the gratification of these desires as an end, or in preferring their gratification to other and higher interests. This choice or intention is sinful. But, as I have said, sin is not the object intended, but self-gratification is the end intended.*

Sorry so long...

**Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/8 12:01**

Quote:  
-----You persist it joining 'sin and guilt' together although I have made it clear that I am not defending that position. I believe in 'original sin' but NOT 'original guilt'. Ezek 18 is declaring a well established truth that 'guilt is not hereditary'. It is also true, by implication that 'sins' are not hereditary. You have set up a straw man. I am not defending these propositions.  
-----

Whoa! Let's rewind for a minute here. You have not made it clear that you make a distinction between sin and guilt (until now). You previously made distinctions about the method of transmission, but this adds a whole new dimension to the argument.

I have never read any confession of faith or theological text that made a distinction between sin and guilt (maybe you can point me to some). The Westminster Confession says concerning the subject, "...the guilt of this sin was imputed..." If you take a view that is significantly different from the traditional doctrine of original sin, then please communicate that because I have to make certain assumptions when you say that you are defending "Original Sin."

If I understand you correctly, you are saying that all mankind did sin the same sin as Adam at the same moment (in the same "timezone" as you put it). So if we were actually there (somehow in some way), and did the sinning with Adam, then how are we not guilty of that sin?

Please explain to me this distinction. How someone can have a "sin nature" yet not be guilty of sin?

Quote:  
-----I had hoped that we were going to have a discussion on this topic. This will be difficult if you begin it by calling me names. If I was forced into one of your three categories I would take my place with Wesley as 'Free Will'. I am NOT Universalist and neither was Wesley. This is a slur which warrants an apology.

-----

I certainly would apologize if I thought that I had in any way communicated a slur, but I fail to see where I have "called names." I understand that you stand with Wesley (as I do) in holding to a "Free Will" type theological view. I was simply pointing out an inconsistency with those who are not Universalists. By interpreting Romans 5 to teach that sin is universally transmitted to all men without their consent; it seems to me that that would require you to also interpret Romans 5 to teach that righteousness is universally transmitted to all men without their consent. (Romans 5:19)

You wrote more that I could respond to, but I'll need you to clarify your fundamental position on sin versus guilt before I can do that.

**Re: - posted by nrambeck, on: 2006/9/8 12:06**

Quote:  
-----Pardon my interruption here, but I seem to be hearing a case against Original Sin coupled with the above quote. Finney would never have concurred with this. Since many of your arguments are much in line with Finney's, I wonder how you are mixing these together? Perhaps you do not hold Finney's view of Original Sin and I'm mistaken, but for clarity sake I wish to give a short quote from Finney:  
-----

Yes, I realize that Finney and I disagree on the nature of the atonement and God's gift of grace. But I am in much agreement with him on the nature of sin.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/8 13:20**

Hi nrambeck,

Quote:  
-----Please explain to me this distinction. How someone can have a "sin nature" yet not be guilty of sin?  
-----

Even Finney would have trouble here because he seems to imply that a man's 'nature' or 'constitution' can be molded by teaching, custom, and habit, etc. Adam Clarke would call this 'second nature'. There is a 'primary nature' that we are born with and then there are things performed by a so-called 'second nature' which develops over time (just following this line of reasoning). If a man were to repent of his sins and yet remain under the 'force' of his second nature (to continue sinning) does that 'sinful second nature' make him guilty of sin? No, *only* if he/she yields to that 'second nature'. The compulsion to transgress the laws of God, whether by force of habit or sinful nature in themselves cannot contain guilt. Sins are transgressions of the Law (the known will of God). Sin is said to have 'entered' the human race at a definite point in time.

Quote:  
-----By interpreting Romans 5 to teach that sin is universally transmitted to all men without their consent; it seems to me that that would require you to also interpret Romans 5 to teach that righteousness is universally transmitted to all men without their consent. (Romans 5:19)  
-----

This is an unnecessary and unworkable conclusion. It is certain that many in the New Testament were born with physical impairments without their consent. In fact, they were born without their own consent. It is not a person's prerogative to be born or to be born a certain way or in a certain place. The fact that men are born 'in Adam' does not necessitate that men will be re-born 'in Christ'. In Adam all men die, but in Christ all shall be made alive. One is either in Adam or they are in Christ. If one is 'in Adam' they are separated from the life of God and at enmity with God. Death in scripture generally denotes 'separation'. We are baptized by one Spirit *into* Jesus Christ.

If one is to be in Christ they are to be baptized 'into Him'. This is the point of the Gospel. The Holy Spirit comes into the unregenerate to regenerate them- baptizing them into Christ. This effectively removes them from Adam as they are dead to him, Sin, the world, etc. God places His Spirit within the person. This changes their 'primary nature' from disobedience to obedience. Before salvation, we are *by nature* the children of wrath. We must be Born Again (John 3:3). This is a crea

tive miracle. This is NOT something as simple as turning over a new leaf or taking on some new years resolutions. This is a NEW creature. This is a NEW heart. This is a NEW Spirit. Not a revised version of the old, but a NEW creature in Christ. Repentance alone cannot perform what I am referring to. Man cannot on his/her own regenerate themselves. This is the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit that He has shed upon us abundantly. If unregenerate man have no sin nature, what need be there of a re-gene-eration?

Quote:  
-----If you take a view that is significantly different from the traditional doctrine of original sin, then please communicate that because I have to make certain assumptions when you say that you are defending "Original Sin."  
-----

Well, as best as I can tell you are the first person I have spoken with that seems to hold to doctrine of eternal security along side of not believing in Original Sin. I guess were all loaded with varying views. This is why patience and Christian charity are essential. :-)

**Re:, on: 2006/9/8 13:33**

Hi..uh...hold on.....(smack...swat...) ah missed.. I was trying to get that dang NAT! Sorry I just couldn't resist an attempt at a little levity..he, he. O.K. go ahead back to your discussion.. God bless, John p.s. I'll delete this if it rubs the wrong way to much.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/9/8 14:21**

Quote:  
-----My quote:The compulsion to transgress the laws of God, whether by force of habit or sinful nature in themselves cannot contain guilt.  
-----

I do not here mean to infer that one could keep the laws of God and be acceptable with Him. I think one of the primary motives in our Lord's preaching to the leaders in the NT was to bring the reality of their sin nature to the surface. Many could keep the letter of the law with some success, but this does not in itself make a person righteous or holy. The motivation for keeping these rules could be almost anything; but the question is, did they *by nature* keep the Laws of God as do the Born Again? Are they a law unto themselves? Do they 'establish' the law as those who are born again are supposed to do? Are they walking in the Spirit?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/8 16:21**

nambeck on 2006/9/8 17:01:13 posted

Quote:  
-----Whoa! Let's rewind for a minute here. You have not made it clear that you make a distinction between sin and guilt (until now). You previously made distinctions about the method of transmission, but this adds a whole new dimension to the argument.  
-----

my quote from 6 days ago, 2006/9/2 23:29

Quote:  
-----Let me make it clear that I am talking about congenital sin and NOT genital guilt. The two are separable.  
-----

nambeck on 2006/9/8 17:01:13 posted

Quote:  
-----I have never read any confession of faith or theological text that made a distinction between sin and guilt (maybe you can point me to some).  
-----

The Canons of Dordt (1618-19) were the response of the Dutch Reformed church to the Remonstrants. It include the st

atement...The true doctrine having been explained, the Synod rejects the errors of those:

V Who teach: That all men have been accepted unto the state of reconciliation and unto the grace of the covenant, so t hat no one is worthy of condemnation on account of original sin, and that no one shall be condemned because of it, but t hat all are free from the guilt of original sin. To make a distinction between original sin and original guilt is not a new idea . In 'Charts of Christian Theology & Doctrine' H .Wayne House states that Arminianism believed that man 'receives from Adam a corrupted nature but does not receive Adam's guilt.'

However, I am not posting to defend any Creed but to examine the scripture, so I will concentrate on that. My working d efiniion of 'guilt' is 'blame-worthiness'. It is the judicial sentence pronounced upon one who has been proved to have co mmitted the charges on which he was tried. We are probably much closer on this topic. I can find no evidence that God holds me 'guilty' for what happened in Adam. To return to my illustration of Abraham and Levi... Levi acquires no 'merit' f or the fact that he 'has paid tithes in Abraham'. In similar manner my view is that although I was 'in Adam' when he sinn ed I do not acquire 'guilt' as a result of Adam's transgression. However, Abraham's right action had implications for Levi and Adam's wrong action has implications for me.

I do not believe, as do many evangelicals, that Adam's transgression condemned me to hell. The sentence which hung over Adam and fell on him in the day that he sinned was not 'hell' but 'death'. I think it important to state this again, the s entence was 'death'. Not physical death, that came over 900 years later in Adam's case.

We need too to define 'sin' and this is where we shall divide. I have often used the simplistic comment that 'sin is wrong response to revelation'. Â“Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.Â” (James 4:17 KJVS) This is 'sin' as a transgression against the known will of God. I think you will probably be comfortabl e with this. You are opposed to the idea that condemnation could visited upon someone who has not transgressed the k nown will of God, but the Bible relates at least one example of just this phenomena. It is the record of Nineveh's death s entence. The whole city was to be destroyed in 40 days but they repented and God spared them. Then we have the fa mous 'argument' between Jonah and God which God concludes by saying Â“And should not I spare Nineveh, that great city, wherein are more than sixscore thousand persons that cannot discern between their right hand and their left hand; and also much cattle?Â” (Jonah 4:11 KJVS) This seems to be a plain statement that those under the sentence of death were not conscious trans gressors of any known command of God. Wesley concludes that these 120,000 were 'infants'. Adam Clarke too conclu des that 'these persons are young, and have not offended'. Gill is of the same opinion 'are not come to years of maturity and discretion; and therefore there were room and reason for pity and sparing mercy; especially since they had not been guilty of actual transgressions, at least not very manifest; and yet must have perished with their parents had Nineveh be en overthrown. ' In fact, I don't know of any other interpretation to this verse. And they were under the same sentence a nd would have perished in the same judgment. To my mind they were not 'guilty' but would have still died.

'in Adam' I was not guilt but I did 'die'. This is the significance of the term 'The Sin' and 'The Death' which is used in Ro mans. This is not 'sin' as a transgression' nor 'death' as an event but both Sin and Death as spiritual states that passed t hrough to the whole race in Adam's transgression. A single 'transgression' would not normally result in a lifetime's bond age to sin. It would not bring me under that power of that 'sin' with the 'sin' being a king and slavemaster, but this is exa ctly what Adam's sin did do and Paul makes that clear in Romans.

I lived my life under the law of The Sin and The Death, although I was not always aware of their reign. Genuine regener ation changes all this in the moment when 'the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus freed me from the law of The Sin an d The Death'. That 'law' of The Sin and The Death ruled all of my life 'in Adam' but when God put me 'into Christ' that rul e was over.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/9/9 1:38**

If Christ in regeneration changes our nature, where did Adam get the Sin Nature. Is it not a specific belief. If Christ is o ur new nature, then who was our old nature. Adam had no nature in the garden before he chose whom he would believ e in. Adam had no knowledge of sin in his innocence, he only new what God had said.

Adam obtained a nature when he chose to believe a lie that would make him not choose what God had told him to do. Adam chose his own nature when he chose to do what Satan said would make him like God. Adam's nature became th e nature of Satan, just like when we believe God about what He says about His Son, we get a new nature. Adam's choo sing his nature by believing Satan became separated from God. This nature was passed to all man, they could not re-e nter the garden to continue in the presence of God and chose the tree of Life that would give him the nature of God inste ad of the nature of Satan.

Jhn 1:29 The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.

Jhn 16:8 And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:

Hbr 9:26 For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world: but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

The world was changed at the cross, taking away the sin of the world. Now all man has to do is believe it.

In Christ: Phillip

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/9 1:58**

Christinyou on 2006/9/9 6:38:28 posted

Quote:  
-----If Christ in regeneration changes our nature, where did Adam get the Sin Nature. Is it not a specific belief. If Christ is our new nature, then who was our old nature. Adam had no nature in the garden before he chose whom he would believe in. Adam had no knowledge of sin in his innocence, he only knew what God had said.  
-----

This is my whole point. Just as Christ must be in us for us to be joined into the New Man, so Sin 'entered' the human race at the point of Adam's transgression. Adam heard a voice and opened the door and one came in and supped with him. This is the full enormity of what transpired in Eden. The whole race was affected in Adam. We sometimes think that Satan's main objective is to create sinfulness in its most obscene forms, but Satan's mission is to displace God, sin is just his method.

This explains the human dilemma. Mankind is magnificent in its potential and from time to time we see mankind doing wonderful things but at root it is all part of the master plan to develop mankind under the wrong head. The Old Man is capable of magnificent action, the lie 'I will ascend...' is lodged in the human spirit. There is no cure; it must be brought to death in the death of Christ. Our old man was co-crucified with Christ but this is only so for those who have been baptized into Christ himself. Only in Christ is the Old Man ended.

Quote:  
-----The world was changed at the cross, taking away the sin of the world. Now all man has to do is believe it.  
-----

An old puritan volume was entitled 'Redemption: Accomplished and Applied.' Christ's death on the cross was 'redemption accomplished', it is not experienced in the individual until 'redemption is applied'. The whole world still lies in the wicked one.

**Re: Original Sin - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/11 21:27**

RevKerrigan wrote:

Quote:  
-----I would like for the brothers and sisters in Christ to give me Scriptural backing for or against this idea. Please use Scripture only and not your opinion as that is all that matters. God Bless and I look forward to this...  
-----

**Romans 5:12** Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; **and so death passed upon all men**, for that all have sinned:

I say that it should not be "Original Sin" but Original Death.

It is unscriptural to say we inherit sin.



Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/12 5:40

Logic on 2006/9/12 2:27:36 posted

Quote:

-----I say that it should not be "Original Sin" but Original Death.  
It is unscriptural to say we inherit sin.

-----  
It would be just as 'unscriptural' to imply that we 'inherit death'. The whole language of inheritance moves the question to the discussion of the engine of 'transmission'. This is a separate but relevant topic.

There are two assumptions I think you are making in referring to the verse. The first is that the KJV has altered the tense from Aorist to Perfect which hides part of the significance of the verse. Young's Literal translation helps to see both my points...

“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)

#### The tenses used.

The Perfect tense implies that a process began which continues. This is the implication of the KJV in 'all have sinned'. It gives some the impression that we are talking about a process that occurs in each succeeding generation of 'sinners'. If Paul had wanted to say this he would have used the Perfect Tense. BUT he didn't he continued to use the Aorist Tense as in the two previous verbs in the sentence. Young's Literal helps to see the pattern of Paul's thought by using the device 'did enter', 'did pass through' 'did sin'. Paul is not referring to a process but to a single event that took place at the point of Adam's disobedience.

If this were a continuing process in each succeeding generation Paul would have used the Perfect Tense but it is not a process but an event and consequently Paul used the Aorist tense.

#### houtos

Secondly, you have been misled, I suspect, by the word 'so'. This word is 'οὕτως'; houtos'. Many read this as though 'houtos' means 'subsequently' and as though it were the next step following the first, but 'houtos' does not mean 'subsequently' but 'consequently'. 'Consequently' is not a next step but a gathering up of the consequences of what has gone before.

This is not the only place that people have concluded that 'houtos' means 'then' as in 'subsequently'. (Rom 11:26 is another place where many have concluded that Paul is saying 'and the next thing that happens is...')

Youngs has carried the sense well in using 'thus'. In other words 'as a consequence' not as a separate event which takes place 'subsequently'.

This is an important but subtle distinction. If this explanation is confusing to any readers please let me know and I will try to make it more plain.

If any want to trace the use of 'houtos' in Romans you will find it in Rom 1:15; 4:18; 5:12,15,18-19,21; 6:4,11,19; 9:20; 10:6; 11:5,26,31; 12:5; 15:20; You can see how the word is used by checking ([http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp\\_dir/words/3/1158053941-5192.html](http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp_dir/words/3/1158053941-5192.html)) here and working your way through the Romans references.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/12 11:13

Quote:

-----philologos wrote:

If this were a continuing process in each succeeding generation Paul would have used the Perfect Tense but it is not a process but an event and consequently Paul used the Aorist tense.

-----  
but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for **in the day** that you eat from it you shall surely die(spiritually).

Adam died spiritually when he ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.



Death can't bring forth life, so whoever is born of Adam is still spiritually dead. This is why we need to be born again, born of the Spirit.

Death in the Bible is always pictured as a separation between two things(Jam 2:26). It is also a Process that involves corruption or decay(Psa 16:10, Psa 49:9)

and thus to all men the death did **pass through**(Rom 5:12) verb, second Aorist, **active, indicative**, 3rd Person, Singular ;

This sounds like death pervaded or permeate from Adam to us.

Furthermore, death is the reason that people sin. In the same matter, People are not sinners because they sin as much as I am not a dog because I bark like one. However, People sin because they are sinners, as much as all dogs bark because they are dogs.

A sinner or a spiritually dead person can't do anything but sin, even their most noble and sincere acts are tainted by sin. Sinners are separated from God and therefore can not know good and **consequently** can not do good, except what their conscience knows, and that they can not follow.

All this is because a law when people would think to do good, evil is present with them....moreover, there is another law in their members, warring against the law of their mind(conscience) and bringing them into captivity to the law of sin which is in their members.(Rom 7:22,24)

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/12 12:01**

Logic on 2006/9/12 16:13:53 posted

Quote:  
-----Death can't bring forth life, so whoever is born of Adam is still spiritually dead. This is why we need to be born again, born of the Spirit.  
-----

I think you are still locked into the idea of inheritance. Human beings were never intended to reproduce 'spirits'. Bodies are produced from human beings but spirits?

Quote:  
-----This sounds like death pervaded or permeate from Adam to us.  
-----

I am happy with this, so far, as long as we are not saying that the route was through my 'father'. Also, from the tenses used the impression is that the pervasion/permeating took place at the same time as the sin entered.

Quote:  
-----Furthermore, death is the reason that people sin. In the same matter, People are not sinners because they sin as much as I am not a dog because I bark like one. However, People sin because they are sinners, as much as all dogs bark because they are dogs. A sinner or a spiritually dead person can't do anything but sin, even their most noble and sincere acts are tainted by sin.  
-----

Aren't we mixing up the images a bit? Death is the reason that people are not alive to God, rather than the reason that they sin. We may say that people 'sin' because they are 'sinners' although some of our contributors here will not like that language. The revelation of Rom 5:12 is that The Sin entered through Adam's transgression and that The Death followed it. Consequently, The Death spread to all because all sinned. In your scenario 'sin' seems to be following 'death' rather than the order of this verse.

Quote:  
-----Sinners are separated from God and therefore can not know good and consequently can not do good, except what their conscience knows, and that they can not follow.  
-----

You are going a step further than I am comfortable with here. My working definition of 'a sin' is 'a known transgression of the revealed will of God'. Or to use my little rule of thumb definition 'it is wrong response to revelation'. If men and women

men really are unable to follow what God has commanded how can they be held responsible? I would say that they are held responsible not because they don't have the 'power' but because they have chosen not to avail themselves of God's enabling power. This is close to the area of 'prevenient grace'. God's grace is available so that we may do what He commands.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/12 13:17

Quote:  
-----philologos wrote:  
I think you are still locked into the idea of inheritance. Human beings were never intended to reproduce 'spirits'. Bodies are produced from human beings but spirits?  
-----

I agree, however, we are still born cut off from God, the question that remains is how and why?  
How: We are first cut off spiritually as adam was, for in **the day that you eat from it** you shall surely die(Gen 2:17b).  
Why: It is because of Adams' sin; "Sin did pass through to all"

Quote:  
-----I am happy with this, so far, as long as we are not saying that the route was through my 'father'. Also, from the tenses used the impression is that the pervasion/permeating took place at the same time as the sin entered.  
-----

It did at the same time as the sin entered which is when Adam sinned.

Quote:  
-----Aren't we mixing up the images a bit? Death is the reason that people are not alive to God, rather than the reason that they sin. We may say that people 'sin' because they are 'sinners' although some of our contributors here will not like that language. The revelation of Rom 5:12 is that The Sin entered through Adam's transgression and that The Death followed it. Consequently, The Death spread to all because all sinned. In your scenario 'sin' seems to be following 'death' rather than the order of this verse.  
-----

You have read my scenario correctly then; and that is because that people are not alive to God.  
What is Life?

In the Bible, life always pictured as a relationship with God **John 17:3** "Now this is eternal life: that they shall be knowing You, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom You sent.  
It is also a process that involves growth and repair(Psalm 1:3).  
If one does not have these attributes, how can one not sin?

Quote:  
-----You are going a step further than I am comfortable with here. My working definition of 'a sin' is 'a known transgression of the revealed will of God'. Or to use my little rule of thumb definition 'it is wrong response to revelation'.  
-----

Explain this verse then; **Psalm 19:12** Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults.

Quote:  
-----If men and women really are unable to follow what God has commanded how can they be held responsible?  
-----

this goes back to Romans 7 as I said. This law of sin is like the Law of gravity, we can not brake it no matter how hard we try.  
So, it is with trying not to sin before receiving Life from God(Romans 8:2).  
If the Law of God was perfect, then should no place have been sought for the second covenant and man could have obeyed the law and not sinned.

Quote:  
-----I would say that they are held responsible not because they don't have the 'power' but because they have chosen not to avail themselves of God's enabling power.  
-----

are we talking about sinners?

If so, they can not avail themselves of God's enabling power because it is not available to them except they receive Eternal life for they are dead.

In turn, they have not power.

**Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/9/12 16:51**

What is the sin that put Adam under the law of sin. Is it the act or the believing a lie and choosing the lie in his heart that put Adam in the choosing and believing the sinful one himself, that is the serpent and devil of old, that put Adam into the ruler and spirit being, and Angle of light in this world?

Adam became separated from God by his believing what Satan said. Even though it was a lie, God had the tree of the knowledge of good and evil already in the garden and the tree of Life also. There was also access to the garden by the serpent. God's plan was to give man a choice to choose between what He said and what God knew Satan was going to do, that is to lie to Eve who was not the direct created being that Adam was, he being the one God gave the first test to. Eve came from Adam and Satan knew it and Satan went to Eve first to confirm the lie to Eve, making Adam see that God was wrong and she surely didn't die. When Adam believed the hearsay lie from Eve and had evidence that Eve was still alive, he ate. In believing Eve, Adam lost Oneness and fellowship with God and he surely died and as all mankind is now in the nature of their father the devil all die, even though they don't sin in the same sin as Adam, death has passed to all mankind.

1Cr 15:45 And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam a quickening spirit.

1Ti 2:13 For Adam was first formed, then Eve.

Adam did not have a spirit until he chose the created spirit of Satan's lie in believing even by proxy what Eve said. To prove his own nature the he had chosen, now being separated from God by his choice in believing Satan, Adam blamed his wife when confronted with the question, who has said you were naked. That is why he was put out of the garden so Adam and all his descendants could die and by God's Plan have a chance to destroy the corrupt seed and believe the Incorruptable Seed and by believing what God says about His Son Jesus Christ be born again in spirit and soul and in destruction of the corrupt seed of the body in death, the body which has been quickened to contain the Incorruptable Seed, it could bring forth the Incorruptable body in resurrection. Blood shed uncorrupted, perfect as a sacrifice for corrupted blood and the full remission of sin, in believing the truth instead of the lie, first in spirit and soul at rebirth and in body on resurrection day.

1 Corinthians 15:45-50 And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption.

A created being inheriting a created spirit beings nature by believing a lie. "earthy"

A recreated being in Christ Jesus inheriting eternal life by the Nature of a Spirit Being, the second Adam Jesus Christ. "Spiritual" "Born Again"

Earthy to the Cross. Spiritual from the Cross.  
Born of Satan's seed. Born Again of Christ Seed

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/12 22:48

Quote:  
-----Christinyou wrote:  
What is the sin that put Adam under the law of sin.  
-----  
**1Tim 2:14** And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.  
Adam didn't choose to believe the lie, it was Eve who did.  
Eve was the first one to eat of it and she is the one who was deceived, not Adam. Adam was the one accountable to God. Eve was accountable to her husband.

Adam must have wanted to eat of it in the first place, otherwise he would have stopped his wife from sinning. Therefore, Adam knowingly violated an express command of God by his own will.  
**Gen 2:16** And the LORD God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou may freely eat  
It was the sin of breaking God's law, **just like the rest of us.**

**2Corinth 11:3b** But I am afraid that, as the serpent in his craftiness deceived Eve

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/13 11:55

Logic on 2006/9/12 18:17:57 posted  
Quote:  
-----Explain this verse then; Psalm 19:12 Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret faults.  
-----

As a preacher/teacher I frequently pray this psalm. This is my personal exposition...

The Psalm deals with the ways that God has revealed His will. 1. The creation, vss 1-6  
2. The scriptures... vss 7-11 I have received the next verses personally... "Who can understand his errors? cleanse thou me from secret *faults*. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous *sins*; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer."

(Psa 19:12-14 KJVS) I note from my KJV that neither the word 'faults' nor 'sins' is in the original and that he goes on to ask that God will guard his thoughts and his utterances. My suggestion is that this is relating, as the earlier part of the Psalm, to the way that God brings revelation into the world. As a preacher/teacher I am last in this list but I have unique responsibilities and these petitions bring them clearly into focus. I read them in the light and spirit of "My brethren, let not many of you become teachers, knowing that we shall receive a stricter judgment."

(James 3:1 NKJV) I ask that in my teaching and preaching God will keep me from error and presumption and set a watch on my thoughts and my words.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/13 12:27

Quote:  
-----  
philologos wrote:  
I note from my KJV that neither the word 'faults' nor 'sins' is in the original  
-----

**Psa 19:12** Who can detect unintentional errors, from those concealed to me, hold me innocent.

It is still implied though, that we are held accountable to unknown sin. Therefore your working definition of a sin as a known transgression of the revealed will of God comes short in that a sin is knowing or not knowingly breaking the revealed will of God.

Moreover, I commend your attitude of being a preacher/teacher.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/13 18:39**

Quote:

-----Psa 19:12 Who can detect unintentional errors, from those concealed to me, hold me innocent.

It is still implied though, that we are held accountable to unknown sin.

I don't know this translation but isn't he asking God to hold him innocent of things he didn't know?

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/13 22:35**

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Quote:

-----Psa 19:12 Who can detect unintentional errors, from those concealed to me, hold me innocent.

It is still implied though, that we are held accountable to unknown sin.

I don't know this translation but isn't he asking God to hold him innocent of things he didn't know?

It is a very stiff translation from greek.

The thought is praying to be forgiven of errors that are unknown, since the subject is error, those concealed to me are sins we do ignorantly.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/14 5:15**

Quote:

-----It is a very stiff translation from greek.

The thought is praying to be forgiven of errors that are unknown, since the subject is error, those concealed to me are sins we do ignorantly.

Greek? you mean the Septuagint?

I repeat that there is no reference to 'sin' in Psalm 19:12,13. This is why I received this passage as having reference to secret and presumptuous workings of the human mind which are so able to misconstrue the truth of God. This is how I pray this psalm...

One of the advantages of 'old(er) age' is a measure of self-knowledge in which you begin to understand your patterns of thought more clearly than when younger. My mind and its processing is a very vulnerable tool. It is important to 'understand my errors' if I am not to repeat them. I need to understand not only what was wrong but how I came to that conclusion and why my way of thinking pointed me in that direction. I have no doubt that there are basic misconceptions in my theology but to me they are 'secret' and I ask for cleansing in these things.

Watchman Nee once distinguished between sins and the 'dust' which gets on our feet from the world in which we live. We shall need constant 'feet washing'. The mind-set of the 21st century will soil my walk if I am not constantly washed. This 'dust on my feet' is often invisible to me so I ask God to cleanse me from 'secret things'; not 'sins' but 'things'.

My acquired knowledge of God and the scripture can very easily lead me to wrong conclusions ie 'presumptuous things'. I must walk humbly and remain teachable. I must not allow yesterday's light to blind me to today's light. I must not go beyond what God has said. If I see truths a,b,c, I must not complete the sequence with a d,e,f, from my own reasoning; this would be extrapolation and presumption. I ask God to restrain me from this.

I know how easy it is to obsess on some aspect of truth which has become deformed because I have not exercised other truths by its side. I ask God not to allow any 'idea' to dominate my understanding. Again it is so easy to get hooked onto one topic and to weary everyone with that topic. I also know that most heresies have been caused by imbalance rather than impiety.

Because I have a stewardship in preaching and teaching it would be, for me, a 'great transgression' if my understanding became distorted and that distortion was passed on to others.

My final prayer gathers up the whole theme...“Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer.”

(Psa 19:14 KJVS) It is the Old Testament prayer to match the New Testament admonition...“Be diligent to present yourself approved to God, a worker who does not need to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. But shun profane and idle babblings, for they will increase to more ungodliness.”  
(2Tim 2:15-16 NKJV)

Now... sins of ignorance, that's another matter to which we should return.

**Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2006/9/14 11:34**

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Greek? you mean the Septuagint?

Yes, even Jesus read the Septuagint.

Since I know more greek than any hebrew, I use the Septuagint.

Quote:

-----I repeat that there is no reference to 'sin' in Psalm 19:12,13.

V:12 The thought in hebrew is a moral error.

In greek it is:

&#960;&#945;&#961;&#945;&#769;&#960;&#964;&#969;&#956;&#945;: parapto&#772;ma, from the Greek From Strong s#3895; a side slip (lapse or deviation), that is, (unintentional) error or (wilful) transgression: - fall, fault, offence, **sin**, trespass.

The second part of the verse (KJV) with the use of the word after secret "falts" is implied corectly.

V:13 Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins

the term "from presumptuous" is better rendered "hence presumptuous or even proud"

The word "hence" is a word to draw your attention back to the last statement of sin.

Therefore, the word "sin" is also implied even though it isn't in the hebrew

Strongs#4480

&#1502;&#1504;&#1468;&#1497;   &#1502;&#1504;&#1468;&#1497;   &#1502;&#1503;

min minni&#770;y minne&#770;y

min, min-nee', min-nay'

properly a part of; hence (prepositionally), from or out of in many senses.

But anyway, man, I definatly know where you are comming from when you talk about a measure of self-knowledge & leading me to wrong conclusions and knowing how easy it is to obsess on some aspect of truth, & so forth exe...

I am with you in all of this.

Quote:

-----Now... sins of ignorance, that's another matter to which we should return.

This should be another thread all together since this is about Original sin (in which I think should be Original death)

Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/9/22 17:08

Original Guilt:

1 Corinthians 15:22

"22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive."

Ephesians 2:3

"3 among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, just as the others."

Romans 5:12-19

Original Pollution:

A. Total Depravity:

Romans 7:18

"18 For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) nothing good dwells; for to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I do not find."

Romans 7:23

"23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."

Romans 8:7

"7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be."

Ephesians 4:18

"18 having their understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, because of the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart;"

Titus 1:15

"15 To the pure all things are pure, but to those who are defiled and unbelieving nothing is pure; but even their mind and conscience are defiled."

B. Total Inability:

John 8:34

"34 Jesus answered them, 'Most assuredly, I say to you, whoever commits sin is a slave of sin.'"

John 15:4-5

"4 Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, unless it abides in the vine, neither can you, unless you abide in Me. I am the vine, you are the branches. He who abides in Me, and I in him, bears much fruit; for without Me you can do nothing."

Romans 7:24

24 O wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?

Romans 8:8

"8 So then, those who are in the flesh cannot please God."

1 Corinthians 2:14

"14 But the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; nor can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

2 Corinthians 3:5

"5 Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think of anything as being from ourselves, but our sufficiency is from God,"



Ephesians 2:1

"1 And you He made alive, who were dead in trespasses and sins,"

Ephesians 2:8-10

"8 For by grace you have been saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, 9 not of works, lest anyone should boast."

Hebrews 11:6

"6 But without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he who comes to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of those who diligently seek Him."

---

1 Corinthians 10:31

"So whether you eat or drink or whatever you do, do it all for the glory of God."  
Obviously, all men have broken this law.

Original sin is one, actual sin is manifold. Adam's sin was our sin so we all are born sinners, guilty, and in a state of pollution.

[www.cornerstoneorlando.org](http://www.cornerstoneorlando.org)

(<http://www.sermonaudio.com/search.asp?currPage1&keywordDavid^Downs&SpeakerOnlytrue&currSectionsermonsspeaker&AudioOnlyfalse&SortBy>) Dr. David Downs

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/28 14:04**

Quote:

-----Original Guilt:

1 Corinthians 15:22

"22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive."

Ephesians 2:3

"3 among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, just as the others."

Romans 5:12-19

Would you define 'guilt' and explain how these scriptures support the idea of 'original guilt'?

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/9/29 16:23**

The guilt of Adam's sin, committed by him as the federal head of the human race, is imputed to all his descendants. This is evident from the fact that death as the punishment of sin passes on from Adam to all his descendants.

1 Corinthians 15:22

"22 For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ all shall be made alive."

Ephesians 2:3

"3 among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, just as the others."

You might want to read through Romans 5.

Just as Christ is a type of adam. Adam imputes condemnation whereas Christ imputes justification.

<http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/Sermons/ByScripture/10/?pageSize=25&pageNumber=4>

Hear John Piper on the subject.

Quote:

philologos wrote:

Would you define 'guilt' and explain how these scriptures support the idea of 'original guilt'?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/9/29 17:51**

Quote:

-----The guilt of Adam's sin, committed by him as the federal head of the human race, is imputed to all his descendants. This is evident from the fact that death as the punishment of sin passes on from Adam to all his descendants.

But don't animals die too, so do they share Adam's guilt? My working definition of 'guilt' is 'blame-worthiness' or culpability. Does God hold me culpable for Adam's transgression?

I do believe in transmitted sin, but not necessarily through heredity. But is 'guilt' transmitted too. Rom 5:12 speaks plainly of Sin and Death but 'guilt'?

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/2 8:44**

Quote:

-----philologos Wrote: I do believe in transmitted sin, but not necessarily through heredity. But is 'guilt' transmitted too. Rom 5:12 speaks plainly of Sin and Death but 'guilt'?

If we sinned in Adam we are guilty. The doctrine of Original Sin is broken down into two elements. One being Original Guilt the other being Original Pollution. If we all sinned in Adam...

Quote:

----- (Romans 5:12) Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned. —

We we're all made sinners and we're already polluted.

Quote:

------(Romans 1:29) ...being FILLED with ALL unrighteousness.

Quote:

----- (Romans 5:12-19) 12 Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned— 13 (For until the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come. 15 But the free gift is not like the offense. For if by the one man's offense many died, much more the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. 16 And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned. For the judgment which came from one offense resulted in condemnation, but the free gift which came from many offenses resulted in justification. 17 For if by the one man's offense death reigned through the one, much more those who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ.)

The point of this text is to show how exceedingly greater Christ's work was than Adam's. If we deny Adam's imputation we deny Christ's.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/2 9:42

Quote:

-----We we're all made sinners and we're already polluted.

Pollution and guilt are different metaphors. The first comes from the Temple background the second from a forensic background. It is consistent with the forensic metaphor used frequently in scripture to describe guilt at 'hereditary'? I have no issue with 'Original Pollution'; I believe the Bible teaches it intrinsically and explicitly, but I don't see the same to be true of 'Original Guilt'.

The law-court has no interest with the 'pollution' of the accused but it is able to define the accused as guilty, if he is culpable. Am I to be blamed for Adam's transgression?

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/5 15:54**

Read this verse carefully...

Quote:

------(Romans 5:12)Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all SINNEDÂ—

Through one man sin entered THE WORLD. Because all sinned....

If we all sinned in Adam we are guilty in Adam. The doctrine of Original Sin is broken down into two elements. One being Original Guilt the other being Original Pollution. If we all sinned in Adam... WE are guilty of our transgression that Adam committed.

We were MADE sinners... How were we sinners if we hadn't committed sin yet? You're depraved even before you sin. A dam was guilty of leading the human race into sin by sinning. We were already sinners before we sinned. Proof of this being death that spread to all man.

Reading all of Romans 5 might clear up your confusion.

(<http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/Sermons/ByScripture/10/?pageSize25&pageNumber4> ) LISTEN TO JOHN PIPER ON THE SUBJECT. HE'S BETTER AT EXPLAINING THIS THAN ME.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/5 17:31

Quote:

-----Reading all of Romans 5 might clear up your confusion.

This is rather an arrogant statement. Do you think I am not familiar with the chapter?

Quote:

-----One being Original Guilt the other being Original Pollution.

You are still mixing up the metaphors.

Quote:

-----Through one man sin entered THE WORLD. Because all sinned....

What are you trying to say here? That it is 'because' all sinned that sin is entered into the world? That reverses the whole order of this sentence and ignores the fact that the 'because all sinned' is the proof, not of Adam's sin but of Sin and D

eath having passed through to the whole race.

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/10/5 17:49**

Quote:

-----If we all sinned in Adam... WE are guilty of our transgression that Adam committed.  
-----

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. (Ezekiel 18:20)

This is one of those areas that seems like hair splitting, but has serious consequences when it comes to witnessing. If I ever told someone that they were going to hell for Adam's transgression I would expect the whole opportunity to be lost, then and there. If sin is not imputed where there is no law, how is it possible that one could have sin imputed to them who had not seen the light of day? Revelation brings responsibility. I am accountable for my response to the revealed will of God alone. To him that *knoweth* to do good and doeth it not- to him it is sin.

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/6 8:10**

Though this doctrine may be new to you it isn't new to the church. Just give me a chance to explain what I've learned. Consider what I'm trying to say.

Quote:

-----If we all sinned in Adam... WE are guilty of our transgression that Adam committed.  
-----

Let me reword this: sorry for my mistake... I meant that you and me sinned in Adam. The whole of the human race sinned here.

Quote:

-----This is rather an arrogant statement. Do you think I am not familiar with the chapter?  
-----

I wasn't assuming you were familiar with the chapter I was just saying that rereading the chapter might help you to see what I'm saying.

Quote:

-----One being Original Guilt the other being Original Pollution. ---Reply: You are still mixing up the metaphors.  
-----

I'm saying that this is doctrinally what original sin is composed of.

Consider this verse in light of what I'm saying...

Quote:

-----For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man's obedience many will be made righteous.  
-----

Quote:

-----What are you trying to say here? That it is 'because' all sinned that sin is entered into the world? That reverses the whole order of the sentence and ignores the fact that the 'because all sinned' is the proof, not of Adam's sin but of Sin and Death having passed through to the whole race.  
-----

"Therefore, just as through one man sin entered the world, and death through sin, and thus death spread to all men, because all sinned—" The order is this...

Adam sinned and we all sinned-> sin and death entered world.

The question is what does "because all sinned" mean here? Its either (1.) well, our individual sins lead us to death or (2.) Adam's sin became our sin (we're not held accountable for his sin but ours).

This text is trying to show that Jesus wasn't just for the Jews but for the world because Adam is our father. It shows that Christ isn't only for the Jews. He broke off the sentence in verse 12 and stops his comparison because he decided to elaborate on what "because all sinned" meant. He is comparing Christ's work with Adam's in parallel. He's saying that Adam's sin became our sin (because we were united with him) just as Christ's righteousness became our righteousness. If we say "No, my individual sins brought me my damnation." then in consequence we say, "My individual sins have brought me righteousness." For example verse 19 says, "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so also by one Man's obedience many will be made righteous."

If we change it to say, "For as by my disobedience I was made a sinner, so also by my righteousness I will be made righteous."

Do you see the parallel? I thought this was really cool when I learned it. It wasn't our individual acts of righteousness which made us righteous but Christ's. This means our justification has nothing to do with our works.

Try to see what I'm saying...

v12. Because all sinned

v13. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those who had not sinned according to the likeness of the transgression of Adam (who have not committed individual sins)

v15. For if by the one man's offense many died

v16. And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned

v17. For if by the one man's offense death reigned through the one

v18. Therefore, as through one man's offense judgment came to all men, resulting in condemnation (to all men)

v19. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners

“Sin was in the world before the law, sin isn't imputed when there is no law” this is not a contradicting statement because it was our sin in Adam which was imputed to us.

Forgive me for not having much structure in this presentation. I am unworthy to take up such a task so please bear with me. I'm telling you John Piper explained it 50xs beter.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/6 12:15**

You don't have to convince me of 'original sin'. I am totally convinced of it. Neither do you have to convince me of sin which is different in nature to Adam's first transgression. Let's see if we can get at it by another route.

“And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression.”  
(1Tim 2:14 KJVS)

You will see that Paul, by the Spirit, is differentiating here between Adam's sin and Eve's sin. Adam was clearly 'blameworthy' and, by my rule of thumb definition, was 'guilty'. But how about Eve? Her 'transgression' was the result of deception whereas Adam's was the result of disobedience. Was Adam blameworthy? Yes. Was Eve blameworthy? No! Adam was guilty but was Eve? If there is a distinction between the transgressions of Adam and Eve, what is it based on? Surely on 'volition'. Adam clashed with the revealed will of God and knew what he was about. He is guilty. Eve transgressed a limit set by God but not as a chosen defiance of the will of God; she was deceived. She was not guilty although her transgression was genuine.

If there is a difference between Adam's guilt and Eve's guilt is it not also true that there is a difference between Adam's guilt and mine. As federal head of the race Adam's sin had immediate implications for the race whereas Eve's did not. It was Adam's, second in chronology, transgression rather than Eve's which caused Sin and Death to spread instantly to the whole creation. In Adam we all sinners, no doubt about it, but am I found 'guilty' of the sin of defiance of God's will because of what Adam did.

Let's come from the opposite direction. “And verily they that are of the sons of Levi, who receive the office of the priesthood, have a commandment to take tithes of the people according to the law, that is, of their brethren, though they come out of the loins of Abraham: And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was y

et in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him.Â”

(Heb 7:5,9-10 KJVS) This is a vital piece of evidence in understanding the corporate nature of the race. Did 'Levi' gain merit by the act of Abraham? Abraham was 'blessed' but was Levi 'blessed' by Abraham's action?

I am trying to distinguish the different concepts of Sin and Guilt. In personal sin they are inseparable but is this true of the sin of Adam?

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/6 16:54**

Quote:  
-----Was Adam blameworthy? Yes. Was Eve blameworthy? No! Adam was guilty but was Eve? If there is a distinction between the transgressions of Adam and Eve, what is it based on? Surely on 'volition'. Adam clashed with the revealed will of God and knew what he was about. He is guilty. Eve transgressed a limit set by God but not as a chosen defiance of the will of God; she was deceived. She was not guilty although her transgression was genuine.  
-----

I don't believe Eve was not held accountable and guilty for her sin. I believe she sinned first and that Adam being the head of his wife was held in greater accountability for her sin as well as his. This idea of Eve not being guilty individually in the garden is new to me. Every other person I've heard on it (Sproul and MacArthur off the top of my head) say that she did sin individually. Besides God cursed her as well as the man.

Even if we were to let this new idea slide, its consequences are too great. First off, Eve blameshifted her responsibility to the devil... But Adam blameshifted his guilt to God because of the woman. If the devil is responsible for tricking Eve then God is responsible for tricking Adam by giving him this "woman" named Eve. If Eve was able to blameshift and have God submit then why couldn't Adam. No, Eve individually sinned in the garden but Adam was responsible for them. He sinned as well and now our father Adam has caused a lot of trouble.

Quote:  
-----As federal head of the race Adam's sin had immediate implications for the race whereas Eve's did not. It was Adam's, second in chronology, transgression rather than Eve's which caused Sin and Death to spread instantly to the whole creation. In Adam we all sinners, no doubt about it, but am I found 'guilty' of the sin of defiance of God's will because of what Adam did.  
-----

No, its because of what you did in Adam. We are all sinners in Adam because we sinned as well. As the bible puts it "we all sinned". As federal head Adam lead us into death whereas Christ leads us into life.

[www.cornerstoneorlando.org](http://www.cornerstoneorlando.org)

**when and how are we made righteous?, on: 2006/10/6 18:32**

Rom. 5:19 For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.

If by Adam's sin we were made sinners (without choice) then when and how are we made righteous?

**Re: when and how are we made righteous?, on: 2006/10/7 8:38**

Quote:  
-----shall many be made righteous.  
-----

Is this statement in the future tense?

Quote:  
-----If by Adam's sin we were made sinners (without choice) then when and how are we made righteous?  
-----

Earlier in Romans 5 Paul offers

1 Therefore, **having been justified by faith**, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,

2 through whom also we have access by faith into this grace in which we stand

1 Corinthians 1

27 But God has **chosen** the foolish things of the world to put to shame the wise, and God has **chosen** the weak things of the world to put to shame the things which are mighty;

28 and the base things of the world and the things which are despised God has **chosen**, and the things which are not, to bring to nothing the things that are,

29 that no flesh should glory in His presence.

30 **But of Him you are in Christ Jesus**, who became for us **wisdom from God -- and righteousness** and sanctification and redemption --

1 John 2:1

My little children, these things I write to you, so that you may not sin. And **if** anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.

**Re: Original Sin, on: 2006/10/7 8:52**

Gracealone said:

Quote:

-----WE are guilty of **our** transgression that Adam committed.

No-one was 'guilty' when notionally in the loins of Adam. That's because we were all ALREADY DEAD! That was the effect of his sin on all his descendents *yet to be **born***.

*Guilt* is a completely different entity from death and cannot be applied to dead people - only live ones.

I don't take any responsibility for what Adam did and God doesn't expect me to.

I am responsible for dealing with my own sin and sins through faith in Christ's death and resurrection, *even though* I was born with sin like a noose round my neck because of what Adam did....

Now, please think clearly about this.... none of us committed **Adam's** transgression.... He did it *all by himself*.

**Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/10/7 9:51**

Quote:

-----WE are guilty of our transgression that Adam committed.

Adam's sin 'pass on' to us in form of the sin nature, but we are only responsible for and guilty of our own transgression/sins. The above quote doesn't sound quite right.

One can still say, I think, " we are guilty of our transgression just as that which Adam committed".



**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/7 14:58**

Well, since I'm not too good with words heres an article on it...

What is the biblical evidence for the imputation of Adam's Sin?

By DG Staff

January 23, 2006

The doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin means that when Adam first sinned, that sin (and its blame) was rightly regarded by God to be our sin as well. John Piper writes:

The problem with the human race is not most deeply that everybody does various kinds of sins; those sins are real, they are huge and they are enough to condemn us. Paul is very concerned about them. But the deepest problem is that behind all our depravity and all our guilt and all our sinning, there is a deep mysterious connection with Adam whose sin became our sin and whose judgment became our judgment. (John Piper, "Adam, Christ, and Justification: Part I")

God ordains that there be a union of some kind that makes Adam's sin to be our sin so that our condemnation is just. ("Adam, Christ, and Justification: Part V")

The biblical basis for this doctrine of imputed sin is discussed thoroughly in John Piper's five sermons on Romans 5:12-21. Here we will simply seek to summarize some of the primary evidence from this text.

#### Sin Entered the World Through One Man

First, Paul states in 5:12 that all sinned in Adam: "Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned." Paul seems to be equating the "because all sinned" with "through one man sin entered into the world."

#### Sin is Not Imputed Where There is no Law

Second, in verses 13-14 Paul adds a clarification which confirms that he does indeed have the imputation of Adam's sin in view in the phrase "because all sinned" rather than our individual sins. He states: "For until the Law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come." In other words, Paul concedes that personal sin was prevalent in the world before Moses ("until the Law sin was in the world..."). But he adds that these personal sins were not the ultimate reason people died in that time period: "But sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses." As Piper summarizes:

People died even though their own individual sins against the Mosaic law were not the reason for dying; they weren't counted. Instead, the reason all died is because all sinned in Adam. Adam's sin was imputed to them. (John Piper, "Adam, Christ, and Justification: Part II")

#### Death Reigned Even Over Those Who Did Not Sin Like Adam

Third, Paul's statement at the end of verse 14 further clarifies that he does not have personal sins in view as the reason for human death: "Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam." Piper notes:

In other words, yes Paul concedes that there are other kinds of laws before the Mosaic Law, and yes people broke those laws, and yes, one could argue that these sins are the root cause of death and condemnation in the world. But, Paul says, there is a problem with that view, because death reigned "even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam." There are those who died without seeing a law and choosing to sin against it.

Who are they? I think the group of people begging for an explanation is infants. Infants died. They could not understand personal revelation. They could not read the law on their hearts and choose to obey or disobey it. Yet they died. Why? Paul answers: the sin of Adam and the imputation of that sin to the human race. In other words, death reigned over all humans, even over those who did not sin against a known and understood law. Therefore, the conclusion is, to use the words of verse 18: "through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men." (Ibid)

So the purpose of verses 13 and 14 are to clarify verse 12 in this way:

At the end of verse 12 the words, "death spread to all men, because all sinned" mean that "death spread to all because all sinned in Adam." Death is not first and most deeply because of our own individual sinning, but because of what happened in Adam. (Ibid)

Paul's Emphasis Upon the One Transgression

Fourth, at least five times in the following verses Paul says that death comes upon all humans because of the one sin of Adam:

Verse 15: by the transgression of the one the many died

Verse 16: the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation

Verse 17: by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one

Verse 18: through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men

We are all condemned not ultimately because of our individual sins, but because of one sin (verse 18). We die not ultimately because of personal sins, but because of Adam's one transgression (verse 17). It is not ultimately from our personal sins that we die, but rather "by the transgression of the one the many died." Paul states over and over again that it is because of one sin that death and condemnation belong to us all. In other words, we are connected to Adam such that his one sin is regarded as our sin and we are worthy of condemnation for it.

The Direct Statement of Verse 19

Fifth, verse 19 provides us with a direct statement of imputation:

For as through the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the One the many will be made righteous.

Paul here says that we are made sinners by the sin of Adam. Due to his disobedience, we are regarded as sinners. We cannot take "made sinners" here to be referring to original sin in which we become inherently sinful because it is paralleled with "made righteous." The phrase "made righteous" in this context is referring to the great truth of justification. Justification does not concern a change in our characters, the infusion of something inherent in us. Rather, it involves a change in our standing before God. In justification, God declares us righteous because He imputes to us the righteousness of Christ--not because He makes us internally righteous (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:21). Thus, when Paul says "made righteous" here, he means "imputed with righteousness" not "infused with righteousness." Since "made sinners" is paralleled with "made righteous," it must also be referring to imputation. Thus, Paul is saying that we are all made sinners in the sense that we are imputed with Adam's sin.

© Desiring God

Permissions: You are permitted and encouraged to reproduce and distribute this material in any format provided that you do not alter the wording in any way, you do not charge a fee beyond the cost of reproduction, and you do not make more than 1,000 physical copies. For web posting, a link to this document on our website is preferred. Any exceptions to the above must be explicitly approved by Desiring God.

Please include the following statement on any distributed copy: By John Piper. © Desiring God. Website: [www.desiringGod.org](http://www.desiringGod.org). Email: [mail@desiringGod.org](mailto:mail@desiringGod.org). Toll Free: 1.888.346.4700.

Re: - posted by mamaluk, on: 2006/10/7 15:14

Gracealone,

Oh yeah, much clearer now, with those Scriptures in view.

Guilt leading to..condemnation.. death.. yes, that's totally fine, it's probably how it sounded when we quoted yours out of the context of your post. :)

thank you

Re: Original Sin, on: 2006/10/7 15:37

From John Piper's article, last paragraph

Quote:  
-----**Justification does not concern a change in our characters**, the infusion of something inherent in us. **Rather, it involves a change in our standing before God.** In justification, God declares us righteous because He imputes to us the righteousness of Christ--not because He makes us internally righteous (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:21).  
-----

Yes, justification involves a change in our standing with God, but I couldn't disagree *more*, that it **doesn't** make us 'internally righteous'.

On the contrary, if it doesn't make us **internally righteous**, what use is it?

Further, John Piper's thesis militates directly against the New Covenant promises (Heb 8 and 10) which are to all believers (even though Gentiles were never formally subject to the Law).

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/7 18:00

Quote:  
-----I don't believe Eve was not held accountable and guilty for her sin. I believe she sinned first and that Adam being the head of his wife was held in greater accountability for her sin as well as his. This idea of Eve not being guilty individually in the garden is new to me. Every other person I've heard on it (Sproul and MacArthur) off the top of my head) say that she did sin individually. Besides God cursed her as well as the man.  
-----

You will need a KJV to check out this next point. Read the account of the entrance of sin and take note of the '2nd person singular pronouns' ie thee, thy, thine etc. When we encounter this is it the equivalent of God's resting his finger on our chest and saying 'you'. Singular only involves one person, to involve both Adam and Eve God would have to say 'you' not 'thou'.

If you do this you will find that God lays the whole blame and responsibility upon Adam. Contrary to your comment above the woman is not 'cursed'. The serpent is cursed and the ground is cursed for 'thy sake' ie Adam's sake. There is absolutely no mention of a curse in connection with the woman. There are two consequences for the woman. I think a good case could be made for them to be recognized as blessings rather than cursings. Both built in a dependence upon her man. God never cursed the woman.

At the beginning of the chapter Satan constantly includes Adam in the temptation. The account of the conversation uses '2nd and 3rd person plurals consistently'...  
“Now the serpent was more subtil than any beast of the field which the Lord God had made. And he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden: But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil.”  
(Gen 3:1-5 KJVS)

If you follow the story you will see that the whole emphasis is upon Adam's responsibility. In fact the original prohibition was couched in singulars...  
“And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat: But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof t

hou shalt surely die.Â”  
(Gen 2:16-17 KJVS)

God's word to Adam is personal and specific...

Gen. 3:17 And unto Adam he said, Because thou hast 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;

Gen. 3:18 Thorns also and thistles shall it bring forth to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field;

Gen. 3:19 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.

It was Adam who was specifically banished from the garden and his wife was included in his punishment. She suffered as a result of his sin but there is no indication that he suffered as a result of hers. If you follow through this account carefully you will discover that Eve's sin did not cause her Death, it was Adam's sin that caused her Death. Sin and Death entered through Adam not through Eve and Eve was the second victim of Sin and Death. She was the first to whom Sin and Death spread and it did not happen to her as a result of heredity because she was already alive when it happened.

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/8 8:31**

Quote:

-----God never cursed the woman.  
-----

Genesis 3:16

16 To the woman He said:

Â”I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception;  
In pain you shall bring forth children;  
Your desire shall be for your husband,  
And he shall rule over you.Â”

Quote:

-----If you follow through this account carefully you will discover that Eve's sin did not cause her Death, it was Adam's sin that caused her Death.  
-----

I agree, Adam was responsible and accountable for her (not that she did not sin). Death entered the world through Adam.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/9 7:04**

There can be consequences without cursings. My point was that God uses the word 'curse' in his conversation with the Serpent and with Adam but never with the woman. Gen 3:16 are consequences following the Fall but the Fall was occasioned by Adam and not by Eve.

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/9 10:03**

Ok, I see what you mean. Maybe Eve had consequences without cursings, still her "consequence" has penetrated the female human race. There is a chance, but I'm not convinced. Still, since that's besides the point, she sinned in the garden as well as Adam. But Adam was our federal head and our seminal head. Adam brought in the fall not Eve. Not that Eve was not guilty in the garden, but that Adam was accountable for them.

Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/9 10:12

Quote:

-----dorcass said: On the contrary, if it (justification) doesn't make us internally righteous, what use is it?  
-----

You're saying that being declared righteous before God is of no use? Being justified is what happens at conversion. You are justified before God, declared righteous, declared a son. If you don't believe in the imputation of righteousness and only that we are righteous because of our individual acts of righteousness, you'd have to be perfect.. and you're not. Only Christ was perfect. Only Christ's righteousness could be sufficient for God's standard of holiness. Besides even if we clean up our lives, we've still broken God's laws and are deserving of hell. The only way I could be declared righteous is if Somebody righteous takes my punishment and gives me His reward. Then, that Person would have to rise from the dead to show His righteousness. That is the gospel and the difference between Christianity and other religions... The fact that we have a substitute before God! The fact that we don't have to rely upon our righteousness.

Besides, being justified means that you are being sanctified. Its a promise of God that He will sanctify his sheep. IF you are justified, you will be sanctified and later glorified. Or in other words, If you've been justified you are being sanctified and will be glorified.

www.cornerstoneorlando.org -Dr. David Downs

www.heartcrymissionary.com -Paul Washer

([http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/QuestionsAndAnswers/ByTopic/86/1622\\_What\\_happens\\_to\\_infants\\_who\\_die/](http://www.desiringgod.org/ResourceLibrary/QuestionsAndAnswers/ByTopic/86/1622_What_happens_to_infants_who_die/)) John Piper on infant salvation

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/9 11:28

Quote:

-----Ok, I see what you mean. Mabey Eve had consequences without cursings, still her "consequence" has penetrated the female human race.  
-----

Yes it has but then the rest of the creation suffered 'consequences' as a result of Adam's sin but that does not make my dog 'guilty'.

Have we talked about the nature of the 'condemnation' that came on the whole race as a result of Adam's sin?

Rom. 5:16 And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification.

Rom. 5:18 Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.

Re: Original Sin, on: 2006/10/9 14:07

Hi GraceAlone,

I think you've misunderstood what I said. Here it is again.

(You might need to read the last paragraph of John Piper's article which you posted on p8, to notice the point of my disagreement more clearly. The quote I made was only a *snippet* from his last paragraph.)

Then I said, in the sentence before the one you quoted 'Yes, justification involves a change in our standing with God,' (so I *do* agree on that point) '**but I couldn't disagree more, that it doesn't make us 'internally righteous'.**

Perhaps there were too many 'n'ts' to combine with the one 'disagree' for it to make easy sense. Sorry!!

I think if you read my comment through again slowly, you'll see that what I'm disagreeing with is *not* the 'imputed righteousness' but *imputed righteousness only*.

Then I said 'On the contrary, **if it doesn't make us 'internally righteous', what use is it?**

Adding 'Further, John Piper's thesis militates directly against the New Covenant promises (Heb 8 and 10) which are to all believers (even though Gentiles were never formally subject to the Law).'

Perhaps you hadn't noticed the aspect of his thesis on which I commented? (Perhaps you *agree* with him that we cannot become 'internally righteous' - but that's a different discussion, I guess - nevertheless, it was the substance of my post.)

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/9 14:08**

Adam sinned as our federal and seminal head. We were condemned in Adam...not your dog.

Though creation has also felt the fall...Romans 8:22 For we know that the whole creation groans and labors with birth pangs together until now.

The bottom line here is we we're condemned and sinners even before we sinned individually.

You might want to read or reread the article I posted below to help clear the air by John Piper.

**Re: sinners before sinning????, on: 2006/10/9 14:24**

GraceAlone

How can we be called sinners before we sinned individually?

**Re: Original Sin, on: 2006/10/9 14:35**

Quote:

-----You might want to read or reread the article I posted below to help clear the air by John Piper.

-----  
GraceAlone,

To whom is this comment directed, please?

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/9 18:02**

Quote:

-----You might want to read or reread the article I posted below to help clear the air by John Piper.

I read it but I couldn't see that it added substantially to what you had expressed yourself. As it stands I am in large agreement with the article. As I have said previously my problems do not lie with 'original sin'. Does he distinguish between 'imputed sin' and 'imparted sin'? I am thinking this through but my instinct is to say that 'original sin' has to do with 'imparted sin' and that instantly from the moment of Adam's transgression. The 'Sin' that entered the world through Adam's transgression was immediately imparted to Eve. (By the way, I know that Eve is in a different category to my dog. I was just making the point that Eve's physical condition is not described as 'curse' in the Genesis account.)

But was Adam's sin 'imputed' to me? I am not speaking now of the Sin which entered the world from outside as a result of Adam's transgression but of Adam's single act of disobedience. Does God hold me responsible for that act and is Adam's transgression in this thing 'put to my account'?

Again, I repeat, I know that Sin - the dynaminc passed through to me in consequence of Adam's transgression. I am not

talking about Adam's 'sin' but rather about Adam's 'Sin'. I hope you follow that distinction. The 'sin' being the act, the 'Sin' being the disposition.

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/11 11:20**

Paul here says that we are made sinners by the sin of Adam. Due to his disobedience, we are regarded as sinners. We cannot take "made sinners" here to be referring to original sin in which we become inherently sinful because it is paralleled with "made righteous." The phrase "made righteous" in this context is referring to the great truth of justification. Justification does not concern a change in our characters, the infusion of something inherent in us. Rather, it involves a change in our standing before God. In justification, God declares us righteous because He imputes to us the righteousness of Christ--not because He makes us internally righteous (cf. 2 Corinthians 5:21). Thus, when Paul says "made righteous" here, he means "imputed with righteousness" not "infused with righteousness." Since "made sinners" is paralleled with "made righteous," it must also be referring to imputation. Thus, Paul is saying that we are all made sinners in the sense that we are imputed with Adam's sin.

Quote:

-----  
But was Adam's sin 'imputed' to me? I am not speaking now of the Sin which entered the world from outside as a result of Adam's transgression but of Adam's single act of disobedience. Does God hold me responsible for that act and is Adam's transgression in this thing 'put to my account'?

-----  
I think you are separating what shouldn't be separated... God holds you guilty of Adam's sin. He puts it into your account. Just as if a woman takes drugs while she is pregnant (although the baby isn't taking the drugs-- the baby is taking drug s) due to his mother the baby feels the effects. His sin is put into our account just as Christ's righteousness is put into our account.

I still haven't understood the question please be patient with me and clarify.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/11 13:50**

Quote:

-----Paul here says that we are made sinners by the sin of Adam. Due to his disobedience, we are regarded as sinners. We cannot take "made sinners" here to be referring to original sin in which we become inherently sinful because it is paralleled with "made righteous." The phrase "made righteous" in this context is referring to the great truth of justification. Justification does not concern a change in our characters, the infusion of something inherent in us.

-----  
This is the crux of our different perspectives. I think you are mistaken in attributing 'made righteous' of Romans 5:12ff to the forensic background of Romans 4.

Let me say it plainly, not to provoke but to make my position clear, that I believe that regeneration creates a new nature which does not co-exist with the old. By first birth I was 'in Adam'; by second birth I am 'in Christ'. These two states are mutually exclusive in my understanding of Romans. I do not believe, as do many evangelicals, that the effect of regeneration is to add another 'new' nature to the 'old'. I believe that "if any man be 'in Christ' he is a new creation" not a modified 'old creation'.

Justification by faith is the basis of all God's dealing with us and always has been. I agree with your statement that...

Quote:

-----Justification does not concern a change in our characters, the infusion of something inherent in us.

-----  
...and this is why I distinguish between justification and regeneration. Justification is a change of legal status, regeneration is a change of nature.

Romans 4 lays the foundation of 'Justification by faith' but as we move into Romans 5 we begin with the foundation of justification and move on to "this grace wherein we stand". Romans 5 is the 'much more' chapter of New Testament revelation;

Rom. 5:9 Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him.

Rom. 5:10 For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.

Rom. 5:15 But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.



Rom. 5:17 For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

Young's Literal Translation is significant here... "for if by the offence of the one the death did reign through the one, much more those, who the abundance of the grace and of the free gift of the righteousness are receiving, in life shall reign through the one— Jesus Christ." (Rom 5:17 YNG) Young's has identified the fact that the verb form of 'receive' is the participle and not the indicative. Is justification something we 'are receiving' as a process or something we 'do receive' as a single act of the judge?

The first half of this verse makes it plain that we are not talking about 'sins' but about 'The Sin' and 'The Death' of Romans 5:12. The second half of the verse maintains that topic; not transgressions but nature. Paul begins Romans 5 with a reference to 'this grace in which we stand' and here refers to 'receiving...the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness'. The law court deals with unlawful acts not with unlawful nature. What we need is not only forensic justification by faith but to receive the 'free gift of righteousness'. This is not righteousness imputed but righteousness imparted.

Quote:  
-----I think you are separating what shouldn't be separated... God holds you guilty of Adam's sin. He puts it into your account. Just as if a woman takes drugs while she is pregnant (although the baby isn't taking the drugs-- the baby is taking drugs) due to his mother the baby feels the effects.  
-----

I think this illustration shows the weakness of your position. You keep switching from impartation to imputation and back again to impartation. The mother 'imparts' the drug and baby 'partakes' of the drug, it does not have the mother's folly imputed to it and the child is not 'blamed' for the mother's behaviour.

edit: 5 min later.

I had intended to add that I presume from your logon that you are of the 'Reformed' persuasion. Does this include the reformed position that a sovereign act of regeneration begins the whole process? Do you believe that regeneration precedes conviction, faith, repentance, conversion and justification?

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/11 16:05**

I think I see what you're saying....

#1 Imparted righteousness goes.

Justification (conversion)--->Santification (new life)--->Glorification (after earthly death)

#2 Imputed righteousness...

Solely based on Christ's work alone. Not by our works, but by Christ's.

Quote:  
-----Does this include the reformed position that a sovereign act of regeneration begins the whole process?  
-----

Yes. Phil 2:12-13 "Therefore, my beloved, as you have always obeyed, not as in my presence only, but now much more in my absence, work out your own salvation with fear and trembling; for it is God who works in you both to will and to do for His good pleasure."

Quote:  
-----Justification is a change of legal status, regeneration is a change of nature.... I believe that "if any man be 'in Christ' he is a new creature"

ation" not a modified 'old creation'.  
-----

I agree that justification is a change of legal status as well... Still, I have to differ with you on the "abolishing of our sin nature". A "new creation" does not necessitate an abolishment of our old nature. I'd just like to say that if we were made perfect after we were justified I have all the right to say that none of us are saved. Of course, being justified doesn't necessitate perfection but it does necessitate a radical life change and a life practicing righteousness (not lawlessness). We'll be made perfect in heaven. Romans 7:13-24

By the way, my illustration was just to help you understand what I was saying... I hope I've understood your question now. I hope I've made myself clearer now.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/12 6:04**

Are you familiar with John MacArthur's position on (<http://www.ondctrine.com/2mac0060.htm>) one nature'? Just enter "one nature" when you get to this site and you will find the specific point he is making. Apparently Martyn Lloyd-Jones took a similar position.

I don't hold his position in all its detail. My own conviction is that Romans 7 is 'pre-Spirit'.

Quote:

-----I'd just like to say that if we were made perfect after we were justified I have all the right to say that none of us are saved.  
-----

Now you are running more words together as though they meant the same thing. ;-) It all depends on what you mean by 'perfect'. Wesley's Christian Perfection made a careful study of (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/wesley/perfection/files/perfection.html>) (1.) In what sense Christians are not, (2.) In what sense they are, perfect. (See section 12 following.) I do the same. I believe in Christian Perfection but not in 'Sinless Perfection'.

**Re: - posted by GraceAlone (), on: 2006/10/12 14:53**

Hey thanks for that information! That was some interesting information on John MacArthur. I truly respect his work and ministry.

I guess I should better define my terms.

1 Peter 2:11

"Beloved, I beg you as sojourners and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul"

I believe our flesh is at war with our spirit not that we have our old nature in a cage somewhere in our heart next to Christ.

I guess I was a little cross-eyed about "the flesh" and "the old nature". Forgive me and be patient with me. :-?

Still, even though we are given a new nature it is God who provides sanctification and justification. I think I'm pretty familiar with Wesleyan theology on sanctification. Personally, I am convinced that the war Paul is talking about in his members is his flesh vs his spirit.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/13 4:10**

Quote:

-----Forgive me and be patient with me.  
-----

Nothing to forgive, we are learning together here. :-)

Perhaps we are straying from our 'original sin' a little...

Quote:

-----I believe our flesh is at war with our spirit not that we have our old nature in a cage somewhere in our heart next to Christ.  
-----

...but the ongoing consequences of Adam's transgression and the Sin to which it gave entrance has its ongoing effects. Robert W and myself have talked around this 'flesh and spirit' thing for years now, not to prove one right against the other but simply to try to get a handle on where the 'war' is taking place and consequently how we may prepare ourselves for it.

Here's a provoking verse...

“For we have not a high priest not able to sympathise with our infirmities, but tempted in all things in like manner, sin a part.” (Heb 4:15 DRBY)

I know this verse is a great comfort to us but what is it telling us about the nature of a Christian's temptations; what does it mean when it says He was 'tempted in all things in like manner'? I have switched to Darby's translation here as he avoids the word 'points' which our KJV supplies but is not in the original.

If we consider the nature of Christ's temptations where do we see their origin? I think we shall all be agreed that he had no 'Sin nature' so that eliminates 'the Old Man' from our list of suspects.

The Hebrews statement says He was 'tempted... in like manner'. 'like manner' to what or to whom? Surely this means the kind of people like the author and recipients of Hebrews. It is 'we' who have this High Priest and the 'we' is people with a shared experience. This is not necessarily referring to the whole of mankind but to that section of mankind who are defined by the 'we' of the author.

Now, if He was tempted in all things in like manner as 'we' what does that say about 'our' temptations? If His temptations came from without and ours come from within how can we say he was 'tempted in all things in like manner' to us?

The kind of people that the author of Hebrews has in mind are described in that letter.....“those who were 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) The 'we' of Hebrews is defined by the common experience of author and recipient. Christ was tempted in all things in like manner to people with this kind of experience. So where is the seat of our temptations?

Thoughts?

**Re:, on: 2006/10/13 4:47**

I really enjoy Winkie Pratney's writings on original sin.

If you can find any of his articles on the subject, they are precious.

**Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/13 6:25**

Quote:

-----I really enjoy Winkie Pratney's writings on original sin.  
-----

Personally, I disagree strongly with Winkie Pratney's teachings on Original Sin or at least those I have read online. He is pretty much straight down the line Finney who rejected the classic teaching of Original Sin altogether.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/10/13 9:02

Quote:  
-----The 'we' of Hebrews is defined by the common experience of author and recipient. Christ was tempted in all things in like manner to people with this kind of experience. So where is the seat of our temptations?  
-----

I like the way you sort of flipped that verse in Hebrews around to show that we are tempted in all points like as was Christ (*since* we have been regenerated). At least that what I got from it. I think I have come to terms with this more over the last few years, but I don't have it all figured out. There is a natural side of us that has needs or 'desires'. These desires are natural and God given. In themselves they are good. Yet, Reidhead defined 'temptation' as an appeal to the intellect to fulfill a good desire in a bad way. If I have a good desire and am offered a bad means to fulfill it and an attraction develops, I think it is safe to say that I am in the 'throes' of temptation. I see our natural desires as a magnet and anything with iron content will attract (as it were). The problem is that certain metallic items have been marked by God as being off limits (unlawful). This is why my decision or 'will' comes in.

If I sense that my natural desire is 'pulling' at something unlawful I have to make a conscious choice to 'turn loose'. I wish it was that simple, but really it is not. Some of these things are not just 'turned off' like a switch. This is where the overall governance of our life has to be that of the Holy Spirit. When we are FULL of the Holy Spirit then the phenomena of God working in us both to will and to do of His good pleasure is at its maximum. If we 'hold back' and don't allow the Holy Spirit to daily fill us and maintain that fullness then we get into trouble. Just my experience. It is *not* a sin nature we are fighting, but our human nature in a world of many many sinful means.

If we had a sinful nature I would argue that we would be gratified by the act of disobedience itself. Rebellion would be our 'meat'; whereas now we are gratified or I should say "our meat" is to do the will of Him that was sent of God (Christ). We are in Christ and it was His meat to do the will of the Father; likewise because we are in Him we share that experience.

So the struggle, to me, is our initial willingness to be surrendered to God in a way that He will work in us to will and to do His good pleasure. If we work at this at any other level we are really only treating symptoms of the cause of our struggle. Temptation comes when the temptor comes. These 'temptations' or 'suggestions' come from without OR as MaCarthur may say they are due to residual memories of past temptations. If the temptation somehow originates in me then it is due to my mind needing renewed. This is also the working of the Holy Spirit as we choose not to recall those things. The 'will' not to recall has to come from the Holy Spirit (I think). This is God working in us both to will and to do. We are back to being continually FILLED with the Spirit again. Before I go I am not saying 'suppression of the sin nature' by the Holy Spirit, I am saying suppression of anything that may appeal to our natural desires and cause a temptation. I think Sin Nature is simply a nature that is gratified by rebellion itself. I don't see that believers can have a nature such as that.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/10/13 9:36

Quote:  
-----I like the way you sort of flipped that verse in Hebrews around to show that we are tempted in all points like as was Christ (since we have been regenerated). At least that what I got from it.  
-----

That is what I was trying to do anyway. :-)