



Scriptures and Doctrine :: The "Sin Nature"

The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 13:09

Here is a question meant to stimulate our thinking and exegesis and get us thinking about whether we receive teachings because they just sound good.

1. Where is the Sin Nature mentioned in the Bible? I see the Flesh mentioned in Romans, but not the Sin Nature.

Re: The "Sin Nature" - posted by sojourner7 (), on: 2010/11/8 13:12

Sin is a principle at work in our bodily members. The Greeks could not find a word or term to associate with; so they referred to the flesh. Romans Ch 7 is the best exegesis concerning the effects and the principle of sin within us.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 13:17

Did Adam and Eve have a "sin nature" before they sinned?

Re: The "Sin Nature" - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/11/8 13:18

Rom 7:20 Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me.

Rom 7:23 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.

It is obvious from the context that sin mentioned in the above 2 verses is not talking about individual acts of sin, but a principle or "law" of sin that indwells the individual and inclines them to commit acts of sin.

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/8 13:34

Quote:

-----Did Adam and Eve have a "sin nature" before they sinned?

No?

The verse that is used to prove that is Eccl 7:29

Lo, this only have I found, that God hath made man upright; but they have sought out many inventions.

Also Adam and Eve did not have knowledge of good and evil.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 13:54

Galatians 5:19 Now the works of the flesh are evident, which are: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lewdness, 20 idolatry, sorcery, hatred, contentions, jealousies, outbursts of wrath, selfish ambitions, dissensions, heresies, 21 envy, murders, drunkenness, revelries, and the like; of which I tell you beforehand, just as I also told you in time past, that those who practice such things will not inherit the kingdom of God.

Here we are talking about individual works or acts of sin.

Is it about "flesh vs spirit", or is it ok to blame our problems on our "sin nature"?

I am just trying to understand clearly what the Bible says on this.

Romans 8:5 For those who live according to the flesh set their minds on the things of the flesh, but those who live according to the Spirit, the things of the Spirit. 6 For to be carnally minded is death, but to be spiritually minded is life and peace. 7 Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, nor indeed can be. 8 So then, those who are in the flesh cannot please God. 9 But you are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if indeed the Spirit of God dwells in you. Now if anyone does not have the Spirit of Christ, he is not His.

Scripture seems very clear regarding Romans 8:5-9. It's all about Flesh vs. Spirit. I don't see anything about "sin nature".

Why do Christians fall into sin? Because we put our mind on flesh instead of spirit. I can relate to this. Scripture makes it easy for me. But "sin nature" seems too esoteric. It certainly is not part of our DNA, otherwise it could be removed through genetic engineering.

If our flesh is just left alone as Adam was left alone, what happens? I am sure that Adam did not have a "sin nature" before he sinned. But he did have flesh.

Okay, so we do agree that there is no actual term "sin nature" in the Bible. But, we see that there is a "law of sin" in our flesh and Paul says, "sin that dwelleth in me". Maybe we should concentrate on what these are.

There is a lot of Christianese wording out there and it is better to stay with exactly what the Bible says and understand it from that perspective.

Is it right to say that "my sin nature got the best of me" or is it more like, "I yielded to my flesh instead of to the Spirit"?

Contending with you guys for a proper understanding according to what the Bible says. Sometimes we receive everything taught to us so easily and readily that we forget to bring it through the filter of God's Word.

Thanks a lot.

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/8 14:12

I understand the "sin nature", "flesh", "old man" to all refer to the same thing.

It is there. it is never eradicated. Whenever the Spirit dominates, the sin nature is put to death. Whenever the Spirit is weakened, the sin nature rises.

Gal 5:17

For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.

you notice the language in the end of the verse is similar to that of Romans 7: 16,19,20

19For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do.

but that is when the flesh dominates.
That is why Paul says in Gal 5:16

I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh.

He is saying in effect, there is a remedy to not fulfilling the lust of the flesh, that remedy is to walk in the Spirit.

Re: - posted by AbideinHim (), on: 2010/11/8 14:54

I hope that this post by Watchman Nee on "A Talk With Young Believers" will be helpful as many times the terms sin nature, old man, and flesh can be confusing. Yet, as it was mentioned in a previous post it would seem that these terms are one and the same.

"Before we speak of our present condition, we should first understand the kind of person we were before we believed in the Lord. After that, we will speak of our condition after we believed in the Lord. We know that we are persons made up of three parts—the spirit, the soul, and the body. The spirit is the organ with which we fellowship with God. Animals have no spirit. Hence, they can never worship God. The soul is the seat of our personality. Our will, mind, emotion, and sentiments are all functions of the soul. The body is our outward shell. Although man has become fallen, he still possesses these three parts. After man is regenerated, he still has the same three parts. When God created man, He created him with a self-consciousness; man was a living creature with consciousness. He had a spirit. Hence, he was different from other lower kinds of creatures. He had a soul. Hence, he was different from the angels of light, who are purely spirits. The center of man was his spirit; it controlled his whole being. It controlled his soul and his body. Man was living totally for God; the emotions of his soul and the demands of his body were all headed up by his spirit, and they were for glorifying God and worshipping God.

But alas, man fell! This fall did not annul any of the three elements in man. However, the order of these three elements has been upset. The condition in the garden of Eden shows us clearly that mankind rebelled against God; his love for God ceased, and he declared his independence from God. Genesis 3:6 says, "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise." In this way, man fell, and his spirit, soul, and body were all affected. The spirit became subject to the soul, and the soul was controlled by its many senses. The body developed many abnormal cravings and lusts, which enticed the soul. Originally the spirit took the lead. Now the body takes the lead to satisfy its lusts. In the Bible, this lust of the body is called the flesh. From this time on, man became flesh (Gen. 6:3). This flesh is now man's nature after he sinned; it is now his natural constitution. Our nature is the life principle or constitution that directs our whole being. Since the time of Adam, everyone born of woman bears this sinful nature; all of them are of the flesh. After understanding the origin of the flesh and how the flesh is just our sinful nature, we can now consider the character of this flesh. We cannot expect this flesh to improve. Human nature is hard to change. In fact, it will not change. The Lord Jesus said, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." We should focus on the word "is." That which is born of the flesh is flesh. No matter how much a person reforms, improves, and cultivates himself, the flesh is still the flesh. No matter how much a person tries to perform charitable, benevolent acts, send relief aid, love others, or serve, he is still the flesh. Even if he can do all these things, he is still the flesh. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." Since it is the flesh that is born, it will be the flesh that will result. No man on earth can change his flesh. Neither can God in heaven change man's flesh, that is, man's nature.

Since God saw that it was impossible to mend, improve, or change man's sinful nature, He brought in the present wonderful way of redemption. We know that the Lord Jesus died for us on the cross at Golgotha. We also know that when we believe in Him and receive Him as our Savior, we are saved. But why does God deliver us from death to life once we believe in His Son's name? If this believing does not involve an exchange in our life, which is different from a mere change, will not God be delivering a man who is still full of sin into heaven? There must surely be a profound message here.

After we have believed in the Lord Jesus, God does not leave us to walk according to the old sinful nature, that is, the flesh. He sentenced the Lord Jesus to death because He intended, on the one hand, that the Lord become sin for us, and on the other hand, that the old Adamic creation be crucified with Him, so that He could give us a new life. When we believed in the Lord Jesus as our Savior, God gave us this new life with its new nature. "Through these you might become partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption which is in the world by lust" (2 Pet. 1:4). At the time we believed, He dispensed into us His own life, the life of God, with the nature of God. This nature is entirely new; it is totally different from our old sinful nature. This nature does not come from an improvement of our old nature. This mysterious transaction took place at the instant we believed in the Lord Jesus as our Savior. This is regeneration, which is to be born from above and to receive God's life and nature. This regeneration is not something that man feels. Rather, it is the work of God's Holy Spirit in our spirit, recovering our spirit's lost position and installing God's life in our spirit. "The wind blows where it wills, and you hear the sound of it, but you do not know where it comes from and where it goes; so is everyone who is born of the Spirit" (John 3:8). All those who have genuinely believed in the Lord Jesus have the Holy Spirit working in them in this way. Those who believe only with their mouth or their head are not regenerated. All those who have believed with their heart are saved (Rom. 10:9) and are surely regenerated."

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 15:04

Hi Pilgrim, great topic!

Quote:
-----There is a lot of Christianese wording out there and it is better to stay with exactly what the Bible says and understand it from that perspective.

Yes, I agree. Additionally though, it is possible to understand how such a phrase arose, because Rom 6:6 clearly states that 'our old man' was 'crucified' with Christ. Christ died. In Him, WE may die. I dare say if I do not receive His death to myself, I am not 'in Him'.

You said of Adam

Quote:
-----But he did have flesh.

I put it to you that it may not have looked like ours, and before the Fall, may not have 'thought' like ours.

Here are some more points to consider:

Genesis 1:27
So God created man in his image, in the image of God created he him;

'... Adam, which was of God. (Luke 3, last verse.)

Genesis 2:15 And the LORD God took the man, and put him into the garden of Eden to dress it and to keep it... 17 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 thou shalt surely die.

Gen 3:23
Therefore the LORD God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.

Rom 5:14
death reigned from Adam to Moses,

Genesis 5:1
This the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him;

3 And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat in his own likeness, after his image;

Matthew 1:1

The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham.

Hebrews 2:10 For it became him, for whom all things, and by whom all things, in bringing many sons unto glory... 11 For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren,

2 Cor 5:17

Therefore if any man in Christ, a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, ALL things are become new.

Re: to Untobabes and Pilgrim's posts - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 15:23

But that begs the question, what are the lusts of the flesh? Or most importantly, what is "lust"?

Our modern conception of the word "lust" is that it must be evil. In James 1:14-15 the word occurs, but that same word in James is in Phillipians 1:23 that same word is translated "desire" as in Paul desiring to be with Christ, which cannot indeed be evil. It is also translated "desire" when Christ said He "desired" to take the Passover with the disciples. (I don't have a reference off the top of my head right now, forgive me) So the word "lust" or lusts are not necessarily or uncontrollably evil, it is when they are against the will of God that they are evil. For instance, when is hunger gluttony? When it goes beyond your needs and becomes simple desire of selfish pleasure in that food you are eating. When is wanting something evil? When you covet it, and obsess over it. The lusts of the flesh, are Biblically spoken of as evil, but where did they come from?

I would say, through much prayer and Bible study for a year on this subject alone, not from sinful nature. For I do not believe in the sinful nature. The lusts of the flesh can be simply understood, if you look deeply into the ways of the flesh and when the Bible speaks of them, they always refer to actions that the unregenerate indulge in and the child of God does not. For instance "There is now therefore no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. . . So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Please understand that what I mean is a Christian can sin after the sins of the flesh, but not as a lifestyle.) The lusts of the flesh, can be easily understood to be like cigarette and alcohol addictions. It is terrible and miserable the first time, but that which is awful soon becomes something that you desperately desire. The first sin that a person commits in full knowledge of what sin is, is an awful torture to their conscience, but as they go on it gets easier. . . and easier. . . and easier, until it is something they crave.

Another question, what is the old man?

I concur with your statement sir, on the remedy is to walk in the Spirit, but that is reference to true conversion. (Romans 6)

Romans 7 is a man who is under deep conviction of sin, a legalistic hypocrite who has found himself, in his self-righteous state, condemned under the law and a slave to his own sin. (hence his self-condemning language) But contrast that with the previous chapter, and we see two very different walks. (Please take note of that phrase "the law of sin" in 7, then read chapter 6-7:3 understand the death to sin in chapter 6 and re-examine the first three verses of chapter 7) Chapter 7 speaks of a man that is battling his old man, (Romans 7:19) But chapter 6 speaks of a man that has seen his old self crucified! (Romans 6:6-7) Logically speaking, when you fight a dead man, then you will win every time.

The sin nature:

I say this with compassion and love, but sinful nature is heresy. It was founded and propagated by the Roman Catholic Church and is one of their foundational dogmas. It was introduced to Protestantism by John Calvin who was a student of Augustine, a Catholic, and Calvin was also a Catholic before he left that denomination, but held on to that doctrine. Luther did the same thing, but he as well kept transubstantiation though retitled it. (See Luther's Catechism)

Now to say that sin is a nature is to say that it must be transmitted somehow. Sin cannot be physical, for that denies its very principle. Sin is a HEART problem (Matthew 15:16-20, James 1:14-16, Psalm 81:12, Romans 1:24) And if it were physical, then it could not break a spiritual law, (I John 3:4b) Romans 7:14) But sin is spiritual, in its nature and function. So if sin were to be placed anywhere as a nature, then it must be in the soul, which means that God would give it to you,

for God fashions you and places your soul in your body. (Psalm 119:73, Job 33:4, Zechariah 12:1, Malachi 2:10, Psalm 100:3)

Sorry to write a book about it, but I felt that God would have me post this. My prayer is that you will not simply reject it, but consider slowly these words.

For more reference on this subject, go to www.straightpaths biblechurch.com and click on the "Articles" find the list of them and scroll to the bottom. There are ten articles on sin nature there. Also, for a wonderful and explanatory exposition of Psalm 51:5 God to www.midway biblebaptistchurch.com and scroll to the bottom of the page where it says "topics of interest" and click on "Original sin" Best documentation on the subject though, would be a book "ARE MEN BORN SINNERS ?" By A. T. Overstreet. You can find it free online.

God bless you richly.

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/8 16:59

Pilgrim,

When you say that Adam had the flesh. Do you mean (hunk of meat), or the "invisible principle" that operates within our members. The word "flesh" in the Bible has two meanings.

The first meaning is not sinful, our Lord Jesus came in the flesh but He was sinless. The second meaning is sinful, invisible.

For example: my hand is made of flesh (hunk of meat). If the hand is operated by the invisible sin principle or the flesh in the negative sense, it will do the works of the flesh such as steal, hit, pull the trigger,...but if it is operated by the Spirit, it will help the needy, cook a meal to the hungry, write a kind note,...

It is the same hand or the same hunk of meat (flesh), but depending on the operating power be it the flesh (invisible sin principle) or the Spirit it will do the works of the flesh or the works of God.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 17:04

Madefree, thanks for your post. Several things to consider.

Alive-to-God, if we just go by what the Bible tells us, there is no reason to suspect that Adam did not have the same flesh we have.

My point is, flesh that is left alone, will not glorify God.

Madefree, coming from a strict Catholic background, I am well aware of their doctrine of original sin and the sin nature. That is why they baptize babies.

Yes, you are getting to my point of this whole thing.

"Now to say that sin is a nature is to say that it must be transmitted somehow. Sin cannot be physical, for that denies its very principle. "

We create our Christianese language and then have to make up doctrines to support the terms we create. Something the RCC does very, very well. Saying sin is a "nature" opens up all kinds of cans of worms. It works much easier for me when the scriptures just say flesh. I can relate to that, but sin nature is like some metaphysical substance that seems made up.

That's why I say, Adam and Eve had flesh like us but it had not been tested/tempted. Flesh when tempted will not live for God, for there is nothing good in our flesh. We need the Spirit of God. It is too easy to invent a ritual of child baptism to nullify a nature when what is needed is the Spirit of God. That is why most Catholics today are still depending on their rituals and see no need for the indwelling Holy Spirit.

We are to put to death the deeds of the flesh by the Spirit of God. God's Spirit does not make flesh better, it crucifies it.

Thank you for your willingness to jettison christianese and see what the Bible says. I am fleshing (excuse the pun) this out with you guys and appreciate your input. This rocks standard christian theology, I know, but so much of what we believe today, I seem to recognize comes from the RCC.

I was born asking why and I think the Lord wants us to. We do not have to be afraid of anything. All we have to lose are erroneous beliefs and maybe some idols. God's Word won't disappoint.

Blessings to you all

BTW, thanks for that book title. I will look into it.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 17:12

Only thing about the book, Pilgrim, is the man does not believe in eternal security. I am unaware of your view on that, but I do not endorse that view. Just a heads-up.

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2010/11/8 17:22

Therefore, just as sin came into the world through one man, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all sinned-- for sin indeed was in the world before the law was given, but sin is not counted where there is no law. Yet death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over those whose sinning was not like the transgression of Adam, who was a type of the one who was to come. But the free gift is not like the trespass. For if many died through one man's trespass, much more have the grace of God and the free gift by the grace of that one man Jesus Christ abounded for many. And the free gift is not like the result of that one man's sin. For the judgment following one trespass brought condemnation, but the free gift following many trespasses brought justification. For if, because of one man's trespass, death reigned through that one man, much more will those who receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man Jesus Christ. Therefore, as one trespass led to condemnation for all men, so one act of righteousness leads to justification and life for all men. For as by the one man's disobedience the many were made sinners, so by the one man's obedience the many will be made righteous. Now the law came in to increase the trespass, but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, so that, as sin reigned in death, grace also might reign through righteousness leading to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.
(Romans 5:12-21)

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 17:23

Well, we don't all believe in the same exact things, do we?

I believe in the "Security of the Believer".

I do not believe in the "Security of the Unbeliever".

I will leave it to you to define Believer and Unbeliever from your reading of God's Word.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/8 17:26

Quote:
-----"Now to say that sin is a nature is to say that it must be transmitted somehow. Sin cannot be physical, for that denies its very principle."

There is a mix up here between the word nature and the word Physical or natural.

Everything has a nature. There is the nature (character or attribute)of God, of love, of evil, of spirit, of faith,....or anything you can think of.

But not everything is natural, or physical

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 17:30

Pilgrim replied

Quote:
-----Alive-to-God, if we just go by what the Bible tells us, there is no reason to suspect that Adam did not have the same flesh we have.

Hi Pilgrim,

I agree it's a bit unquantifiable, what sinless flesh may have been like, but, I believe Adam and Eve had a glory, being as they were in God's image, which they lost when they fell. I don't mean they lost God's image. I mean they lost the glory that covered it - which is why they felt naked when it had gone after they sinned.

Romans 8:3

For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son IN THE LIKENESS OF SINFUL FLESH, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh:

Hebrews 2:14 Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same; that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; 15 And deliver them who through fear of death were all their lifetime subject to bondage.

16 For verily he took not on angels; but he took on the seed of Abraham. 17 Wherefore in all things it behoved him to be made like unto brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. 18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

God covered a lot of ground when Christ took on flesh that was like sinful flesh, able to be tempted, and yet did He not sin, and had no 'sin nature', since He was Divine.

Peter's words may have influenced the language we use to describe our natural state, when he said: Grace and peace be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises: that by these YE MIGHT BE PARTAKERS OF THE DIVINE NATURE, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. (2 Pet 1)

Re: UntoBabes - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 17:34

Yes indeed, I understand that. (Sorry if I was not clear upon that, my fault.) But to say that sin is a spiritually natural thing, is to say that God gave a sinful spirit. "Is Christ the minister of sin? God forbid!" I posted many Scripture references in my larger post toward the end I hope you will consider.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 17:36

Well, Pilgrim, it seems we hold a similar view upon that. I concur with what you just said. However I believe that the trick is not keeping salvation, it is getting it. I do believe in Perseverance of the Saints.

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 18:10

To UntoBabes, well spotted - the misunderstanding you have clearly elucidated. I enjoyed your 'hunk of meat' post. ;-)

To Madefree

Quote:
-----So if sin were to be placed anywhere as a nature, then it must be in the soul, which means that God would give it to you, for God fashions you and places your soul in your body.

There is no reason to assume that if sin is spiritual, it was God who 'placed it' in man.

God set out the conditions whereby man could live free from sin in the Garden of Eden, and Adam made a decision not to comply with God's command. As a result, Adam was no longer under God's blessing. By default, Adam came under the curse of death.

It is the spirit that gives life to the man. Logically then, the death which began to kill Adam because he had disobeyed God, was spiritual. If God had not put a stay on its effects, by commanding that men could live to 120 years old, some thousands of years ago, the human race would have died out by now. We are on borrowed time.

The spirit which God had breathed into Adam's body had given him and his flesh life, thus creating a soul. When the Holy Spirit comes to dwell in a man, He dwells with the man's spirit. The man's practical fellowship with, and obedience to that Spirit, affect everything about how he feels, how his flesh feels (mind thinks), and whether his soul is being purified by the choices he makes, or not.

1 Peter 1:22 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently: 23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.

1 John 3:3 And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure.

Romans 8:13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

2 Cor 4:11

For we which live are always delivered unto death for Jesus' sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh.

Put simply, I believe the living soul is the invisible sum of the person. Although God can divide between soul and spirit with His word, He intends man to be totally unified within himself and, in fellowship with Himself. Believers' souls will be clothed with an immortal body in the resurrection.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 18:22

Yes, sin is not placed there by God. Every human being's choice to sin and disobey God is what puts it there. The sinful habit is developed by sinning, not sinful habit develops sinning. God put the spirit there, the Bible clearly teaches that. I may be misunderstanding you, but God can indeed as you said divide between soul and spirit, but in the beginning of our existence there is no reason for them to be divided, they are both pure, for they are given of God. But this begs a question of its own: if sin is there when you are born, how did it get there? It cannot be from Adam, for that would mean we are condemned for another's sin (Due 24:16 Ezekiel 18:4, 20) God does not violate His own Laws.

Re: The "Sin Nature" - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 18:28

Quote:

-----1. Where is the Sin Nature mentioned in the Bible? I see the Flesh mentioned in Romans, but not the Sin Nature.

Good question and discussion. Romans 8:3 says, "For what the Law could not do, weak as it was through the flesh, God did: sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and as an offering for sin, He condemned sin in the flesh"

That passage tells us that man is made up of "sinful flesh" which Christ was not made up of, only in that "likeness". So even though it doesn't say "sinful nature" it seems to convey a similar idea.

This is one topic that has caused Charles Finney to be a controversial figure among Christians. I mention him because I lean toward his view on this topic. Finney rejected the idea that sin can be a nature. He pointed to Scriptures like 1John 3:4 which clearly state that sin is transgression of the Law, not a nature.

However he did affirm that man is born with a "corrupted" nature that causes him to be tempted to sin. To him this was the fleshly nature which the Bible speaks of. This "corrupted, twisted, or warped" nature causes man to have appetites above what is proper.

When Adam was first created, his appetites or desires for food, comfort, sex, etc were normal or acceptable in proportion. But once he sinned against God, his appetites or desires became twisted and corrupted in such a way that they were now above what is normal or acceptable. For example, instead of having an appetite for enough food to eat, he now had an appetite for more than enough food (tempting him to be greedy and gluttonous). The same applied with all other areas of "bodily" desires. His fleshly, or bodily appetites were now expanded or above proper proportion, causing him to be tempted to commit sin in all areas. But that "appetite" along with the "temptation" did not constitute sin. It is only when one yields to those appetites and temptations that one sins. And this "yielding" or "sinning" begins in the mind.

So even though Finney and others do not call it a "sinful nature" they still believe in the same idea of natural corruption inherited from Adam.

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 19:17

Madefree states

Quote:

-----It cannot be from Adam, for that would mean we are condemned for another's sin (Due 24:16 Ezekiel 18:4, 20) God does not violate His own Laws.

This difference between scripture and man's opinion has been discussed many times here. The point is, whatever happened to Adam, every member of the human race still in his loins, was affected by it. As far as God is concerned, we 'die d'. This is stated clearly in the New Testament by Paul in particular, at least twice.

Under the loving provocation of the word of God, we have to come to terms with the fact that no man, apart from Christ, has ever NOT sinned. Children before the age of 1 are capable of disobedience, as every parent knows. They are not usually copying the adults when this becomes apparent. They just know how to be unco-operative, selfish, non-compliant and so on. You are implying they make a conscious choice to behave like this?

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/8 19:21

Quote:
----- Finney rejected the idea that sin can be a nature. He pointed to Scriptures like 1John 3:4 which clearly state that sin is transgression of the Law, not a nature.

Oracio,

Could you please explain further what you meant by Finney rejecting that idea that sin can be a nature.

Do you mean to say that Finney believed that "we are sinners because we sin" instead of "we sin because we are sinners"?

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/8 19:29

Madefree, you write

"But this begs a question of it's own: if sin is there when you are born, how did it get there? It cannot be from Adam, for that would mean we are condemned for another's sin"

Yet paul teaches in Romans that both sin and death do come from Adam:

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

And Judgement as well:

Therefore as by the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one (Christ) 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. Romans 5:18-19 (KJV)

And then the remedy: not to struggle against sin, not to resist it. not praying and fasting for deliverance, but in simple faith yield yourselves to God.

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. For he that is dead is freed from sin. Now if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him: KNOWING that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once: but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God. Likewise RECKON ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord. Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof. Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin: but YIELD yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God. For sin shall NOT have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under GRACE Romans 6:6-14 (KJV)

David

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2010/11/8 19:57

Davidc,
Amen.

We have only two options:

- 1) Either we are slaves to sin, or;
- 2) We are slaves to righteousness in Christ Jesus.

As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins, in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient. All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our flesh and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature deserving of wrath. But because of his great love for us, God, who is rich in mercy, made us alive with Christ even when we were dead in transgressions—it is by grace you have been saved. And God raised us up with Christ and seated us with him in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus, in order that in the coming ages he might show the incomparable riches of his grace, expressed in his kindness to us in Christ Jesus. For it is by grace you have been saved, through faith—and this is not from yourselves, it is the gift of God (Ephesians 2:1-8)

When you study a passage like Romans 5:12-18, you realize that in the same way that condemnation and death were brought upon us because of the first Adam, justification and life are brought upon us because of the second Adam, Jesus Christ.

Because of Adam, death and condemnation came upon this cursed world. But thanks be to God, who did not leave us to perish. For when the times came to fulfillment, He sent forth His one and only Son, so that the curse might be removed and that a righteousness from above might be revealed. We who once were dead, slaves to sin and condemned already, when the grace of God appeared, we were raised up to life and seated in the heavenly realms in Christ Jesus.

Praise be to His holy Name! God, the great and mighty Savior! His loving kindness is the only hope. We who were helpless, completely and radically helpless; we were rescued from the pit of destruction by the One who works all things according to the counsel of his will (Ephesians 1:11).

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/8 20:49

Romans 7:14+ is about a convicted hypocrite.

Romans 5:12 says death (condemnation) passed to men because they sinned.

"sinful flesh" just means sinful humanity, not our literal flesh. Jesus was in the likeness of sinful humanity.

The "old man" is a former way of life.

"The flesh" is the figurative flesh of that "old man".

Adam was just as capable of obedience after he sinned as he was before he sinned. Cain was also capable of obedience.

Sin is avoidable, not inevitable.

The word "Nature" can sometimes mean "character" (good-natured) and sometimes "make-up" or "constitution". One is a choice, the other is not. This creates confusion.

A sinful character is possible (choice).

A sinful constitution/makeup is not possible (not a choice).

God's law commands us to use all the ability we currently have (heart, soul, mind, strength).

God's law does not command us to use more ability than we have.

Toddlers disobey because God made them that way. It is not sin for them, just immaturity.

Justin Martyr, Pelagius, Finney, Winkie Pratney, Overstreet, and others are correct that sin is a choice and avoidable.

Augustine, Calvin, etc are incorrect to deny freewill and attribute our sin to Adam.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 21:02

Jesus had the same nature as us but did not make the same sinful choices as us:

"we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin." (Heb 4:15)

"he had to be made like his brothers in every respect, so that he might become a merciful and faithful high priest in the service of God, to make propitiation for the sins of the people." (Heb 2:17)

"because he himself has suffered when tempted, he is able to help those who are being tempted." (Heb 2:18)

Re: The "Sin Nature" - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/8 21:11

Just logged on and saw this topic. Not to ignore any ongoing posts (I read through most of them), but I would like to address the original question.

I think the closest thing to a "sin nature" that is mentioned in scripture is in Eph. 2:3 saying that we were by nature the children of wrath. The problem is that this term does not speak of a "thing" called a "nature". It literally means that we were "naturally the children of wrath" which means that our natural state due to being in sin was that we were subject to the wrath of God. So it has nothing to do with having a thing called a nature.

The next closest thing would be the NIV rendering of flesh (sarx) in Romans 7. Romans 7:18 is rendered as "in my sinful nature", but I think this is a perversion of scripture by translators with an a priori commitment to the idea that man has a sinful nature. The word is flesh (sarx). It occurs 150 times in the NT and is always translated "flesh" with the exception of three occurrences of "carnal" which just means "of the meat or of the flesh" like when you order chili con carne at a Mexican restaurant.

Romans 7 does not describe duality of nature and the battle between the two in the heart of a Christian. Placing it in context of Paul's teaching on Romans will show that Paul is describing the futility of trying to please God by keeping the law. The wretchedness of this futile effort is remedied in chapter 8 when Paul tells us the Jesus Christ sets us free from this bondage.

We do not struggle with two natures. We simply struggle with the flesh. Our body and our minds are not born again, our spirit is. So we can still be tempted through our flesh and our minds. Victory comes as we reckon ourselves dead indeed to sin and alive unto God. It comes as we awake to righteousness and sin not. There is not a white dog and a black dog living in me. This concept is nowhere found in scripture. It is only found in a misinterpretation of Romans 7. I have been regenerated and am now the temple of the Holy Spirit. I can walk in the spirit or in the flesh. I am servant to what I yield myself to obey.

Just my take.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/8 21:15

I don't think Finney was coming against the idea of original sin. He was not saying man was not born into sin. He was saying that man does not have a "sin nature". Original sin was strongly taught by Finney, but the idea that original sin was due to a sin nature would make this original sin simply calamity for which the sinner could not be blamed any more than a human could be blamed for being a human.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/8 21:20

Naatmi, you say

"sinful flesh" just means sinful humanity, not our literal flesh. Jesus was in the likeness of sinful humanity."

But Jesus was without sin, and the only man who was without sin.

And on the cross, God did something with His son. He made Him to be SIN. This is much more than His atoning work for our SINS through the shedding of His precious blood. God made Him sin, and put him to death.

Why?

It was for us, so that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him. In Him, we are made new creatures with a nature of the righteousness of God. Yes, we are made righteous through the cleansing of His blood, and this relates to our sins. But by faith in Him, our very nature is changed from sin to the righteousness of God Himself.

David

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 21:21

Quote:

-----Could you please explain further what you meant by Finney rejecting that idea that sin can be a nature.

Quote:

-----Do you mean to say that Finney believed that "we are sinners because we sin" instead of "we sin because we are sinners"?

Exactly, but he did not deny the fact that we are born with a "corrupt" nature which we inherited from Adam. He just did not call it a "sin nature" because it is unbiblical and it can easily lead sinners to justify themselves for their sins and blame God.

Romans 5:12 makes it very clear that when Adam sinned we all sinned in him and because of that we are guilty and condemned already because we sinned in Adam. Because of that guilt we inherit a corrupt nature and a perishable body as well. If we were not guilty of Adam's sin we would not even be born with perishable bodies or deformities.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/11/8 21:23

Whom did Jesus say is our father before we are born from above?

"You are of your father the devil".

When Christ is birthed in the believer, the believer receives a new Father, "Our Father".

Satan is and was and always will be the sin nature that entered into the world. If Satan is our father before new birth, no one can escape the sin nature, until God puts His incorruptable Seed Jesus Christ in the Believer, then Satan no longer rules with a rod of sin, but we are by Grace through Faith saved from sin and the old has now become new. We now are no longer serving sin but serving righteousness and Light and Love in Christ, by the Christ that is in us. Sin Nature of Satan out and righteousness by justification and regeneration of Christ born again in the believer. We either have the nature of Satan or we have the Nature of, "God our Father".

Man does not have the ability to defeat sin, for Satan nature is stronger than man. Only by the Birthing do we have the ability to defeat sin, by the Christ that is in us, who is our new nature in whom we live and move and have our being.

The only free will we have is to believe a lie, or believe the truth by Grace through faith, becoming the son's of whom we believe, Satan or Jesus Christ, whom we believe by the faith of the Son of God that is given to us in rebirth, Satan out, Christ in, Christ is now whom we believe, the truth unto salvation, by Grace through the Faith of the Son of God given to every believer.

Galatians 2:16-21 Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid. For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

His Faith: Ephesians 2:1-10 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. But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, Even when we were dead in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ, (by grace ye are saved;) And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus: That in the ages to come he might shew the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us through Christ Jesus. For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: Not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.

No longer walking in accordance with the prince of the power of the air, SATAN. Now walking in the life of Christ that is in me. For "it is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me". IN CHRIST: Phillip

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2010/11/8 21:33

I believe it was David who said, In sin did my mother conceive me.

It is interesting to note in Rom. 5-8 when it says "sin" that in the greek it includes the article "the" that many believe refers to a nature of sin in contrast to acts of sin. Man became depraved because they were deprived of the presence of God by their rebellion.

We are not responsible for the sin nature being there, but we are responsible for it remaining and controlling us. We have no excuse.

People have tried spiritual utopia's to find that sin always found its way in. Why? Because man is sinful from the inside out. Jesus said it is from the heart that all sin comes from.

Evidence of depravity is seen in babies before they even have the capacity to sin.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 21:46

JB1968, I forgot about the term "depraved" nature. Glad you brought it up. We are indeed depraved before we are born again by the Spirit. Man is not basically good or morally neutral. That is heresy and humanism. The Bible makes it abundantly clear that without regeneration man cannot obey or please God(Rom.8:7-8).

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 21:54

twayneb,

I agree with you on Eph 2:3 and the NIV.

I have some slightly different thoughts on Roman 7, but maybe compatible with what you think.

Quote:

-----Romans 7 does not describe duality of nature and the battle between the two in the heart of a Christian.

I believe Paul personified sin in Romans 7 in order to show that our own sin is the bad guy, not the law. He called sin "another law" to contrast it with God's law, but this other law (sin/selfishness/carnality) was self-imposed. He was showing how a person victimizes themselves by their own sin. It's their own choice (carnality, selling themselves to sin) that makes them a wretched victim - not God's fair, just, obeyable law.

Quote:
-----Placing it in context of Paul's teaching on Romans will show that Paul is describing the futility of trying to please God by keeping the law.

Keeping God's law is good and possible. But a selfish person, who submits their mind to their flesh (carnal-minded), can not obey God's law because it commands a spirit of love. A selfish person (carnal) has sold themselves to sin and made themselves like an unspiritual beast. Since the law is spiritual, a selfish person cannot obey it, even though they naturally agree with it and delight in it according to the inner man. Unless they obey it in spirit and not just outwardly, it will only condemn them for their inner sins (covetousness etc).

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 22:11

Quote:
-----I don't think Finney was coming against the idea of original sin. ... Original sin was strongly taught by Finney ...

Have you read Finney's Systematic Theology?

"They call it original sin, indwelling sin, a sinful nature, an appetite for sin, an attribute of human nature, and the like." ~ (Systematic Theology, Lecture 39, Moral Depravity)

"The doctrine of original sin, or of a sinful constitution, and of necessary sinful actions, represents the whole moral government of God, the plan of salvation by Christ, and indeed every doctrine of the gospel, as a mere farce. Upon this supposition the law is tyranny, and the gospel an insult to the unfortunate." ~ (Systematic Theology, Lecture 40, Moral Depravity)

"This doctrine represents sin as being of two kinds: original or constitutional, and actual--sin of substance, and sin of action; whereas neither the Bible, nor common sense acknowledges more than one kind of sin, and that consists in disobedience to the law." ~ (Systematic Theology, Lecture 40, Moral Depravity)

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 22:20

@davidc

Sin is a choice (intention, goal, etc).

Jesus being without sin means that Jesus did not choose sin.

Since sin is a choice, Jesus was not literally "made sin". It is a figurative phrase. Jesus didn't turn into a choice. It represents the fact that Jesus suffered for our sins when we are the one's who deserve to suffer for them. He offered up his life on account of our sins in order to justify pardon being granted to those who repent.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 22:26

I have read Finney's Systematic Theology and he affirms that the human soul is depraved or corrupted. But he defined the issue in different terms than Calvinists, so as not to give sinners any excuses whatsoever for their sins. He affirmed that there is something in all of us that causes us to be tempted to sin. So therein lies the difference. For Finney, the depraved nature caused temptation, not sin. For Calvinists, the depraved nature causes sin, not just temptation.

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2010/11/8 22:34

Let God be true, though every man is a liar.

Whether you are a Jew or a Gentile, you are absolutely worthless, sinful, rebellious, and condemned apart from Christ.

What then? Are we Jews any better off? No, not at all. For we have already charged that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin, as it is written: "None is righteous, no, not one; no one understands; no one seeks for God. All have turned aside; together they have become worthless; no one does good, not even one." "Their throat is an open grave; they use their tongues to deceive." "The venom of asps is under their lips." "Their mouth is full of curses and bitterness." "Their feet are swift to shed blood; in their paths are ruin and misery, and the way of peace they have not known." "There is no fear of God before their eyes."

(Romans 3:9-18)

Therefore, if you think you will be justified before God by "doing the right thing", I've got bad news for you: You can't do anything truly good, unless you are quickened by the Spirit of God and raised to life!

And you were dead in the trespasses and sins in which you once walked, following the course of this world, following the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience-- among whom we all once lived in the passions of our flesh, carrying out the desires of the body and the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, like the rest of mankind. But God, being rich in mercy, because of the great love with which he loved us, even when we were dead in our trespasses, made us alive together with Christ--by grace you have been saved-- (Ephesians 2:1-5)

You have two options:

- 1) Slave to sin, or;
- 2) Slave of righteousness in Christ.

Do you not know that if you present yourselves to anyone as obedient slaves, you are slaves of the one whom you obey, either of sin, which leads to death, or of obedience, which leads to righteousness? But thanks be to God, that you who were once slaves of sin have become obedient from the heart to the standard of teaching to which you were committed, and, having been set free from sin, have become slaves of righteousness. (Romans 6:16-18)

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 22:40

Romans 5:12 says nothing about sinning "in" anyone. That is not even possible. The idea comes from the mistranslated Vulgate which Augustine used to justify the inherited sin nature idea.

Romans 5:12 say that all men were condemned for their own sins just like Adam was condemned for his own sin. "because all sinned"

Charles Finney rejected the false doctrine of Imputed Guilt as well as Original Sin.

"President Edwards relates of a young woman in his congregation, that she was deeply convicted of being guilty for Adam's first sin, and deeply repented of it. Now suppose that this and like cases should be regarded as conclusive proof that men are guilty of that sin, and deserve the wrath and curse of God for ever for that sin; and that all men will suffer the pains of hell for ever, except they become convinced of their personal guilt for that sin, and repent of it as in dust and ashes! President Edwards's teaching on the subject of the relation of all men to Adam's first sin, it is well known, was calculated in a high degree to pervert the judgment upon that subject; and this sufficiently accounts for the fact above alluded to. But apart from education, no human being ever held himself responsible for, or guilty of, the first or any other sin of Adam, or of any other being, who existed and died before he himself existed. The reason is that all moral agents naturally know, that inability or a proper impossibility is a bar to moral obligation and responsibility; and they never conceive to the contrary, unless biassed by a mystifying education that casts a fog over their primitive and constitutional convictions." ~ (Charles Finney, Systematic Theology, Lecture 52, The Notion of Inability)

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 22:43

Quote:

-----For Finney, the depraved nature caused temptation, not sin. For calvinists, the depraved nature causes sin, not just temptation.

That sounds accurate.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 22:43

Amen Renoncer.

"The heart is more deceitful than all else and is desperately sick; Who can understand it?"(Jeremiah 17:9)

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 22:46

@JB1968

Quote:

-----I believe it was David who said, In sin did my mother conceive me.

This is hyperbole/poetic, not literal.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 23:02

Quote:

-----Romans 5:12 says nothing about sinning "in" anyone. That is not even possible. The idea comes from the mistranslated Vulgate which Augustine used to justify the inherited sin nature idea.

"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."

"Because all sinned" is in reference to the reason why death spread to all men. We all know that death is a curse from the fall of Adam. We all know that the curse of "death" is something we are BORN with. Paul is saying that death came to Adam's children(all men), because all sinned. How else can that be interpreted other than saying that when Adam sinned all sinned in him. In other words, Adam represented the human race. God knew the whole human race before he created it, and He knew the choice we would make before we made it. He knew that we would make the same choice Adam made if we were in his shoes. So instead of bringing death to each person when they actually committed the first sin, he allowed Adam's sin to be our sin because we also "made" that choice(in eternity in God's sight). We have to remember that God dwells in eternity not time.

That is also why God can predestine some to eternal life, because He knows every choice we make before we make it.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 23:09

It seems to me that Romans 5:15-21 makes it abundantly clear that through Adam's sin we were all made guilty and became condemned before God:

15But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many.

16The gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification.

17For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ.

18So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men.

19For 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.

20 The Law came in so that the transgression would increase; but where sin increased, grace abounded all the more, 21so that, as sin reigned in death, even so grace would reign through righteousness to eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 23:35

@Oracio

Adam was created mortal. Adam died because he did not have access to the tree of life.

Mortality is not a curse. Jesus became a mortal man just like we are mortal. Jesus did not have access to the tree of life just we don't have access. Just as Jesus was not being punished for his ancestor's sin, neither are we. Just as it was not a punishment for Jesus to be mortal, neither is our mortality a punishment.

If physical mortality was the punishment for our sin then Christians would not die because Jesus saved us from the punishment for our sins.

Quote:

-----How else can that be interpreted other than saying that when Adam sinned all sinned in him.

Like this: Just as Adam sinned and was condemned as a result of his own sin, likewise all men were condemned as a result of their own sins.

Children do not inherit the guilt or sin of the parent: Deuteronomy 24:16, 2 Kings 14:6, 2 Chronicles 25:4, Ezekiel 18:2-4, Ezekiel 18:19-20

Quote:

-----God knew the whole human race before he created it, and He knew the choice we would make before we made it. He knew that we would make the same choice Adam made if we were in his shoes. So instead of bringing death to each person when they actually committed the first sin, he allowed Adam's sin to be our sin because we also "made" that choice that(in eternity in God's sight). We have to remember that God dwells in eternity not time.

That is also why God can predestine some to eternal life, because He knows every choice we make before we make it.

There's no such thing as "in" or "outside" of time. Time is the uncreated sequential nature of God himself. Since God is enduring, temporal, living, active - therefore in him we live and move.

The past and future do not exist like in movies. Only this reality exists, which we call the present.

The Bible shows God getting information in ordinary ways: asking questions (where are you, who told you you were naked, did you eat it, etc), traveling places to see what is happening (sodom and gomorah), and testing people to see if they are trustworthy:

Deu 8:2 ..the LORD thy God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble thee, and to prove thee, TO KNOW what was in thine heart, WHETHER thou wouldest keep his commandments, OR NO.

Deu 13:3 ..the LORD your God proveth you, TO KNOW whether ye love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul.

2Chr 32:31 ..God left him, to try him, THAT HE MIGHT KNOW all that was in his heart.

Ge 22:12 ..NOW I KNOW that thou fearest God, SEEING thou hast not withheld thy son, thine only son from me.

God values genuine relationship with his creation more than a predictable universe. That is why he created us intelligent, rational, and free - so we could be "holy and blameless before him in love" (Eph 1:4). If God was interested in a completely predictable universe then he could have made one but there couldn't be any genuine love in it that way.

Predestination is corporate, not individual. The church (Jew/Gentile/International) was predestined corporately. Who becomes a member is a matter of personal choice.

The unphilosophical and unbiblical "outside of time" idea of a foreknown or settled future (fate) goes hand in hand with inherited sinfulness back through Calvin all the way to Augustine and right into gnosticism.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 23:47

Quote:
-----It seems to me that Romans 5:15-21 makes it abundantly clear that through Adam's sin we were all made guilty and became condemned before God

The causative effect of Adam's sin is defined as being figurative of following Adam's example (being condemned for their own sins). Passages which occur after the defining passage (v12) should be interpreted consistently with this.

I have various non-Augustinian commentaries on this passage if you are interested.

I'd say this is Paul's most misinterpreted passage.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/8 23:52

naatmi, it seems you believe in open theism. we will have to agree to disagree on that one. there is no way I can believe that doctrine because there are numerous Scriptures that declare the omniscience of God. But that's a whole other topic. Maybe you can start one on that topic. Just a suggestion.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 23:53

That magical verse has been brought up. Here's a good summary of it: (not written by me)

"Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. - Psalms 51:5

Just yank this verse out of context and it looks like the issue is settled doesn't it? However, that violates every rule of interpretation by anyone's standards, and so anyone who is going to be honest is going to have to look a little closer. There are several ways to look at this, unless you have your mind already made up and don't intend to change it.

First of all, this is David's prayer of deep and thorough repentance. He sees himself as very low in the light of God's holiness. He has sinned against God and his guilt is great. He is humbling himself before God, as we all have to do. He is saying that he is just unworthy of anything from God. His best has not been anything to compare with God's holiness, and the best he has ever done now looks very worthless in view of his sin. His sin is all that is before him now and it is the great obstacle between him and God.

This is figurative language and that cannot be denied. If we take this statement and make a literal application with it, then we must also take verse 7 and apply it literally.

Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. -Psalm 51:7

But we know that hyssop will not cleanse us from our sins - it is figurative language. The idea is that David wants to be clean from his sin. He is begging God for deliverance and forgiveness and holding forth nothing of his own merit, but putting himself as low as he possibly can. He is saying, "I've never done anything worthy of your mercy, but I'm asking anyway."

Again in verse 8 we see figurative language used:

Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice. - Psalm 51:8

God did not literally break his bones, and bones do not rejoice. It is figurative language and in the same context as verse 5. Again it is speaking of David's low estate because of his sin and his desire to have his innermost heart pure and right with God.

Another way of looking at this to realize that he said "I was shapen IN iniquity, and IN sin did my mother conceive me..." Sin entered the world through Adam. David was born IN this world. His mother conceived him IN a sinful world and he was shapen as he grew IN the midst of a world full of iniquity. This is the way that Jewish writers of old interpreted this verse. We are all in the same boat. We were born into a world full of sin and we have been exposed to it from the day we entered the world. How can anyone imagine that it would not be a factor in our "going astray" or "becoming filthy?"

Some have put forth the idea that David was saying he was conceived when his mother committed fornication. I completely disagree with that idea. I see no evidence to even justify thinking such a thing. In my opinion it is far from a satisfying explanation for this verse.

We can also start dissecting the words in this verse and see much more than the "obvious" meaning that has filled so many textbooks and doctrinal books. "Shapen" means to "writhe or twist in pain." He says he was "shapen in iniquity." It is connected to the later part of the verse, which says, "and in sin did my mother conceive me." The word "sin" there means "a crime or its penalty." Take a look at Genesis 3:16: Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee. - Gen. 3:16 Part of the result of sin entering the world through Adam and Eve is that childbirth is painful. David is saying that he entered the world in the midst of writhing and pain and it was because of the fact that sin had entered the world long ago. We surely see the effects and results of sin everywhere, but that doesn't mean that it is physically transmitted from generation to generation. It is a moral problem - not a physical problem. Sin has definitely affected the entire creation, but INFLUENCE is the way sin is spread - it hasn't done so by physically transmitting itself from one being to another.

Of course, Augustine, the father of this doctrine of devils, believed this verse to say that the union of David's parents in which he was conceived was sinful in itself. Augustine believed that intimacy between a man and woman was sinful because it involved lust. The fact that they were married made no difference, as far as he was concerned. He believed that sin was transmitted to the child because of the lust that was involved in the intimacy between husband and wife. Never mind that it is a natural desire given by God and also blessed by God inside a marriage relationship.

Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled: but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge. - Heb. 13:4

Of course, when you look at a verse with your mind already made up you just don't think about all those other verses that contradict your private interpretation.

So you see that there are other interpretations for Psalm 51:5, and they also fit much better with the rest of the Bible and its teaching on sin."

- Taken from "Are We Born Sinners" series of articles.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/8 23:56

Here's another from the same article on that recurring passage:

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

In the first place, if we are going to be consistent then we must say that if Adam MADE ALL men sinners then Jesus MADE ALL men righteous. You cannot change your interpretation between two identical phrases in the same verse. The Universalists use the doctrine of original sin to prove that all men are going to heaven. If you believe in original sin then you have no grounds on which to argue with them - they win the debate. The word used here is not ALL, but MANY. This verse is speaking of the INFLUENCE of Adam - not what he physically passed to his descendants. We are not trying to lessen the significance of Adam's sin because it surely did bring sin into the world. It was the beginning of every heartache and misery that has been experienced by men since that day, not to mention all the death. However, the doctrine of original sin is a terrible distortion and misrepresentation of what really happened.

For example, we could say that Hugh Hefner of Playboy magazine has made many men immoral, adulterers, and perverts. That is certainly true, but we don't think of the sins of Hugh Hefner being imputed to others! That would be a ridiculous twist of reason! We could say that all the devil-possessed rock musicians of our day have ruined multitudes of people with their music and their message of drugs and rebellion. That would be true, but we would not think of them being ruined in the sense that the rock singers' sins were imputed to them by some physical means. Again, we might see a family where the father was a drunkard and all his sons were drunkards, too. We would say that father made drunkards out of his boys with his drinking, and that would be true. But you would never think that the father somehow passed that to his children physically. We understand that it was his INFLUENCE that caused his boys to be drunkards also. We have sense enough to understand these things correctly but when it comes to the Word of God we put a twist on it that doesn't fit with reason, or with the rest of the Scripture.

Along that same line of reasoning, we all have known wicked fathers who had sons who were righteous. The Bible is also

o full of examples like that. Likewise, we have seen righteous men who have had wicked sons. It is the INFLUENCE - NOT THE GENES! It is whether or not they submit their heart to God and his law or rebel against it. EVERY person must choose for themselves - and they DO!"

Again, not written by me. But that is what I believe about it.

Re: , on: 2010/11/8 23:57

Sorry guys, just getting back online to SI. I have been researching around the web for info on "sin nature". By the way, great questions and answers that you have. I am glad we are researching this.

While googling, I came upon some other brethren that are engaged in a similar discussion. I found many discussions like this, but this particular one was fascinating.

The author of this thread likens "sin nature" to "phlogiston". What??? Haha, that's what I said. But have a read.

Here is the text and to follow the conversation, the link is at the bottom. Very, very interesting.

Sin Nature - the phlogiston of Christian Theology?

Scientists once thought there was a physical substance called phlogiston that was released when things burned. It was interesting stuff because it had no color, odor, taste, or weight. In other words, it was undetectable. They speculated that the ash was the essence of wood after the phlogiston escaped. Then they discovered that combustion is a chemical process, and discarded the false notion of phlogiston as not corresponding to anything in the real world.

Likewise, scientists once thought there was a physical substance called the ether that was required to carry light waves. They could not conceive how light could travel through a vacuum. They thought that all waves, like sound waves in the air or waves in the water, needed a medium to undulate. The Michelson-Morley experiment showed that it, like the phlogiston before it, was undetectable. Apparently, scientists had had enough with "undetectable substances", and so they discarded the false notion of the ether too.

In both of these cases, science advanced by recognizing that the physical substances postulated in their theories did not correspond to anything in the real world. Attempts to formulate theories based on such false notions of reality were doomed to failure.

The same is true for the Christian understanding of the world that God created.

I think the idea of the "sin nature" is the theological equivalent of phlogiston and ether.

It does not correspond to anything in the real world addressed in Scripture.

It seems that theologians have confused the very real and biblical teaching about the flesh with a theological construct called the "sin nature." Most of them speak as if it is some sort of physical contagion transmitted to the next generation only by the father, an idea they use to "explain" why Christ had to be born of a virgin.

Clarification of this issue brings a lot of light to our study of the Bible. For example, most people have been taught that we sin "because we have a sin nature." But that immediately raises the question of why Adam and Eve sinned, since they were created without a "sin nature." Once the "sin nature" is exposed as a false notion, we can easily see the elegant solution to this ancient conundrum. Adam and Eve were created as fleshly creatures, just like you and me. And what does the flesh do when it is not subject to the guidance of God's Spirit?

IT SINS.

It can't help it. How could it? It doesn't know what the mind of the Spirit is! How can it know the will of God? All it knows is its own desires and lusts. The flesh by itself can not please God. It is like a horse without a rider, run wild.

But remember, the flesh is not sinful by nature. True, it is very weak, and prone to sin, but we know it can not be intrinsically sinful because the Word (Christ) became flesh and dwelt amongst us, yet without sin. And again, we have proof from Genesis that the flesh is not intrinsically sinful. Adam and Eve were created as fleshly creatures, but had no sin until they disobeyed God.

So how did Adam and Eve sin without having a sin nature?

Simple! They were fleshly creatures, and the story makes it abundantly clear they were not in conscious communion with God when they sinned! And so, they acted as fleshly creatures not guided by God, and sinned. (Note how this relates to the challenges of our daily walk!) This is further confirmed by the description of what led up to their sin:

Genesis 3:6 And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat

Sounds like a very fleshly temptation! Compare this with the classic sin passage:

1 John 2:16 For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life (make one wise?), is not of the Father, but is of the world.

So there it is. That's the basic idea I was hoping to share in this post. I think it leads to a magnificent harmony between Scripture and Reality that actually makes sense. And it is extremely satisfying to have a full understanding of Scripture without a mystical undetectable substance that has no "color, odor, taste, or weight."

There is much more to say on this matter, but I will wait for a response to what has been written. I am curious if these ideas make sense to other folks, and if not, why not.

I look forward to your comments.

RAM

<http://biblewheel.com/Forum/showthread.php?s=12aa51721118e5d34c1d87728b971afd&t=13>

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/9 0:05

Quote:
-----Just as Adam sinned and was condemned as a result of his own sin, likewise all men were condemned as a result of their own sins.

"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." (Rom.5:19)

I don't see how we can get away from the clear, plain reading and meaning of that verse. It clearly states that through Adam's sin we were all made guilty sinners.

I understand your point about man being accountable for his own sin and not his parents sin, and I agree. That is why I cannot see any other way of reconciling that truth with the Romans 5 passages other than the way I explained it.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 1:05

@Oracio,

The causative effect of Adam ("made sinners") makes sense if understood as a pattern/example/influence of sin initiated by Adam, rather than strict deterministic causation (involuntary).

Likewise the causative effect of Christ ("made righteous") makes sense if understood as a pattern/example/influence of righteousness initiated by Jesus, rather than strict deterministic causation (involuntary).

Romans 5:19

The way Adam's selfishness figuratively made men sinners (by following his example v12) is the same way Jesus' righteous love will make men saints (by following his example).

I don't think there is anything in that passage to suggest foreknowledge is the key to interpret it. Though I understand how it would make the phrase "made sinners" seem less confusing.

Here is a look at verse twelve which establishes a non-foreknowledge way to interpret Rom 5:19.

Quote:
-----I don't think sin and death actually 'move' in a locational sense. Therefore when it says death entered the world and spread all over, it is not as if a moving object called death actually traveled from outer-space into the world (entered the world) - and it is not as if, in a literal sense, an object moved all over the globe (passed upon all men). Rather, I take this language to represent the pattern, example, and influence of sin which result ed in a pattern of condemnation.

The Pattern/Example/Influence of Sin:

1) This pattern/example/influence was initiated by Adam.
As it is written, "sin came into the world through one man"

2) This pattern/example/influence was repeated, followed, and perpetuated by everyone else.
As it is written, "all sinned"

The Resulting Pattern of Death:

1) The result of Adam initiating the pattern/example/influence of sin was his own condemnation.
As it is written, "and death through sin"

2) The result of everyone repeating/following/perpetuating the pattern/example/influence of sin was their own condemnation.
As it is written, "death spread to all men because all sinned"

I put those in the wrong order to show the parallel. I'll restate it in the order in which it appears in the Bible.

Just as the pattern/example/influence of sin was initiated by Adam, and the result was his own condemnation, likewise everyone else received their own condemnation because this pattern/example/influence of sin was repeated/followed/perpetuated by everyone else.

Here is another non-Augustinian commentary on verse 19,

Quote:
-----ROMANS 5:19

Â"For as by one manÂ's disobedience many were made sinners . . . Â"

Through AdamÂ's leading, influence, and example, men have voluntarily chosen to become sinners of their own free will. Adam has provided the circumstances of temptation and the occasions to sin through his leading, influence, and example, though each man is the cause of his own sin, and is therefore accountable for his sin, and for his sin only.

One man can wrongly influence another man, who wrongly influences another man, who wrongly influences another man, who wrongly influences another man, and on and on it goes. But if we were to trace all of these influences back as far as we can go, we would terminate upon Adam, who started this chain reaction, in the garden. So Adam has made many to sin by his leading, influence, and example.

It can also be argued that because of AdamÂ's fall, all of his descendants inherit physical depravity which inclines them, influences them, and tempts them.

hem to sin, and in this way does Adam "make" us sinners, though we voluntarily choose to obey those inclinations, influences, and temptations by our own free will.

Many Old Testament Kings "made Israel to sin" (1 Kings 14:16; 15:26, 30, 34; 16:13, 26; 21:22; 22:52; 2 Kings 3:3; 10:29, 31; 13:2; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 21:11, 16; 23:15); that is, through their leading, influence, and example they made Israel to sin.

Foreign women caused King Solomon to sin (Nehemiah 13:26); that is, through their leading, influence, and example, Solomon decided to sin. By setting up high places of Baal, men caused Judah to sin (Jeremiah 32:35); that is, they sinned because of this leading, influence, and example. Israel had leaders who would "lead" and "caused to err" (Isaiah 3:12) by their leading, influence, and example. Through a person's leading, influence, and example, a little child can be caused to sin (Matthew 18:6; Mark 9:42; Luke 17:2). The leading, influence, and example of a Christian can even cause a weaker brother to stumble (1 Corinthians 8:9).

These are all cases in which someone can be "made" or "caused" to sin through someone else's leading, influence, and example. Likewise, because of Adam's disobedience, "many were made sinners;" that is, through his leading, influence, and example, men voluntarily choose of their own free will to sin and to be sinners, and thus become spiritually dead and receive eternal condemnation.

"... so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

Christ makes men righteous in their standing and in their doing, so that those who are converted are accounted righteous by His blood, and those who are converted are actually righteous by following His example. Christ brings pardon of previous sins and purification of present sins, forgiveness to the past and freedom to the present.

Through Christ's obedience in shedding His blood on a cross, we are given the possibility of being accounted righteous (forgiven) through faith. We can be forgiven (accounted righteous) by faith in His blood.

"And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification" (Romans 4:22-25).

"Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, in thee shall all nations be blessed" (Galatians 3:6-8).

Through Christ's obedient life we are given an example to live righteous by following Him. Christ will "lead" us "in the way of righteousness" (Proverbs 8:20). "For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you" (John 13:15). "Christ also suffered for us, leaving us an example, that ye should follow his steps" (1 Peter 2:21). "For the grace of God that brings salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world" (Titus 2:11-12). And we are to follow the example of brethren who are followers of Christ's example (1 Corinthians 11:1; Philippians 3:17; 2 Thessalonians 3:9).

Being righteous is not only a standing, but is also a moral character in relation to deeds: "Obedience unto righteousness" (Romans 6:16). "Yield yourselves servants to righteousness unto holiness" (Romans 6:19). "If ye know that he is righteous, ye know that every one that doeth righteousness is born of him" (1 John 2:29). "Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous" (1 John 3:7). "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God" (1 John 3:10).

The purpose of the atonement was to cleanse sinners from all their sin, to pardon their past and to purify their present (Titus 2:14; 1 Peter 2:24). Both imputed righteousness (forgiveness) and imparted righteousness (repentance unto obedience) are by faith in Christ, and not by outward works (Acts 2:6, 18; Romans 3:28; 1 John 3:3).

Here is another similar commentary on the same verse,

Quote:

-----In understanding Ro. 5:12-19, we must distinguish between "occasion" and "cause." By occasion we mean an opportunity or "a condition of affairs that brings something about; ...especially, the immediate inciting circumstances as distinguished from the real or fundamental cause." By cause we mean that event or force which actually produces the results or the effect without any further action. Cause is therefore the reason for the action, occasion the opportunity or circumstances. This passage speaks of two individuals who did something to or for the human race - Adam and the Lord Jesus. We have a direct parallelism drawn, extending to the same group of mankind, or, most evidently, to the whole of mankind. The article "the" inserted before "many" in verses 15 and 19, adds emphasis and affirms that the same group is referred to in both cases. In verse 18 we have "all men" appearing in each parallelism. By what linguistic authority could we say that the terms, "the many" and "all men," when appearing on the Adamic side of the parallelism refer to the whole of mankind, while the same terms appearing on the Christ side refer only to those who are actually saved?

Since, obviously, the terms, "the many" and "all men," appearing on each side of the parallelism, refer to the same mass of mankind, we are entitled to say that if Adam was the cause of the downfall and condemnation of all, then Christ is the cause of the salvation of "all men unto the justification of life." If free will and moral agency is eliminated on one side, it is also eliminated on the other. But if we view the two great leaders of the human race as providing occasions or circumstances for moral action, each to the whole mass of mankind without exception, then we may say that Adam's sin strongly influenced every member of the human race to follow in his footsteps and choose for himself the life of sinful indulgence, while the Lord Jesus by His life and sacrificial death likewise provided something for each member of the human race to act upon. Just as Adam permeated the atmosphere with wrongful indulgence to draw all men towards sin, so the Lord Jesus permeated the atmosphere with love and mercy to draw all men toward holiness. The passage, then, describes the occasion of sin and the occasion of salvation as being co-extensive, committing to each moral being the cause and the responsibility for his own response to these influences. In this view, the passage becomes a blessed revelation of the glories of our Lord and Saviour,

unencumbered by perplexity.

C. G. Finney remarked on Ro. 5:12-19 as follows: "The Bible once, and only once, incidentally intimates that Adam's first sin has in some way been the occasion, not the necessary physical cause, of all the sins of men. It neither says nor intimates anything in relation to the manner in which Adam's sin has occasioned this result. It only incidentally recognizes the fact, and then leaves it, just as if the quo modo was too obvious to need explanation."

We are considerably relieved, therefore, to find the lack of Biblical evidence for the dogma, that the guilt of Adam's sin is imputed to all his posterity, and to conclude that "the Judge of all the earth" will hold each moral being accountable only for his own sins. While the sin of Adam and its consequences provide a strong occasion, nevertheless each moral being is the cause or author of his own guilt. The guilt of all past sins must be forgiven if the objective of reconciliation is to be achieved.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/9 1:07

@naatmi

Quote:

-----Adam was created mortal. Adam died because he did not have access to the tree of life.

Quote:

-----Mortality is not a curse. Jesus became a mortal man just like we are mortal. Jesus did not have access to the tree of life just we don't have access. Just as Jesus was not being punished for his ancestor's sin, neither are we. Just as it was not a punishment for Jesus to be mortal, neither is our mortality a punishment

Romans 6:23 clearly declares that the wages/penalty/punishment for sin is death. And Romans 5:12, the verse we just looked at also declares this truth. So I'm curious to know how you interpret those verses.

Re: - posted by Oracio (), on: 2010/11/9 1:42

@naatmi

The second commentary you quote seems to give two possible interpretations of Romans 5:12-19 regarding Adam's sin and our relation to it. Out of those two possibilities this is the one I agree with, which Finney also believed:

Quote:

-----It can also be argued that because of Adam's fall, all of his descendants inherit physical depravity which inclines them, influences them, and tempts them to sin, and in this way does Adam "make" us sinners, though we voluntarily choose to obey those inclinations, influences, and temptations by our own free will.

So I may not agree with Finney's views regarding the issue of "imputed guilt" but I do lean toward his view of human depravity or corruption.

BTW could you give the names of the authors of those commentaries? Just curious to see if I know of any of them.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 9:23

@Oracio

Both Romans 5:21 and 6:23 contrast "death" with "eternal life". I think Paul was talking about eternal death, judgment, condemnation.

I believe the second death, eternal punishment, not physical death or annihilationism, is the true penalty of sin. The physical death penalty is just a shadow of what sinners deserve.

If Jesus saves us from the punishment for our sins, and we still physically die, then the true punishment for sin must not be physical death.

I agree with Finney's view on eternal punishment: that the severity of punishment is determined by the value of the law a

and that the value of God's law is immeasurable.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 9:46

Quote:
-----The second commentary you quote seems to give two possible interpretations of Romans 5:12-19 regarding Adam's sin and our relation to it. Out of those two possibilities this is the one I agree with, which Finney also believed:

Quote:
-----It can also be argued that because of Adam's fall, all of his descendants inherit physical depravity which inclines them, influences them, and tempts them to sin, and in this way does Adam "make" us sinners, though we voluntarily choose to obey those inclinations, influences, and temptations by our own free will.

So I may not agree with Finney's views regarding the issue of "imputed guilt" but I do lean toward his view of human depravity or corruption.

Winkie Pratney also mentions that view in his "Me or Adam" tract.

http://www.winkiepratney.com/_files/pdf/tracts/MeOrAdam.pdf

Jesse Morrell, who wrote the second set of comments I quoted on Romans 5, also proves that Jesus Christ was a descendant of Adam (physically that is).

<http://www.youtube.com/user/bibletheology#p/a/u/1/olpPoRQRkWs>

I mention this because I believe it is very important to understand that Jesus was tempted in all the ways we are tempted. If Adam's descendants inherit a physical (not moral) depravity which is a source of temptation, yet Jesus did not experience this same burden, then the whole section in Hebrews about him being made like us, tempted like us, and able to fully relate to us, becomes meaningless.

I'm not against the idea of inherited physical depravity being a source of temptation as long as we don't say 1) Jesus didn't have the same burden of temptation it causes for us, and 2) something we inherited from Adam unavoidably forces us to sin so that we have an excuse, something to blame sin on.

Quote:
-----BTW could you give the names of the authors of those commentaries? Just curious to see if I know of any of them.

The first set of comments on verse 12 were my own notes which I had previously written to someone else.

The second was Jesse Morrell:

<http://www.youtube.com/user/bibletheology>

The third quote was from Gordon C. Olson (not to be confused with "C. Gordon Olson"):

<http://www.youtube.com/user/mgtheology#p/u/160/a8npV-NJvb4>

Re: - posted by Lesserlight, on: 2010/11/9 9:56

UB said

Quote:
-----I understand the "sin nature", "flesh", "old man" to all refer to the same thing.

I agree..... and it the thorn in the flesh that is the messenger of satan

Sin is not just a verb but is a noun that adheres unto the law of the seed and brings forth a verb in its image

Evil became sin and it lives in all of humankind..... then someone somewhere called it a "sin nature" that is not mentioned in the Bible but nevertheless is very true

Blessings

Doug

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/11/9 10:22

Jesse Morrell is an admitted Pelagianist. Here is an explanation of Pelagianism from Theopedia:

Pelagianism views humanity as basically good and morally unaffected by the Fall. It denies the imputation of Adam's sin, original sin, total depravity, and substitutionary atonement. It simultaneously views man as fundamentally good and in possession of libertarian free will. With regards to salvation, it teaches that man has the ability in and of himself (apart from divine aid) to obey God and earn eternal salvation. Pelagianism is overwhelmingly incompatible with the Bible and was historically opposed by Augustine (354-430), Bishop of Hippo, leading to its condemnation as a heresy at Council of Carthage in 418 A.D. These condemnations were summarily ratified at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431).

Nearly all Pelagianists greatly admire fellow Pelagianist Charles Finney. Most people can admire Finney for preaching repentance and holiness but when it comes to the atonement, Christ being our substitutionary sacrifice, and the imputed righteousness of the believer, Finney's theology was gravely in error. Finney did not believe that Christ died and paid for our sins. Rather, he taught that God poured out His wrath on His Son in order to show us the seriousness of sin. If you want to read up on Finney and all of his heresies, go here:

<http://www.spurgeon.org/~phil/articles/finney.htm>

Question to naatmi: Are you Jesse Morrell? If not, you can simply say: Not Me

Re: - posted by UntoBabes (), on: 2010/11/9 10:46

Just to clarify something about Finney, I am posting a short clip from an article titled "How to Win Souls"

quote from Finney.

"1st. They are free moral agents, of course rational, accountable.

2nd. They are in rebellion against God, wholly alienated, intensely prejudiced, and committed against Him."

Finney believed that man has the ability to repent and believe the gospel because he is a free moral agent, able to make choices, but man is also depraved and does not desire God.

That means, man is able to choose God but he does not want or desire to.

The main stream in Finney's time believed that man is unable to choose God.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 11:57

For more clarification about Finney's views on depravity, go here www.gospeltruth.net His Systematic Theology is on here. (highly recommended reading.) Also, I have read the article on Phil Johnson's website and since he is a well-known and proud of it Calvinist, he would naturally be against Finney's views. If you want to know what Finney believed, read HIS writings and not someone commenting on him. His complete works are at the above mentioned site.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/11/9 12:22

I read Finney's Total Depravity sermon found here:
http://www.gospeltruth.net/1836SOIS/04sois_total_depravity.htm

What is particularly striking is that he does not quote even one scripture verse. These are the words of Charles Finney but not the word of God.

He has one scripture at the top of this sermon but it is not used to support his arguments.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 12:23

Read his Systematic Theology on this subject. I think he put Scripture there. He also assumed it to be a self-evident truth with his audience to whom he was writing. They knew him pretty well.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 12:25

If you want a lot of Scripture, look in "Other Authors" link on that site and find "Over 100 Texts that Prove Babies are Born Innocent" by A. T. Overstreet. Available on the same site.

P. S. Has anyone posted Albert Barnes yet?

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 12:38

What do you think of this from the NIV? I think it is weird.

1 Cor 5:4-5

4When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present,

5hand this man over to Satan, so that the sinful nature may be destroyed and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord.

Satan can destroy our sinful nature??? Why would he want to do that?

No wonder so many are confused today.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 12:43

That was actually a translator error. The word "sarx" is supposed to be translated "flesh" but for some reason the translators made a doctrinal assumption. There is an article on that as well on www.gospeltruth.net "The Scandal of the NIV"

Good question though, that's pretty funny.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 13:10

SARX is well known even by "amateurs" to be flesh.

Sounds more like an "agenda" error than a translation error. These guys are supposed to be the experts.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 14:33

You know what, that's right. Wescott and Hort who were responsible for finding that text from which the NIV was translated were members of the London's Club of Hermes, a santanist group that is still active today.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 14:34

Here's some Albert Barnes, he was a new-schooler like Finney:

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS - Chapter 5 - Verse 12

Verses 12-21. This passage has been usually regarded as the most difficult part of the New Testament. It is not the design of these Notes to enter into a minute criticism of contested points like this. They who wish to see a full discussion of the passage, may find it in the professedly critical commentaries; and especially in the commentaries of Tholuck and of Professor Stuart on the Romans. The meaning of the passage in its general bearing is not difficult; and probably the whole passage would have been found far less difficult if it had not been attached to a philosophical theory on the subject of man's sin, and if a strenuous and indefatigable effort had not been made to prove that it teaches what it was never designed to teach. The plain and obvious design of the passage is this— to show one of the benefits of the doctrine of justification by faith. The apostle had shown

(1.) that that doctrine produced peace, Ro 5:1

(2.) That it produces joy in the prospect of future glory, Ro 5:2

(3.) That it sustained the soul in afflictions;

(a) by the regular tendency of afflictions under the gospel, Ro 5:3,4; and

(b) by the fact that the Holy Ghost was imparted to the believer.

(4.) That this doctrine rendered it certain that we should be saved, because Christ had died for us, Ro 5:6; because this was the highest expression of love, Ro 5:7,8; and because, if we had been reconciled when thus alienated, we should be saved now that we are the friends of God, Ro 5:9,10.

(5.) That it led us to rejoice in God himself; produced joy in his presence, and in all his attributes.

He now proceeds to show the bearing on that great mass of evil which had been introduced into the world by sin, and to prove that the benefits of the atonement were far greater than the evils which had been introduced by the acknowledged effects of the sin of Adam. "The design is to exalt our views of the work of Christ, and of the plan of justification through him, by comparing them with the evil consequences of the sin of our first father, and by showing that the blessings in question not only extend to the removal of these evils, but far beyond this; so that the grace of the gospel has not only abounded, but superabounded." (Prof. Stuart.) In doing this the apostle admits, as an undoubted and well understood fact,

1. That sin came into the world by one man, and death as the consequence, Ro 5:12.

2. That death had passed on all; even on those who had not the light of revelation, and the express commands of God, Ro 5:13,14.

3. That Adam was the figure, the type of him that was to come; that there was some sort of analogy or resemblance between the results of his act, and the results of the work of Christ. That analogy consisted in the fact that the effects of his doings did not terminate on himself, but extended to numberless other persons, and that it was thus with the work of Christ, Ro 5:14. But he shows,

4. That there were very material and important differences in the two cases. There was not a perfect parallelism. The effects of the work of Christ were far more than simply to counteract the evil introduced by the sin of Adam. The differences between the effect of his act and the work of Christ are these:

(1.) The sin of Adam led to condemnation. The work of Christ has an opposite tendency, Ro 5:15.

(2.) The condemnation which came from the sin of Adam was the result of one offence. The work of Christ was to deliver from many offences, Ro 5:16.

(3.) The work of Christ was far more abundant and overflowing in its influence. It extended deeper and farther. It was more than a compensation for the evils of the fall, Ro 5:17.

5. As the act of Adam threw its influence over all men to secure their condemnation, so the work of Christ was fitted to affect all men, Jews and Gentiles, in bringing them into a state by which they might be delivered from the fall, and restored to the favour of God. It was in itself adapted to produce far more and greater benefits than the crime of Adam had clone evil; and was thus a glorious plan, just fitted to meet the actual condition of a world of sin; and to repair the evils which apostasy had introduced. It had thus the evidence that it originated in the benevolence of God, and that it was adapted to the human condition, Ro 5:18-21.

Verse 12. Wherefore. (dia touto). On this account. This is not an inference from what has gone

before, but a continuance of the design of the apostle to show the advantages of the plan of justification by faith; as if he had said, "The advantages of that plan have been seen in our comfort and peace, and in its sustaining power in afflictions. Further, the advantages of the plan are seen in regard to this, that it is applicable to the condition of man in a world where the sin of one man has produced so much woe and death. On this account also it is a matter of joy. It meets the ills of a fallen race; and it is therefore a plan adapted to man." Thus understood, the connexion and design of the passage is easily explained. In respect to the state of things into which man is fallen, the benefits of this plan may be seen, as adapted to heal the maladies, and to be commensurate with the evils which the apostasy of one man brought upon the world. This explanation is not that which is usually given to this place, but it is that which seems to me to be demanded by the strain of the apostle's reasoning. The passage is elliptical, and there is a necessity of supplying something to make out the sense.

As. (wsper). This is the form of a comparison. But the other part of the comparison is deferred to Ro 5:18. The connexion evidently requires us to understand the other part of the comparison of the work of Christ. In the rapid train of ideas in the mind of the apostle, this was deferred to make room for explanations, (Ro 5:13-17.) "As by one man sin entered into the world, etc., so by the work of Christ a remedy has been provided, commensurate with the evils. As the sin of one man had such an influence, so the work of the Redeemer has an influence to meet and to counteract those evils." The passage in Ro 5:13-17 is therefore to be regarded as a parenthesis thrown in for the purpose of making explanations, and to show how the cases of Adam and of Christ differed from each other.

By one man, etc. By means of one man; by the crime of one man. His act was the occasion of the introduction of all sin into all the world. The apostle here refers to the well-known historical fact, (Ge 3:6,7) without any explanation of the mode or cause of this. He adduced it as a fact that was well known; and evidently meant to speak of it not for the purpose of explaining the mode, or even of making this the leading or prominent topic in the discussion. His main design is not to speak of the manner of the introduction of sin, but to show that the work of Christ meets and removes well-known and extensive evils. His explanations, therefore, are chiefly confined to the work of Christ. He speaks of the introduction, the spread, and the effects of sin, not as having any theory to defend on that subject, not as designing to enter into a minute description of the case, but as it was manifest on the face of things, as it stood on the historical record, and as it was understood and admitted by mankind. Great perplexity has been introduced by forgetting the scope of the apostle's argument here, and by supposing that he was defending a peculiar theory on the subject of the introduction of sin; whereas nothing is more foreign to his design. He is showing how the plan of justification meets well-understood and acknowledged universal evils. Those evils he refers to just as they were seen, and admitted to exist. All men see them, and feel them, and practically understand them. The truth is, that the doctrine of the fall of man, and the prevalence of sin and death, do not belong peculiarly to Christianity, any more than the introduction and spread of disease does to the science of the healing art. Christianity did not introduce sin; nor is it responsible for it. The existence of sin and woe belongs to the race; appertains equally to all systems of religion, and is a part of the melancholy history of man, whether Christianity be true or false. The existence and extent of sin and death are not affected if the infidel could show that Christianity was an imposition. They would still remain. The Christian religion is just one mode of proposing a remedy for well-known and desolating evils; just as the science of medicine proposes a remedy for diseases which it did not introduce, and which could not be stayed in their desolations, or modified, if it could be shown that the whole science of healing was pretension and quackery. Keeping this design of the apostle in view, therefore, and remembering that he is not defending or stating a theory about the introduction of sin, but that he is explaining the way in which the work of Christ delivers from a deep-felt universal evil, we shall find the explanation of this passage disencumbered of many of the difficulties with which it has been thought usually to be invested.

By one man. By Adam. See Ro 5:14. It is true that sin was literally introduced by Eve, who was first in the transgression, Ge 3:6 1Ti 2:14. But the apostle evidently is not explaining the precise mode in which sin was introduced, or making this his leading point. He therefore speaks of the introduction of sin in a popular sense, as it was generally understood. The following reasons may be suggested why the man is mentioned, rather than the woman, as the cause of the introduction of sin.

(1.) It was the natural and usual way of expressing such an event. We say that man sinned, that man is redeemed, man dies, etc. We do not pause to indicate the sex in such expressions. So in this,

he undoubtedly meant to say that it was introduced by the parentage of the human race.

(2.) The name Adam, in Scripture, was given to the created pair, the parents of the human family, a name designating their earthly origin. Ge 5:1,2, "In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called THEIR name Adam." The name Adam, therefore, used in this connexion, (Ro 5:14,) would suggest the united parentage of the human family.

(3.) In transactions where man and woman are mutually concerned, it is usual to speak of the man first, on account of his being constituted superior in rank and authority.

(4.) The comparison on the one side, in the apostle's argument, is of the man Christ Jesus; and to secure the fitness, the congruity (Stuart) of the comparison, he speaks of the man only in the previous transaction.

(5.) The sin of the woman was not complete in its effects without the concurrence of the man. It was their uniting in it which was the cause of the evil. Hence the man is especially mentioned as having rendered the offence what it was; as having completed it, and entailed its curses on the race. From these remarks it is clear that the apostle does not refer to the man here from any idea that there was any particular covenant transaction with him, but that he means to speak of it in the usual, popular sense; referring to him as being the fountain of all the woes that sin has introduced into the world.

Sin entered into the world. He was the first sinner of the race. The word sin here evidently means the violation of the law of God. He was the first sinner among men, and in consequence all others became sinners. The apostle does not here refer to Satan, the tempter, though he was the suggester of evil; for his design was to discuss the effect of the plan of salvation in meeting the sins and calamities of our race. This design, therefore, did not require him to introduce the sin of another order of beings, he says, therefore, that Adam was the first sinner of the race, and that death was the consequence.

Into the world. Among mankind, Joh 1:10 3:16,17.

The term world is often thus used to denote human beings—the race, the human family. The apostle here evidently is not discussing the doctrine of original sin; but he is stating a simple fact, intelligible to all: "The first man violated the law of God, and in this way sin was introduced among men." In this fact—this general, simple declaration—there is no mystery.

And death by sin. Death was the consequence of sin; or was introduced because man sinned. This is a simple statement of an obvious and well-known fact. It is repeating simply what is said in Ge 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." The threatening was, (Ge 2:17,) "Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it, for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If an inquiry be made here, how Adam would understand this, I reply, that we have no reason to think he would understand it as referring to anything more than the loss of life as an expression of the displeasure of God, Moses does not intimate that he was learned in the nature of laws and penalties; and his narrative would lead us to suppose that this was all that would occur to Adam. And indeed there is the highest evidence that the case admits of, that this was his understanding of it. For in the account of the infliction of the penalty after the law was violated, in God's own interpretation of it, in Ge 3:19, there is still no reference to anything further. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Now, it is incredible that Adam should have understood this as referring to what has been called "spiritual death," and to "eternal death," when neither in the threatening, nor in the account of the infliction of the sentence, is there the slightest recorded reference to it. Men have done great injury in the cause of correct interpretation by carrying their notions of doctrinal subjects to the explanation of words and phrases in the Old Testament. They have usually described Adam as endowed with all the refinement, and possessed of all the knowledge, and adorned with all the metaphysical acumen and subtlety of a modern theologian. They have deemed him qualified, in the very infancy of the world, to understand and discuss questions which, under all the light of the Christian revelation, still perplex and embarrass the human mind. After these accounts of the endowments of Adam, which occupy so large a space in books of theology, one is surprised, on opening the Bible, to find how unlike all this is the simple statement in Genesis. And the wonder cannot be suppressed that men should describe the obvious infancy of the race as superior to its highest advancement; or that the first man, just looking upon a world of wonders, imperfectly acquainted with law, and moral relations, and the effects of transgression, should be represented as endowed with knowledge which, four thousand years after, it required the advent of the Son of God to communicate! The account in Moses is simple. Created

man was told not to violate a simple law, on pain of death. He did it; and God announced to him that the sentence would be inflicted, and that he should return to the dust whence he was taken. What else this might involve—what other consequences sin might introduce, might be the subject of future developments and revelations. It is absurd to suppose that all the consequences of the violation of a law can be foreseen, or must necessarily be foreseen, in order to make the law and the penalty just. It is sufficient that the law be known; that its violation be forbidden; and what the consequences of that violation will be, must be left in great part to future developments. Even we yet know not half the results of violating the law of God. The murderer knows not the results fully of taking a man's life: he breaks a just law, and exposes himself to the numberless unseen woes which may flow from it.

We may ask, therefore, what light subsequent revelations have cast on the character and result of the first sin? and whether the apostle here meant to state that the consequences of sin were in fact as limited as they must have appeared to the mind of Adam? or had subsequent developments and revelations, through four thousand years, greatly extended the right understanding of the penalty of the law? This can be answered only by inquiring in what sense the apostle Paul here uses the word death. The passage before us shows in what sense he intended here to use the word. In his argument it stands opposed to "the grace of God, and the gift by grace," (Ro 5:15) to "justification," by the forgiveness of "many offences," (Ro 5:16) to the reign of the redeemed in eternal life, (Ro 5:17) and to "justification of life," (Ro 5:18.) To all these, the words "death," (Ro 5:12,17) and "judgment," (Ro 5:16,18) stand opposed. These are the benefits which result from the work of Christ; and these benefits stand opposed to the evils which sin has introduced; and as it cannot be supposed that these benefits relate to temporal life, or solely to the resurrection of the body, so it cannot be that the evils involved in the words "death," "judgment," etc., relate simply to temporal death. The evident meaning is, that the word "death," as here used by the apostle, refers to the train of evils which have been introduced by sin. It does not mean simply temporal death; but that group and collection of woes, including temporal death, condemnation, and exposure to eternal death, which is the consequence of transgression. The apostle often uses the word death, and to die, in this wide sense, Ro 1:32 6:16, 7:5,10,13,24 8:2,6,13; 2Co 2:16 7:10; Heb 2:14.

In the same sense the word is often used elsewhere, Joh 8:51 11:26; 1Jo 5:16,17; Re 2:11 20:6, etc. etc. In contrasting with this the results of the work of Christ, he describes not the resurrection merely, nor deliverance from temporal death, but eternal life in heaven; and it therefore follows that he here intends by death that gloomy and sad train of woes which sin has introduced into the world. The consequences of sin are, besides, elsewhere specified to be far more than temporal death, Eze 18:4 Ro 2:8,9,12.

Though, therefore, Adam might not have foreseen all the evils which were to come upon the race as the consequence of his sin, yet these evils might nevertheless follow. And the apostle, four thousand years after the reign of sin had commenced, and under the guidance of inspiration, had full opportunity to see and describe that train of woes which he comprehends under the name of death. That train included evidently temporal death, condemnation for sin, remorse of conscience, and exposure to eternal death, as the penalty of transgression.

And so. Thus. In this way it is to be accounted for that death has passed upon all men; to wit, because all men have sinned. As death followed sin in the first transgression, so it has in all; for all have sinned. There is a connexion between death and sin which existed in the case of Adam, and which subsists in regard to all who sin, And as all have sinned, so death has passed on all men. Death passed upon. (dihlyen). Passed through; pervaded; spread over the whole race, as pestilence passes through, or pervades a nation. Thus death, with its train of woes, with its withering and blighting influence, has passed through the world, laying prostrate all before it.

Upon all men. Upon the race; all die.

For that (ef w). This expression has been greatly controverted; and has been very variously translated. Elsner renders it, "on account of whom." Doddridge, "unto which all have sinned." The Latin Vulgate renders it, "in whom all have sinned." The same rendering has been given by Augustine, Beza, etc. But it has never yet been shown that our translators have rendered the expression improperly. The old Syriac and the Arabic agree with the English translation fix this interpretation. With this agree Calvin, Vatablus, Erasmus, etc. And this rendering is sustained also by many other considerations.

(1.) If (w) be a relative pronoun here, it would refer naturally to death, as its antecedent, and not to man. But this would not make sense.

(2.) If this had been its meaning, the preposition (en) would have been used. See Note of Erasmus

on the place.

(3.) It comports with the apostle's argument to state a cause why all died, and not to state that men sinned in Adam. He was inquiring into the cause why death was in the world; and it would not account for that to say that all sinned in Adam. It would require an additional statement to see how that could be a cause.

(4.) As his posterity had not then an existence, they could not commit actual transgression. Sin is the transgression of the law by a moral agent; and as the interpretation "because all have sinned" meets the argument of the apostle, and as the Greek favours that certainly as much as it does the other, it is to be preferred.

All have sinned. To sin is to transgress the law of God; to do wrong. The apostle in this expression does not say that all have sinned in Adam, or that their nature has become corrupt, which is true, but which is not affirmed here; nor that the sin of Adam is imputed to them; but simply affirms that all men have sinned. He speaks evidently of the great universal fact that all men are sinners. He is not settling a metaphysical difficulty; nor does he speak of the condition of man as he comes into the world. He speaks as other men would; he addresses himself to the common sense of the world; and is discoursing of universal, well-known facts. Here is the fact—[^]that all men experience calamity, condemnation, death. How is this to be accounted for? The answer is, "All have sinned." This is a sufficient answer; it meets the case. And as his design cannot be shown to be to discuss a metaphysical question about the nature of man, or about the character of infants, the passage should be interpreted according to his design, and should not be pressed to bear on that of which he says nothing, and to which the passage evidently has no reference. I understand it, therefore, as referring to the fact that men sin in their own persons, sin themselves—[^]as, indeed, how can they sin in any other way?—[^]and that therefore they die. If men maintain that it refers to any metaphysical properties of the nature of man, or to infants, they should not infer or suppose this, but should show distinctly that it is in the text. Where is there evidence of any such reference?
{s} "as by one man" Ge 3:6,19.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 14:50

Quote:
-----You know what, that's right. Wescott and Hort who were responsible for finding that text from which the NIV was translated were members of the London's Club of Hermes, a santanist group that is still active today.

I have read about Westcott and Hort.

It always amazes me that Christendom can admit that Satan has a counterfeit for everything of the Holy Spirit, but they think it is lunacy that we say he has also counterfeited/perverted God's word. Today's versions of the Bible (over 400 english versions), are counterfeit.

The very first thing he did in the garden was to corrupt and pervert God's word. He is still doing it and he has many people snookered. If he cannot change it, he will omit or add to it.

Hath God said???

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 14:54

AMEN!

"God is not the author of confusion" Isn't it confusing with all of these translations? Ask a new convert to go into a bookstore and buy a Bible, how will he know what to do?

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/9 15:39

Quote:
-----Quote: I don't think Finney was coming against the idea of original sin. ... Original sin was strongly taught by Finney ... Have you read Finney's Systematic Theology?

Not in its entirety. Maybe I should rephrase. From some rather lengthy quotes I have gleaned that he did not reject the idea that man was born in sin due to Adam's fall. He rejected the idea that man was born with a "sin nature". That was my understanding of what he was saying.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/9 15:46

Quote:
-----The main stream in Finney's time believed that man is unable to choose God.

True! I am not making this statement to start or to promulgate any sort of Calvin/Arm debate or discussion, but this mainstream belief is orthodox Calvinism, which Finney very strongly opposed.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/9 15:49

Quote:
-----What do you think of this from the NIV? I think it is weird. 1 Cor 5:4-5 4When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus and I am with you in spirit, and the power of our Lord Jesus is present, 5hand this man over to Satan, so that the sinful nature may be destroyed and his spirit saved on the day of the Lord. Satan can destroy our sinful nature??? Why would he want to do that?

Again, the word (sarx) being redefined as "sinful nature" when it really simply means "flesh". I don't have a lot against the NIV, but this redefinition of terms bothers me a little bit.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/11/9 15:59

And why would Satan want to destroy a person's sinful nature? Satan is the author of sin.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 16:21

Sir, If you get the time, I posted a link to a website that puts all of Finney's works online. You can order a copy of his Systematic Theology from them for \$15. (Way cheaper than other copies I've looked at.) It is recommended that you read his entire book though, he very clearly rejected original sin and the sin nature.

Here's the link again: www.gospeltruth.net

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 16:33

Quote:
-----Ask a new convert to go into a bookstore and buy a Bible, how will he know what to do?

At 15, I read the living bible, by 19 God wanted me to read the King James. It was hard reading but I stuck with it and I am glad.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 16:36

bump

Re: The sin nature - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/9 17:36

I've only been away one day, and there are 8 pages of posting to catch up. Can I go back to Anonymous who replied to my posting about Jesus being made sin for us:

"For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." 2 Cor 5:21 (KJV)

Anonymous, You say:

"Sin is a choice (intention, goal, etc)". This is the basis of your belief in this posting.

then you continue:

"Jesus being without sin means that Jesus did not choose sin." This is a logical extension of your belief.

then:

"Since sin is a choice, Jesus was not literally "made sin". It is a figurative phrase. Jesus didn't turn into a choice. It represents the fact that Jesus suffered for our sins when we are the one's who deserve to suffer for them. He offered up his life on account of our sins in order to justify pardon being granted to those who repent."

And so you make the word of God of none effect by your belief. If the plain statement that "God has made Christ to be sin" does not fit into your belief system, you call it a figurative phrase. You say it represents something which it plainly does not. You should abandon your belief system of sin being a choice and believe what God says.

Jesus himself knew what would come upon Him on the cross, and He deliberately chose the Father's will, not his own will. This is what free will is, and only Christ had the authority to exercise it.

David

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 17:49

I don't know how many years it has been now, but I don't hear anyone singing God's Word in meetings anymore or even quoting the Word. There are just so many different versions. You want to show someone where the Bible says, "He heals the brokenhearted"? Don't use theirs, it won't be in there.

There is a natural rhythm and syncopation to KJV and that is why I think there are so many good songs.

When I got saved I did not know a thing about Bibles. Someone gave me a KJV and I started consuming it. Never tried to memorize anything. Just read. But verses would stick inside me like glue. Any difficult words I came across I looked up. Learned a lot by doing that.

The other day a 26 year old Christian brother who reads an extremely wordy version asked me how I seem to have so many scriptures memorized and know where to go in the Bible to find something. I did not seize the opportunity to talk about Bible versions. I was just not led by the Holy Spirit to do that. But I did tell him, "I just read the Bible". I know he found

that hard to believe and will probably come back again to ask more. I have found that it is best to just let people come to you and ask rather than to go around talking about bible versions. But, I did not sense this was the time to talk to him about what I have found out regarding Bible versions.

My kids from 11 years old and up, won't read anything else. They have no problem working a dictionary.

I don't want to pick on the NIV without giving equal time to the NASB.

Here is a chunk of info from Foundation Magazine.

We ask the question: "How can anyone be HELPED in their understanding of the Word of God when so many questions are raised about what should or should not be a part of the words of the text?" It is our judgment that the NASV marginal readings generally produce confusion, not confidence; they promote doubt, not faith! In themselves, the marginal references provide an additional reason to reject the NASV.

In presenting specific instances of serious differences between the King James Version and the New American Standard Version, the following abbreviations will be used: King James Version (KJV); New American Standard Version (NASV); marginal reference (MR); manuscripts (MSS). Note the following verses, portions of verses or words which are in the KJV but are missing or questioned in the NASV:

Matthew 18:11-This verse, "For the Son of Man is come to save that which was lost" is in the NASV, but it is in brackets with a MR which says, "Most ancient MSS omit."

Matthew 27:35-NASV omits a major portion as follows: "That it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the prophet, 'They parted my garments among them and upon my vesture did they cast lots ' There is NO marginal reference or explanation FOR THIS OMISSION.

Mark 1:1-The important words, "The Son of God" are in the NASV, but a MR says, "Many MSS omit."

Mark 15:28-The entire verse is missing in the NASV but in its place are the words (SEE MARGINAL NOTE). The MR says, "Later MSS add vs. 28." Interestingly, the liberal RSV text also omits this verse but its footnote says, "Many ancient authorities insert."

Luke 4:4-NASV omits the last part of this verse, "But by every Word of God" without ANY explanation whatever.

Luke 4:8-NASV omits the words, "Get thee behind me, Satan" without ANY explanation whatever.

Luke 4:18-NASV omits the words, "To heal the broken hearted " without ANY explanation whatever.

Luke 22:43-44 These two verses are in the NASV but a MR says, "Some ancient MSS omit."

Luke 23:42-NASV omits the word, "Lord, " an important omission, without explanation.

Luke 24:6-The first part of this verse, "He is not here but he is risen" is in the NASV but a MR says, "Some ancient MSS omit." It is interesting that the liberal RSV omits this portion of the verse but a footnote says, "Some ancient authorities add."

Luke 24:12-NASV has this verse in brackets with a MR saying, "Some ancient MSS omit."

Luke 24:36-NASV omits a portion of this verse: "And he says to them, 'Peace be to you' " but a MR says, "Some ancient MSS insert."

Luke 24:40-This verse is COMPLETELY MISSING in the NASV text-the words (SEE MARGINAL NOTE) appear in place of this verse. The MR says, "Some MSS add vs. 40."

Luke 24:51-NASV omits a portion of this verse "and was carried up into heaven" but a MR says, "Some MSS add." A corresponding footnote in the liberal RSV says, "Many ancient authorities add."

Luke 24:52-NASV omits the words "and worshipped Him" and the MR says, "Some MSS insert." The liberal RSV footnote says, "Many ancient authorities add."

John 1:27-The words "is preferred before me" are MISSING in the NASV with NO EXPLANATION why they were deleted.

John 6:47-The words "on me" are COMPLETELY MISSING in the NASV with NO EXPLANATION.

Acts 8:37-NASV omits the entire verse and uses the now familiar (SEE MARGINAL NOTE) which says, "Later MSS insert." Those who teach the heresy of baptismal regeneration welcome this omission.

Acts 9:6-The words "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" are COMPLETELY MISSING WITHOUT EXPLANATION.

Romans 16:24-NASV OMITTS THE ENTIRE VERSE. In its place is (SEE MARGINAL NOTE) which says, "Some ancient MSS add vs. 24)."

Ephesians 3:9-KJV reads, "Who created all things BY JESUS CHRIST." NASV omits "BY JESUS CHRIST" with ABSOLUTELY NO EXPLANATION OR MARGINAL NOTE.

1 John 4:3-The KJV properly reads, "And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." But the NASV reads, "And every spirit that does not confess Jesus is not from God." There is no manuscript authority cited nor any explanation given for this important change in the text-a change which even the liberal Revised Standard Version does not make.

Revelation 1:11-NASV omits the words "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last" WITH ABSOLUTELY NO EXPLANATION.

Many other specific examples could be given if space permitted. There are several very helpful publications available that provide a summary of textual differences and that also deal with the subject of Bible versions in more depth than we are able to in this leaflet. One such publication is *Evaluating Versions of the New Testament* by Everett W. Fowler, published by Maranatha Baptist Press; this booklet documents hundreds of changes and omissions.

There are also some very subtle and less obvious changes which have been made in the NASV text. Note the following:

Luke 24:47-The words in the KJV read "repentance AND forgiveness of sins" but the NASV reads "repentance FOR forgiveness of sins." The NASV marginal reading says, "Some MSS read 'AND forgiveness'," so they deliberately chose a rendering which raises the question of salvation by faith vs. salvation by works- an amazing decision by supposedly fundamental or evangelical scholars.

John 9:35-NASV substitutes "Son of Man" for "Son of God" with ABSOLUTELY NO EXPLANATION.

1 Timothy 3:16-the NASV text replaces the word "God" with "He" although the MR says "Some MSS read 'God'." This is a key verse concerning the Deity of our Lord Jesus Christ. Yet, the NASV scholars preferred a rendering which blunts this precious truth.

2 Timothy 3:16-Here is a subtle change suggested by the marginal note rather than the text itself. This key verse concerning the complete inspiration of the Scriptures properly reads in the NASV text, "All scripture is inspired by God . . ." but the MR says, "Or, possibly, 'Every scripture inspired of God is profitable....'" No citation of manuscript authority is given-but this suggested possible change does make it conform to the liberal Revised Standard Version.

Now you see it-now you don't! Maybe it's in- maybe it's out! A sleight of hand performance has been perpetrated upon unsuspecting believers by the NASV. Is this any way to handle the precious, infallible, inerrant Word of God? Of course it is true that some words and expressions in the KJV are no longer in common usage or have changed somewhat in meaning. But this is no excuse for trying to replace the KJV with a version like the NASV which updates some words and expressions but leaves out or questions the validity of many words, portions of verses, entire verses and even extensive portions as in Mark 16:9-20 and John 7:53-8:11.

It should be clear that no version of the Bible could ever be produced in which every word would be readily understood by everyone. But that is where cross-references, footnotes, etc., become helpful. They explain without changing the words of the text itself. God has used expository preaching and teaching and the use of Bible commentaries and concordances to instruct and build up the believers. But the purity of the text itself **MUST BE PRESERVED!** Let the commentaries be clearly labeled as such-they are the works of men and are subject to error. **BUT LET THE BIBLE STAND SUPREME AS THE UNCHANGING WORD OF THE LIVING GOD**-without the tampering minds and fingers of man.

In closing, we cite one further instance of an important change in the NASV-a change which bears directly on our responsibility as believers to separate from false teachers and doctrines:

1 Timothy 6:5-Referring to "men of corrupt minds and destitute of the truth," the KJV properly concludes this verse with the clear command of God: "FROM SUCH WITHDRAW THYSELF." The NASV omits **COMPLETELY** these four important words (in this case again following the liberal RSV text) with absolutely **NO EXPLANATION OR INDICATION** THAT ANYTHING IS MISSING FROM THE TEXT.

The issue of Bible translations is not a minor issue as some seem to feel. If we do not have a sure foundation, we really have no foundation at all. Both reason and consistency demand that if one holds the NASV to be the most accurate version, then it should replace the KJV. However, many pastors, schools and religious organizations say that they will continue to use only the King James Version from the pulpit, platform and for study and memorization, yet at the same time they promote and defend the NASV which differs so greatly from the KJV and conforms so closely to other modern versions which they have repudiated.

We believe a choice can be made-AND SHOULD BE MADE! We believe the choice should be to use and recommend **ONLY** the King James Version of the Bible.

Several excellent books have been written on this important subject which are helpful to those who want more complete and thorough information. We have written this leaflet with the hope and prayer that it will inform God's people of the very subtle attack which is being made upon the very foundation of the Christian faith-the Bible! We urge God's people to make their own study of this matter.

-M.H. Reynolds, Editor, FOUNDATION MAGAZINE

By the way, NIV omits 64,000 words of scripture.

Hath God said??? I guess not.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/9 17:56

Quote:

-----I have some slightly different thoughts on Roman 7, but maybe compatible with what you think.

Actually no, I don't think what you said is compatible with what I was saying. I don't believe Paul is personifying anything. He is describing the wretchedness of attempting to live righteously by his own effort. Remember chapter 6 is dealing with our being dead to sin and no longer living therein. Paul shows the relationship between the law and sin and the fact that until he was dead to the law and alive in Christ, his attempts at being righteous through the weakness of his own flesh were futile. It was a wretched state to live in. Knowing the law of God, wanting to be righteous, and not finding it possible. He was only delivered from this wretchedness through Jesus Christ with whom Paul had considered himself crucified. 6,7,8 must be taken as a whole in the context of the remainder of the letter. You are right, the law was not the bad guy. It was just the vehicle by which sin came alive and we died to our own self righteousness. The law was good and holy, but it was never meant to be the thing that we keep in order to be in right relationship with God. It was a ministratio

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/9 18:02

the point:

again, Repentance is the issue and always has been. Adam and Eve were given everything in the Garden. They could have continued under God's provision and not missed anything. Our God was holding nothing good back from them.

But the temptation came and they took it.

The temptation was to go their own way for provision.

You guys (and girls), IT IS EXACTLY THE SAME TODAY!

We choose to not repent of providing for self. We choose to provide our own righteousness at times, our own sanctification and even glorification etc... all through means other than God's Prescribed order. Adam and Eve chose not to repent of self provision. They thought they were missing out/ God was holding back/ they could get more in their own way. That's how we do... until we 'change our mind' which is to repent. And let God provide.

John the Baptizer arrived on scene and told everyone to Repent because the Kingdom was now HERE. He did not mean in sackcloth and ashes or the Lord-ah would stompeth you-ah!

not at all.

He was saying to change your mind about how to be in right standing with God as the Door has now come to us and is standing right in front of us. He was simply stating that the Sacrifice for the whole world has now come and that we no longer have to follow this way of Law and Commandments under condemnation of old wine skin sacrificial systems.

Jesus said he was the greatest prophet to ever live. They all pointed to the Messiah and what He would do. If John the baptizer would have been doing the same thing as the pharisees, He would not have called him that.

John was giving the picture of what Jesus had come to do - water baptism... we are buried in Christ and Risen New w/ Him and seated (by Faith) next to the Father.

Jesus Himself made it clear that John's message was exactly right. Jesus said the same thing as John, like what? A Chapter later! And we know Jesus certainly did not come to make everyone feel condemned by keeping them under obligation to the Law! He came to keep it for us! Who was the law made for again? Not the Jews!

John's demeanor was not of a mean religious spirit. He understood the way of Grace and Mercy. Through Grace and Mercy (new Cov't) we repent of our old way of living and live into Christ and through Him. Possible all because of what He did for us at the Cross.

So biblical temptation is nothing more than to leave God's ability to provide and to go another way-

We are to -repent- of providing for self. Adam did not stay repented but chose his own way.

What is our answer? Repent and Believe by Faith.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 18:13

So the "flesh" was the problem then and flesh is the problem, now.

Maybe it is because flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God.

Because Adam was fleshly (the first man Adam was fleshly, the second man, Christ is spiritual), he was destined to fall? Is that what we are saying? Scripture does make a distinction that the "first man was fleshly". What is it trying to tell us?

Now, I believe that God wanted Adam to learn obedience through the things he suffered (deny the flesh), but instead he had one act of disobedience, that broke fellowship with God.

We are in the flesh when we are not in communion with God, then. Adam's flesh left to itself, and tempted, fell. Our flesh when not in subjection to the Holy Spirit, falls.

Still, flesh seems to work better for me than "sin nature".

I know that no man "in the flesh" can please God and no "flesh" will enter the Kingdom of God, and the Spirit leads us to put to death the deeds of the flesh.

I have never read where the Spirit leads us to put to death the "sin nature", but rather the "deeds of the flesh".

What do you think?

Blessings to you all, I am really enjoying all the feedback and working through this with you.

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/9 18:33

I think the 'SN' referred to is that inward bent that is in all of us to do evil. Think it's not there?

Put two three year old babies in the same play pen with one rubber ducky. See what happens. You DID NOT teach them to do that - it's IN them.

And it is still in us ever AFTER we are Saved by Faith.

That's why our Father did the Plan that way which totally by-passes our ability and obligation to 'hold up our end' of the deal. He kept all the law to give us a Perfect Righteousness... that we would not have to 'complete.' We keep it today by simple Faith in the Cross of Christ.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 18:38

I agree. I am looking forward to my new body someday when I will be free from this corruptible body and freed from this body of flesh.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 18:47

Really?

Think about how the two or three year olds you used in your demonstration have been raised up to that point.

They need to be fed: they cry = satisfaction.

They need emotional comfort: they cry = satisfaction

They need a diaper change: they cry = satisfaction.

They need anything: they cry = satisfaction.

What have they been taught their whole life by those who raised them? They have been taught that it's all about SELF! Not only that, they have been taught by those whom have raised them and who care for them to fend for themselves no

matter what. This is what has been interestingly titled, the "I" Principle. And with conversion, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me. And the life which I now live, in the flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me."

I guess it is in them, but they were not born with it.

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/9 19:00

AH! I thought I'd be in this all by myself!

That's exactly right!

We come out of the womb even screaming for attention! Yes indeed!

then we're told 'do this, don't do that' stand up, sit down... and all other manner of learning how to play church and be 'in dependent' all on our own.

That's why it's only revealed By the Spirit, who Jesus is.

flesh (carnality) cannot as in it is impossible to receive the Kingdom into itself. But God found a Way! Amen!

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 19:06

IF SIN WERE A SINFUL NATURE,
THEN:

by Dennnis Carroll

1. God originated SIN
 2. God will punish those who have been punished for Adam's sin, because they have been punished for Adam's sin.
 3. Jesus could have married a virgin and produced a holy race by natural generation
 4. Man is more benevolent and just than GOD
- i.e. man's idea of justice is injustice, and that of injustice is just
5. All human governments are inherently evil, for inability is never punished, and natural attributes are not considered evil.
 6. The physical change that happened at the fall removed the sinner from the obligation to obey the moral law, for the moral law addresses only those able to obey it.
 7. A physical change is necessary in regeneration.
 8. If a physical change occurs, then a loss of identity occurs,
- however, Paul was always Paul.
9. God saving man from sin would be a matter of justice and not grace
 10. God would be obligated, by justice, to relieve the unfortunate, rather than be gracious to the rebel.
 11. Jesus did not become Man, with a sinful nature:
- Therefore, he was not tempted in all points like as we are, nor touched with the feelings of our infirmities.
12. The will is not free.
 13. How could Adam and Eve Sin?

14. How could angels sin?
 15. Children go to hell.
 16. All aborted babies go to hell.
 17. Sin is a calamity, not a crime
 18. Repentance is impossible, because the conscience will never condemn the sinner of his inability.
 19. Immediate repentance and submission cannot be urged immediately upon the sinner. Because He CAN'T.
 20. Man is unable to repent.
 21. Physical regeneration is necessary
- This leads to universalism: FOR-
- If Power changes one's nature in regeneration
If God is all powerful
- If God is benevolent,
- HE must therefore, in justice, regenerate all sinners
22. It regards the atonement of Christ as unnecessary. he did not have to die for the misfortune of men.

Re: Sin Nature - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/9 19:26

Pilgrim, you write

I have never read where the Spirit leads us to put to death the "sin nature", but rather the "deeds of the flesh".

What do you think?

I think you are right, because the sin nature was put to death in Christ - He was made sin for us. On our part we have to reckon ourselves dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ.

David

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 19:32

Yes, David, I believe I can agree with that.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/9 19:44

Madefree

At last you come to the point. Point 11 IF SIN WERE A SINFUL NATURE, THEN: by Dennis Carroll

11. Jesus did not become Man, with a sinful nature: Therefore, he was not tempted in all points like as we are, nor touched with the feelings of our infirmities.

And this is where your heresy lies, which grows into the false doctrine you believe and teach.

Jesus was born of a virgin, by the power of the Holy Spirit. He was on this earth perfect man and perfect God. He was without sin, had no sinful nature and committed no sins. He lived a perfect holy life on this earth, and in obedience to His

Father, laid down that life for us.

How can you believe that Jesus had a sinful nature? Please explain

David

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 19:51

Ok, that was unclear from me. First, I did not write the article, and second remember the title is the point "IF Sin were a sinful nature" the article is based upon the fact that there is no sinful nature at all, and the points are founded upon a hypothetical situation. The point to that was IF. Because, if all men have a sinful nature, and Jesus became a man then either: A. He was not completely human and His life was not supernatural at all. Or B. He had the supposed "sin nature."

Just a disclaimer on my part, I do not believe in the sinful nature, nor any forms of the doctrine of Original Sin. I do not teach these and believe them to be theological fiction created by men with full heads of philosophy and hearts empty of God. Men who believe it may be saved, but the creators of such a doctrine I do not believe were converted.

Re: - posted by davidc (), on: 2010/11/9 19:57

thanks for explaining, although, to me the sinfulness of my nature before Christ came is clearly evident to me. But of course we should not build doctrine on personal experience. Anyway, it's 2 am and time for bed.

David

Re: The "Sin Nature" - posted by mkal, on: 2010/11/9 19:58

Romans 6 (Young's Literal Translation)

1What, then, shall we say? shall we continue in the sin that the grace may abound?

2let it not be! we who died to the sin -- how shall we still live in it?

3are ye ignorant that we, as many as were baptized to Christ Jesus, to his death were baptized?

4we were buried together, then, with him through the baptism to the death, that even as Christ was raised up out of the dead through the glory of the Father, so also we in newness of life might walk.

Notice, the literal translation is "the sin," or in other words, the sin nature. We could also say this relates to the sin principle or the law of sin and death.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 19:59

Have you checked the greek for that, or is that being a literal interpretation an assumption? The point of this topic is that we not trust man (Young was a man) and look to "Thus saith the LORD"

Re: sin nature, cont - posted by mkal, on: 2010/11/9 20:23

Kenneth Wuest on the subject: "The first thing we must settle is regarding the word "sin," does it refer here to sin as an abstraction, namely, to acts of sin committed by the believer, or to the totally depraved nature still in him? A rule of Greek syntax settles the question. The definite article appears before the word in Greek text. Here the article points back to a previously mentioned sin defined in its context. The reference is to sin reigning as king (5.21). There sin is personified since it reigns as king. But one cannot conceive of acts of sin reigning as king in the life of a person. They are the result of some dominant factor reigning as king. That can only be the evil nature still resident in the Christian. And here is the key to the interpretation of the entire chapter. Every time the word "sin" is used in this chapter as a noun, it refers to the evil nature in the Christian. Read the following verse and substitute the words "sinful nature" for the word "sin," and see what a flood of light is thrown upon your understanding of this section of God's Word (1,2,6,10,11,13,14,16,17,1

8,20,22,23).Â”

Other notes: In Romans 7, we see the self dependence and living under law which prevents the Holy Spirit from giving the believer victory over the sinful nature.

As far as a "Thus saith," it is a matter of having the reality revealed within us.

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/9 20:27

yes, mKAL is on the right track,

do some interlinear study and look at where the word sin is in Rom. It usually has the word TON or TOV right in front. That means 'The Sin' and we can argue with original Scripture for a while now...

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 20:32

But does, "the sin" mean a sinful nature? I will look into it though. (the greek that is) What is sin? "Sin is the transgression of the law" this requires action. I have read of Wuest who John Phillips references many times, I didn't see that mentioned.

One thing I have wondered about, is that cliché
"We sin because we are sinners."

Does this mean that if someone drives too fast down the road, breaking the speed limit, it is from within? Do we speed because we are speeders? or is one a speeder because he speeds?

What I'm trying to say, what about action in sin?

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/9 20:34

Quote:

-----That can only be the evil nature still resident in the Christian

According to Romans 6, a Christian, by definition would not have an evil nature inside him. It would have been dead when they died with Christ and were raised to life with him. If a Christian has an evil nature then what is a new creation? Now the flesh is weak, and can be tempted to Sin, but the Spirit is willing and there is a way to overcome in Jesus for he was tempted in all ways as well.

"Madefree" Mike, on: 2010/11/9 20:36

first let me say with trepidation, welcome.

i must confess to you, that i have a check in my spirit regarding your postings here.

some might say, this would be better suited for a PM. but i say bring it out in the light, and it's a simple question:

are you a "Pelagian"?

this thread in my humble view went off the rails a long time ago, when those with agenda came onto this forum, came on to this thread, and sow confusion, dissent, and a spirit of anti-christ.

i'm not accusing you of that, but it seems to me, every time this little cyber communitas makes enormous breakthroughs in the Unity and Love of Jesus, that's precisely the moment the enemy attacks.

we recently witnessed this when a thread popped up about a man's ministry, regarding this very issue, and much contention abounded. Dear Brother Paul West shut that thread down immediately, but right on its heels this thread reared its ugly head.

now my dear Mike, i'm not accusing you of this, but i did search out that website you presented with a fine tooth comb, and there were many similarities with the poster who had been banned,

again i ask, are you a pelagian? yes or no?

Re: MyVeryHeart - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 20:36

Amen, That is the truth!

This is exactly the problem: through the teaching of the sinful nature, Satan has stolen victory from the believer! Not victory in themselves, a thousand times no, but IN CHRIST! Sin is rebellion with God, and salvation is submission to God.

Re: "Madefree" Mike - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 20:38

As far as I understand Pelagianism... No, I am not. I owe no allegiance to a man, or his theological systems, but to the One who saved me from myself.

BTW, Which website did you search?

If you really want to know what I believe, or closest to it, go to this one: www.straightpaths bible church.com

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 20:43

Just the same, after re-reading your post, if I have been a hinderance in any way to the furtherance of Christian unity, I greatly and deeply apologize. It is not my goal to divide, but to try to bring to light what I believe to be the truth of God. Again, if it has happened that I have been a hinderance to Christian unity, I apologize.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/9 20:45

Quote:

-----This is exactly the problem: through the teaching of the sinful nature, Satan has stolen victory from the believer! Not in themselves, a thousand times no, but IN CHRIST! Sin is rebellion with God, and salvation is submission to God.

Now the flipside to this, the flesh is very weak. And if we grieve the Spirit we can come into bondage to sin very easily. That is why we need to pick up our cross daily and crucify the flesh by the power of the Holy Spirit. This is a serious daily walk of nailing that flesh, where no good thing dwells, to your cross.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2010/11/9 20:47

""""According to Romans 6, a Christian, by definition would not have an evil nature inside him.""""

If it were so, that would mean that Christ and Satan live in the Same temple. Which is impossible.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 21:00

After prayer, I feel it is within all best interests that I leave this thread at this time, having stated my beliefs upon this subject.

I wish you all the greatest blessings from the Hand of the Almighty, and I believe we may rejoice that this thread has even started. This is a firstfruit of awakening, when people begin to say "why?" instead of living on spoon-fed theology. No matter what viewpoint you hold on the subject at hand, it is a thankworthy thing that you have thought about what you have been told, and have "searched the Scriptures" Praise God.

My very best.

P. S. I greatly apologize if any of my words have seemed confusing or hostile, I mean not for them to be that way, I have weighed this with tears and prayer, and I pray that God would not let the words come out in such a way.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/9 21:00

Quote:

-----it refers to the evil nature in the Christian

Mr. Wuest says these things. But I am not so convinced.

And those who belong to Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with its passions and desires. Galatians 5:24

Re: - posted by mkal, on: 2010/11/9 21:00

Brothers and Sisters, I want to apologize as I feel perhaps my references to the Greek or original meanings, etc., may just lead to a wrong spirit of conversation here. I would only say that I believe Jesus Christ and him crucified is the answer to the issues of sin and sins - and flesh.

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 21:01

Mike, it was the "gospeltruth. net site, that gave me pause.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/9 21:04

Quote:

-----Brothers and Sisters, I want to apologize as I feel perhaps my references to the Greek or original meanings, etc., may just lead to a wrong spirit of conversation here. I would only say that I believe Jesus Christ and him crucified is the answer to the issues of sin and sins - and flesh.

Let peace reign among us brothers and sisters in Christ Jesus.

Re: - posted by Madefree (), on: 2010/11/9 21:04

Before I leave,

I do not agree with all on that website, but there seemed to be a big Finney confusion, and that site had his works on the re. There are a few (note, few) other good resources on there, but I DO NOT agree with most of the people on that site. (see my other post with www.straightpaths bible church.com on it, as before mentioned, that is what I believe.)

Thank you for your concern, brother.

Yes, Mykal, that is the answer: Christ, and Him crucified. A thousand Amens.

relationship - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/9 21:37

Many say that once the Believer is Saved, the SN is eradicated. Not exactly so.

This is because we still live in the same earth suit but now by Faith. And God counts that as if it (glorification) has already happened. He does not look on the outward.

our relationship w/ the old man/ old nature has died. It's severed. You can be married and then not be married. The relationship is no more but the two people are alive somewhere.

There is STILL an inward bent to evil desire within every Christian. If you do not think so, let's put all your thoughts from the past 24 hrs on a big screen and eat popcorn.

The real matter is what I think the Lord intended this post to go to. How to get and maintain Victory over these desires that easily take us at times.

So let us examine the real issue here.

After Salvation, do we then switch back to the power of the flesh to be Sanctified? If that happens, surely we fail. Most of the Church does not realize this.

"hey, try my 12 step program"

"do what I did to stop that sin brother"

"read your Bible more"

are just a few of the dumb things people say to Believers -who had shifted their object of Faith from the Event that took place on Calvary, to their own power i.e., the flesh- and are now experiencing bouts of sinful activity in their lives.

That is the Romans 7 experience. WE want to go from Rom 6 straight to Rom 8. But we DO and I yell, WE DO, go through a Romans 7 road and bang our head against the wall until we place our faith back in Jesus and Him Crucified.

hope this helps us.

Remember, the real important issue of this thread-

Re: relationship - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/9 22:48

Quote:

-----There is STILL an inward bent to evil desire within every Christian

No there is not. Stop talking about the bride of Christ that way. She does not have some inward bent to evil desire. She desires her bridegroom.

Quote:

-----our relationship w/ the old man/ old nature has died. It's severed. You can be married and then not be married. The relationship is no more but the two people are alive somewhere.

The Word does not say that a "relationship" has died it says

"He who has died is free from sin" Romans 6:7

"Or do you not know that all of us who have been baptized into Christ Jesus have been baptized into His death?" Romans 6:3

"For the love of Christ controls us, having concluded this, that one died for all, therefore all died;" 2 Corinthians 5:14

"Therefore if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old things passed away; behold, new things have come." 2 Corinthians 5:17

Quote:

-----The real matter is what I think the Lord intended this post to go to. How to get and maintain Victory over these desires that easily take us at times.

Believe the Word of God and he will set you free.

"and you will know the truth, and the truth will make you free." John 8:32

Re: - posted by StarofG0D (), on: 2010/11/9 23:06

Quote:
-----No there is not. Stop talking about the bride of Christ that way. She does not have some inward bent to evil desire. She desires her bridegroom.

haha travis thank you for that

Re: , on: 2010/11/9 23:57

The next day after you are saved, you are still living in the same flesh. Your flesh did not change. It is still the same. Your heart changed. Your desires changed and you were indwelt by the Spirit of God.

Now, you are a baby Christian and it is time to learn the love walk. (Turning from sin and loving the Lord with all your heart, mind, soul and strength and your neighbor as yourself).

You also have an enemy that will pervert and corrupt every Word that God says to you from His Word. Doubts will come, despair will come and hopelessness to walk this walk will come. God will bring you to the place where you realize from His Word and your own experience that YOU cannot walk this walk. Only Christ in you can and will overcome.

Gal 2:20 I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

You have become a citizen of heaven by having the faith of Abraham which was accounted to you as righteousness, because you exercised faith in the person of Jesus Christ and what He did for you.

But still you are in your same flesh.

But now it is time to learn about walking in this new life and to understand the law of the Spirit of life, because it has set you free from the law of sin and death.

Rom 8:2 For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death.

Our initial confession is based on faith and your entire walk in this world will still be based on faith. That is why the Word says to "reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin".

Rom 6:11 Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The righteousness of the law will only be fulfilled in us if we walk after the Spirit.

Rom 8:4 That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

We can still be carnally minded because we live in the flesh.

Rom 8:6 For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life and peace.

And if you are in the flesh (not in a body, meaning carnal), then you are not in communion and close fellowship with God.

Rom 8:8 So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God.

Adam did not stay in fellowship with God. How? By obeying His Word.

Jesus said, if you love me you will obey my commandments and HE and HIS Father will come to us and make their abode with us. That is walking in the Spirit and reckoning ourselves dead to sin. By loving Jesus and obeying Him.

We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ. Don't give up walking with Him. If you fall, get up, confess your sins and He is faithful and will forgive you.

But keep pressing forward and as you obey His Word you will receive more and more light about this walk that He has called you to.

The mercy of the Lord endureth forever.

Is Christ in you, are you in Him?

Rom 8:10 And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness.

So, we are warned to not live after the flesh or else we will die.

Rom 8:13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

What does it mean die? Bodily or Spiritual?

Well it contrasts it with this verse.

Rom 8:14 For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

So if you are not led by the Spirit of God, what are you?

Rom 8:15 For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.

Folks, it is really simple, and we don't need a whole lot of theology.

You will love the LORD with ALL your HEART, ALL your SOUL, ALL your MIND, ALL your STRENGTH and your NEIGHBOR as yourself.

This fulfills the Law and this is walking in the Spirit.

Re: - posted by StarofGOD (), on: 2010/11/10 0:09

Rom 8:8,9

verse 9 But yet are in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.

Sounds like this verse is referring to unbelievers, HE IS NONE OF HIS.

We are not in the flesh, but IN the Spirit.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 0:25

And he said to all, If any will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.

Luke 9:23

Re: , on: 2010/11/10 0:37

Paul is talking to Christians. He calls them brethren and says they will die unless they mortify the deeds of the body.

Rom 8:12 Therefore, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh.

Rom 8:13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 0:45

Quote:

-----Rom 8:13 For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live.

exactly!!! It is a narrow way. Yes we are a new creation, but the flesh must be mortified daily by the power of the Holy Spirit. All this is done by FAITH in CHRIST. We must trust him completely.

Re: - posted by knitefall, on: 2010/11/10 7:53

myveryheart and star of God, your posts are laughable.

So how about we put your thoughts up on that screen I talked about? still think you are not capable of wickedness?

Not trying to call you out but 1000s of Christians who are trying to figure out how to please God are failing. And they do not know why. It's important to know what is going on.

Yes, according to God's eyes, the Bride is spotless. But as far as the rest of us, we live in the REAL world w/ failures. We are not pharisees that say we are now perfect and no longer need Jesus and Grace daily...

So as far as those of us who were offended by such a dumb and condemning statements, please forgive these people-

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/10 8:55

MyVeryHeart said:

Quote:
-----According to Romans 6, a Christian, by definition would not have an evil nature inside him. It would have been dead when they died with Christ and were raised to life with him. If a Christian has an evil nature then what is a new creation? Now the flesh is weak, and can be tempted to Sin, but the Spirit is willing and there is a way to overcome in Jesus for he was tempted in all ways as well.

Amen! It has so often been portrayed that Christians have a duality of nature. The most common picture I have heard painted was that of a white dog and a black dog living inside of us and the one we feed the most will be the one who dominates. The only scriptural support for this view is what I consider a gross misinterpretation of Roman's 7. When read in context with chapter 6 and chapter 8, chapter 7 quickly comes into context and makes sense in the flow of the letter. We are crucified with Christ. Our old man is dead. So, even if we had a "sin nature" it is gone now that we have been born again. Old things have passed away, all things are made new. The body of sin had been put to death. Romans 6 and 7 tie the law and sin together inextricably. The law, though holy, gave strength to sin, caused it to be known as exceedingly sinful, and caused us to die in our own efforts to keep a law that we knew to be just and holy and that in our spirits

we longed to keep. When we died with Christ we died to the law. In doing this we quit trusting in our own effort to be righteous and received a righteousness that was not our own. We entered into the sabbath rest of faith in Christ. We ceased from our own labors. We became dead to sin and now we live in Christ or rather He lives through us.

The real danger in believing we have a "sin nature" is the tendency this idea has to keep us bound by sin. When we have a revelation of our new creation, of our regeneration, of being made completely righteous in our spirits, of being totally dead to sin, we then have power over sin like we never had before. We no longer see ourselves as locked in a struggle with an old nature trying to overcome it, but we see ourselves as walking in the liberty wherein Christ has made us free. (Of course I am talking about seeing ourselves in the spirit. Not psychology, but rather a spiritual reality that is revealed to us in our hearts by the Holy Spirit.) When we awake to righteousness we are empowered by God's grace to sin not. Recall the letter to Titus that teaches us that it is God's grace that teaches us not to sin. It is His grace that empowers us. When we reckon ourselves dead to sin and alive unto God, when we get a revelation of what we have been made in the spirit, when we awake to what we are, then we no longer strive in our own strength, but rely on His and have victory.

Re: - posted by twayneb (), on: 2010/11/10 8:59

Quote:
-----Quote: This is exactly the problem: through the teaching of the sinful nature, Satan has stolen victory from the believer! Not in themselves, a thousand times no, but IN CHRIST! Sin is rebellion with God, and salvation is submission to God. Now the flipside to this, the flesh is very weak. And if we grieve the Spirit we can come into bondage to sin very easily. That is why we need to pick up our cross daily and crucify the flesh by the power of the Holy Spirit. This is a serious daily walk of nailing that flesh, where no good thing dwells, to your cross.

Yes. The battle is not one of two conflicting natures, but it is the battle against the flesh. When I was born again, there was a part of me that was regenerated (spirit) and a part of me that was not (flesh or body, mind, and emotions). I am being transformed in my mind and emotions from glory to glory by the Word of God and the Spirit of God. But I will still battle the flesh. But now I have power to be victorious through Jesus Christ. However, if I do miss the mark and sin, I have an advocate with the Father, Christ Jesus and I can rely on His grace and forgiveness, repent, and keep going with Him. Praise God for that!

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 9:14

Quote:
-----myveryheart and star of God, your posts are laughable.

This isn't funny

Quote:
-----So how about we put your thoughts up on that screen I talked about? still think you are not capable of wickedness?

Every thought does not originate with us. Some are fiery darts shot by the devil. That is why we must bring every, every, every, thought captive to the obedience of Christ.

Quote:
-----Not trying to call you out but 1000s of Christians who are trying to figure out how to please God are failing. And they do not know why. It's important to know what is going on.

The reason that many who try to please God are failing is because they do not trust God but instead trust in their own flesh to please God. They have invented a form of Godliness that lacks the power thereof. they are striving in the Flesh. T

he flesh profits nothing.

Quote:
-----Yes, according to God's eyes, the Bride is spotless. But as far as the rest of us, we live in the REAL world w/ failures. We are not pharisees that say we are now perfect and no longer need Jesus and Grace daily...

God sees things as they really are. If his Bride is spotless then she is really spotless because the Holy Spirit is inside of her, she has been justified by Christ, and she mortifies the flesh daily, God has cleansed Her, he has done it SHE HAS NOT done it herself. She needs grace daily, and communion with her LORD daily, lest she die from want of HIM. You seem to be receiving some kind of strange teaching on the Bride of Christ. I am concerned for you.

Quote:
-----So as far as those of us who were offended by such a dumb and condemning statements, please forgive these people-

Unless our righteousness exceeds that of the Pharisees we will NOT enter the kingdom of Heaven. They were like clean cups on the outside but filthy on the inside. The children of the Kingdom are clean inside and out. And if they do happen to fall from Grace then the blood of Christ cleanses them as they confess their sin. The Children of the Kingdom are humble of heart and realize they are so needy of his Grace. That is why they are not Pharisees, they realize they are sinners and need the mercy of God every, every, every day. And so they ask God for it and they are justified.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 9:27

Quote:
-----The real danger in believing we have a "sin nature" is the tendency this idea has to keep us bound by sin.

Or to use it to justify your sin.

Quote:
-----When we reckon ourselves dead to sin and alive unto God, when we get a revelation of what we have been made in the spirit, when we awake to what we are, then we no longer strive in our own strength, but rely on His and have victory.

Amen. It is Christ in us and it is by Faith (complete trust) in Him that we walk this out daily.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2010/11/10 9:49

I found the following essay by Jerry Bridges entitled Gospel Driven Sanctification. It has really helped me understand what it means for a Christian to be dead to sin. I am posting only a portion.

What does Paul mean when he says we died to sin? It's fairly obvious he doesn't mean we died to the daily committal of sin. If that were true, no honest person could claim to be justified because we all sin daily. None of us truly loves God with our whole being and none of us actually loves our neighbor as ourselves (see Matt. 22:35-40). Nor does it mean we have died in the sense of being no longer responsive to sin's temptations, as some have taught. If that were true, Peter's admonition to abstain from the passions of the flesh would be pointless (see 1 Pet. 2:11). So what does Paul mean?

Some Bible commentators believe that Paul means only that we have died to the penalty of sin. That is, because of our union with Christ, when Christ died to sin's penalty we also died to sin's penalty. Well, it certainly means that, but it also means much more. It also means we died to sin's dominion.

What is the dominion of sin? In Romans 5:21, Paul speaks of sin's reign. And in Colossians 1:13, he speaks of the dominion of darkness. When Adam sinned in the Garden, we all sinned through our legal union with him (see Rom. 5:12-21). That is, because of our identity with Adam we all suffered the consequence of his sin. And a part of that consequence is to be born into this world under the reign or dominion of sin. Paul describes what it means to be under this dominion in Eph

esians 2:1-3. He says we were spiritually dead; we followed the ways of the world and the devil; we lived in the passions of our sinful natures and were, by nature, objects of God's wrath.

This slavery to the dominion of sin then is part of the penalty due to our guilt of sin. Through our union with Christ in his death, however, our guilt both from Adam's and from our own personal sins was forever dealt with. Having died with Christ to the guilt of sin, we also as a consequence died to the dominion of sin. We cannot continue in sin as a dominant way of life because the reign of sin over us has forever been broken.

This death to the dominion of sin over us is known theologically as definitive sanctification. It refers to the decisive break with, or separation from, sin as a ruling power in a believer's life. It is a point-in-time event, occurring simultaneously with justification. It is the fundamental change wrought in us by the monergistic action of the Holy Spirit (that is, by the Spirit acting alone without human permission or assistance) when he delivers us from the kingdom of darkness and transfers us into the kingdom of Christ. This definitive break with the dominion of sin occurs in the life of everyone who trusts in Christ as Savior. There is no such thing as justification without definitive sanctification. They both come to us as a result of Christ's work for us.

Consider Yourselves Dead to Sin

So we are free from both the guilt and the dominion of sin. But what use is this information to us? How can it help us live out a gospel-based pursuit of sanctification? Here Paul's instructions in Romans 6:11 are helpful: "So you also must consider yourselves dead to sin and alive to God in Christ Jesus."

It is important we understand what Paul is saying here because he is not telling us to do something but to believe something. We are to believe that we are dead through Christ to both sin's penalty and its dominion. But this is not something we make come true by believing it. We simply are dead to sin, whether we believe it or not. But the practical effects of our death to sin can be realized only as we believe it to be true.

The fact is that we are guilty in ourselves, but God no longer charges that guilt against us because it has already been borne by Christ as our substitute. The sentence has been served. The penalty has been paid. We have died to sin, both to its guilt and to its dominion. That is why Paul can write, "Blessed is the man against whom the Lord will not count his sin" (Rom. 4:8).

But the question arises, "If I've died to sin's dominion, why do I still struggle with sin patterns in my life?" The answer to that question lies in the word struggle. Unbelievers do not struggle with sin. They may seek to overcome some bad habit, but they do not see that habit as sin. They do not have a sense of sin against a holy God. Believers, on the other hand, struggle with sin as sin. We see our sinful words, thoughts, and deeds as sin against God; and we feel guilty because of it. This is where we must continue to go back to the gospel. To consider ourselves dead to sin is to believe the gospel.

This doesn't mean that we just believe the gospel and live complacently in our sin. Absolutely not! Go back again to Paul's words in Romans 6:1-2. We died both to sin's guilt and its dominion. Though sin can wage war against us (hence our struggle), it cannot reign over us. That is also part of the gospel. But the success of our struggle with sin begins with our believing deep down in our hearts that regardless of our failures and our struggle, we have died to sin's guilt. We must believe that however often we fail, there is no condemnation for us (Rom. 8:1).

William Romaine, who was one of the leaders of the eighteenth-century revival in England, wrote, "No sin can be crucified either in heart or life unless it first be pardoned in conscience.... If it be not mortified in its guilt, it cannot be subdued in its power." What Romaine was saying is that if you do not believe you have died to sin's guilt, you cannot trust Christ for the strength to subdue its power in your life. So the place to begin in dealing with sin is to believe the gospel when it says you have died to sin's guilt.

Progressive Sanctification

Warring against our sinful habits and seeking to put on Christlike character is usually called sanctification. But because the term definitive sanctification is used to describe the point-in-time deliverance from the dominion of sin, it is helpful to speak of Christian growth in holiness as progressive sanctification. Additionally, the word progressive indicates continual growth in holiness over time. The New Testament writers both assume growth (see 1 Cor. 6:9-11; Eph. 2:19-21; Col. 2:19; 2 Thess. 1:3); and continually urge us to pursue it (see 2 Cor. 7:1; Heb. 12:14; 2 Pet. 3:18). There is no place in authentic Christianity for stagnant, self-satisfied, and self-righteous Christians. Rather we should be seeking to grow in Christlikeness until we die.

This progressive sanctification always involves our practice of spiritual disciplines, such as reading Scripture, praying, and regularly fellowshiping with other believers. It also involves putting to death the sinful deeds of the body (see Rom. 8:13) and putting on Christlike character (see Col. 3:12-14). And very importantly it involves a desperate dependence on Christ for the power to do these things, for we cannot grow by our own strength.

So sanctification involves hard work and dependence on Christ; what I call dependent effort. And it will always mean we are dissatisfied with our performance. For a growing Christian, desire will always outstrip performance or, at least, perceived performance. What is it then that will keep us going in the face of this tension between desire and performance? The answer is the gospel. It is the assurance in the gospel that we have indeed died to the guilt of sin and that there is no condemnation for us in Christ Jesus that will motivate us and keep us going even in the face of this tension.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 10:00

Quote:
-----What does Paul mean when he says we died to sin? It's fairly obvious he doesn't mean we died to the daily committal of sin. If that were true, no honest person could claim to be justified because we all sin daily

Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. 1 John 3:9

We know that whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but he that is begotten of God keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not. 1 John 5:18

For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the law, but under grace. Romans 6:14

Re: The "Sin Nature", on: 2010/11/10 10:18

Quote:
-----It's fairly obvious he doesn't mean we died to the daily committal of sin. If that were true, no honest person could claim to be justified because we all sin daily

This statement shows exactly where Calvinism goes wrong. Suddenly, (for whatever reason), the focus goes off Christ, our Passover Lamb who was sacrificed for us, and on to me me me and my failures.

1 John 2

1 My little children, these things write I unto you, that ye sin not. And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: 2 And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the whole world. 3 And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. 4 He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him. 5 But whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him. 6 He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked.

The overwhelming assertion of John's words are, that victory over sin is possible most of the time, and IF we sin, we have a great Advocate in the heavens, reminding our Father that He died for us.

It is entirely true, that each sin begins with a single thought, or springs from an unrenewed mind. However IF we believe that we are dead, or can reckon ourselves dead, then those thoughts can be repelled. We don't need to take ownership of them, or, we can choose to bury them in Christ's death immediately.

For by one offering He has perfected for ever, them that are sanctified. (Heb 10:14).

Re: , on: 2010/11/10 10:24

And God's Word emphasizes the positive, right?

Walk in the Spirit and you will not fulfill the lusts of the flesh.

If you are walking in the Spirit, the lusts of the flesh will be a non-factor. You will not fulfill them.

If this is the Christian's avenue to victory of the flesh, maybe we should look into what "walking in the Spirit", really is.

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 10:37

Quote:

-----If this is the Christian's avenue to victory of the flesh, maybe we should look into what "walking in the Spirit", really is.

As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus the Lord, walk ye in him: Colossians 2:6

Re: , on: 2010/11/10 10:40

I did a study one time about putting on the armour of God.

Each piece of armour (salvation, righteousness, gospel of peace, truth, etc) really is the Lord Jesus. My study culminated in this verse and it all made sense to me.

Rom 13:14 But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

It is interesting what the Word tells us to "put off" and what it tells us to "put on".

Where is our focus? - posted by makrothumia (), on: 2010/11/10 10:46

Some seem to think there is great benefit dissecting the rotting corpse of the sin nature of the first Adam

I choose instead to fix my eyes upon the righteous character of the life giving Spirit of the second Adam

We are nowhere told to fixate on our total depravity

We are strongly admonished to fix our eyes upon the author and perfecter of our faith.

Those who gaze upon the glory of God in the face of Christ will be transformed into the same image from glory to glory

I wonder what will be gained from those gazing upon Adam's rotting corpse?

Re: - posted by MyVeryHeart (), on: 2010/11/10 10:49

Quote:

-----It is interesting what the Word tells us to "put off" and what it tells us to "put on".

Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry:

For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience: In the which ye also walked some time, when ye lived in them. But now ye also put off all these; anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, filthy communication out of your mouth. Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds; And have put on the new, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him: Colossians 3:5-10

Let us put on love and let peace also reign in our hearts for Christ is Risen!!!

Re: , on: 2010/11/10 11:23

Rom 13:12 The night is far spent, the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.

Gal 3:27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

Eph 4:24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

Eph 6:11 Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

Col 3:10 And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him:

Col 3:12 Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering;

Col 3:14 And above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.

Rom 13:14 But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfil the lusts thereof.

Re: - posted by Renoncer, on: 2010/11/10 15:35

To all who have ears to hear:

Regardless of what your position is on "Christians struggling against sin" or "being born-again preceding/following repentance", remember this: If you are outside of Christ, you are condemned already.

Whoever believes in Him is not condemned, but whoever does not believe is condemned already, because he has not believed in the name of the only Son of God (John 3:18). For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, and are justified by His grace as a gift, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Romans 3:23-24).

Crystal clear. Justification is in Christ alone, and every single person needs it. Why? Because all have sinned. Who is it that justifies? God. (Romans 8:33) Does God justify on the basis of upholding the Law? No. Then what becomes of our boasting? It is excluded. By what kind of law? By a law of works? No, but by the law of faith. For we hold that one is justified by faith apart from works of the law (Romans 3:27-28).

Salvation is a work of God, not without effect. Therefore, no one born of God makes a practice of sinning, for God's seed abides in him, and he cannot keep on sinning because he has been born of God. By this it is evident who are the children of God, and who are the children of the devil: whoever does not practice righteousness is not of God, nor is the one who does not love his brother (1 John 3:9-10).

I can tell you that I have been crucified with Christ. It is no longer I who live, but Christ who lives in me. And the life I now live in the flesh I live by faith in the Son of God, who loved me and gave Himself for me (Galatians 2:20).

What about you? Have you died with Christ? Is it Christ who lives in you? Or is it still the same old you, trying to work your way into heaven? If you are outside of Christ, you are a slave to sin, even if you do not realize it (Ephesians 2:1-5; Romans 6:16-18). You do not live to please God, indeed, you cannot do so (Hebrews 11:6). But, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has passed away and behold, the new has come (2 Corinthians 5:17).

Thus, remember that there is none righteous, no, not one (Romans 3:10). But Jesus was wounded for our transgressions; He was crushed for our iniquities; upon Him was the chastisement that brought us peace, and with His stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned--everyone--to his own way; and the LORD has laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Isaiah 53:5-6).

Stop trying to justify your wickedness. Stop trying to diminish the sinfulness of man. Stop accusing God by your twisted reasoning. Stop exchanging the wisdom of God for your supposed wisdom, since the foolishness of God is wiser than men (1 Corinthians 1:25).

Therefore I tell you, seek the LORD while He may be found; call upon Him while He is near. Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; let him return to the LORD, that He may have compassion on him; to our God, for He will abundantly pardon. "For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, declares the LORD. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways and my thoughts than your thoughts" (Isaiah 55:6-9).

Know this: Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved (Romans 10:13). Call on Him, while the light is still with you.

Re: - posted by JB1968 (), on: 2010/11/11 22:47

Do we have a separate sin nature or a depraved corrupted sinful human nature that has been twisted by the fall? Otherwise, known as the sinful nature, original sin, depravity, carnality, the flesh, etc.

It's obvious from Scripture that we are not born pure, but sinful. But thank God there is a cure in the blood of Christ!