

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is there a sin nature?

Is there a sin nature? - posted by InLove, on: 2013/4/26 16:55

I will start with my position so that it doesn't seem like I'm trying to argue. I'm honestly searching scripture and looking for the answer. I pray that you will not be upset in answering, but through love you would explain your point clearly with scripture.

Ok. From what I read in scripture I see no direct link to a sin nature. The closest I have found it this, Rom 5:12 NASB - 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--

But still even in this I see no nature just plain facts that all have sinned. I BELIEVE, no hard fact, but think that the reason we sin is because that God is away/apart from us starting off. When we are born we start off alone so since God is the only good, Mar 10:18 NASB - And Jesus said to him, "Why do you call Me good? No one is good except God alone." We must fall because He is not there, not because we are bent toward sin.

I believe fundamentally that being "saved", converted is the restoration of that relationship God intended. So by that we have God and thus since God is good we can resist sin, because of Christ in His work on the cross, providing the Holy Spirit to empower us.

This is just a quick thought that is not well explained, but I would like to hear input with well clear explanation please along with scripture please.

Thanks much and In Love,
Joe

Re: Is there a sin nature? - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/26 19:04

Now let me start by saying you must put away your doctrine and be free from anything that might hinder your understanding... 2 Cor. 4:4 declares that it is the god of this world who blinds the mind of our understanding; he wants to play down sin and hide our desperate condition from us.

The exceeding sinfulness of sin can only be exposed when the Spirit turns the light of God's law upon our conscience and heart. What is needed is an inward revelation from God, giving a deep consciousness of what I am in His sight, this will cause you to loathe and condemn yourself, resulting in a bitter sorrow, a holy horror and repentance.

Job saw his true condition...

Job 42: 5-6 "I have heard of You by the hearing of the ear, but now my eye sees You. Therefore I abhor myself, And repent in dust and ashes."

David saw his true condition...

Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. Psalm 51:5

Paul saw his true condition..

Romans 7: 17-20 But now, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) nothing good dwells; for to will is present with me, but how to perform what is good I do not find. For the good that I will to do, I do not do; but the evil I will not to do, that I practice. Now if I do what I will not to do, it is no longer I who do it, but sin that dwells in me

Where did the sin dwell? In Him

That's why he cried O wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?

Quote: So by that we have God and thus since God is good we can resist sin, because of Christ in His work on the cross, providing the Holy Spirit to empower us.

The work of the cross is not so we can resist sin, the work of the cross was to destroy the Old man the body of death... Rom 6:6

Why-----so that the body of sin might be destroyed

Why-----so that we should no longer serve sin

When Paul cried out O wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? He was crying out to be delivered from the Old man that Adamic nature, the body of sin...

Why-----because he didn't want to serve sin that was in him Roms 7:20

Re: Is there a sin nature? - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/26 19:07

Hi Joe

I do not find that enough scriptural support to convince me that men have a sinful nature.

It seems from my research that such teachings started with St Augustine.

Here is what Paris Reidhead had to say about the doctrine:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pHgsZv1JyJE>

Here is Excerpts from Charles G. Finney's Sermon

THE EXCUSES OF SINNERS :

Men plead a sinful nature for their excuse. And pray, what is this sinful nature? Do you mean by it that every faculty and even the very essence of your constitution were poisoned and made sinful in Adam, and came down in this polluted state by inheritance to you? Do you mean that you were so born in sin that the substance of your being is all saturated with it, and so that all the faculties of your constitution are themselves sin? Do you believe this?

I admit if this were true, it would make out a hard case. A hard case indeed! Until the laws of my reason are changed, it would compel me to speak out openly and say--Lord, this is a hard case, that Thou shouldst make my nature itself a sinner, and then charge the guilt of its sin upon me! I could not help saying this; the deep echoings of my inner being would proclaim it without ceasing, and the breaking of ten thousand thunderbolts over my head would not deter me from thinking and saying so. The reason God has given me would forever affirm it.

But the dogma is an utter absurdity. For, pray, what is sin? God answers--"transgression of law." And now you hold that your nature is itself a breach of the law of God--nay, that it has always been a breach of God's law, from Adam to the day of your birth; you hold that the current of this sin came down in the veins and blood of your race--and who made it so? Who created the veins and blood of man? From whose hand sprang this physical constitution and this mental constitution? Was man his own creator? Did sin do a part of the work in creating your physical and your mental constitution? Do you believe any such thing? No; you ascribe your nature and its original faculties to God, and upon Him, therefore, you charge the guilty authorship of your "sinful nature."

But how strange a thing is this! If man is in fault for his sinful nature, why not condemn man for having blue or black eyes? The fact is, sin never can consist in having a nature, nor in what nature is; but only and alone in the bad use which we make of our nature. This is all. Our Maker will never find fault with us for what He has Himself done or made; certainly not. He will not condemn us, if we will only make a right use of our powers--of our intellect, our sensibility, and our will. He never holds us responsible for our original nature. If you will observe, you will find that God has given no law prescribing what sort of nature and constitutional powers we should have. He has given no law on these points, the transgression of which, if given, might somewhat resemble the definition of sin. But now since there is no law about nature, nature cannot be a transgression.

Here let me say, that if God were to make a law prescribing what nature or constitution a man must have, it could not po

ssibly be otherwise than unjust and absurd, for the reason that man's nature is not a proper subject for legislation, precept, and penalty, inasmuch as it lies entirely without the pale of voluntary action, or of any action of man at all. And yet thousands of men have held the dogma that sin consists in great part in having a sinful nature. Yes, through long ages of past history, grave theologians have gravely taught this monstrous dogma; it has resounded from pulpits, and has been stereotyped for the press, and men have seemed to be never weary of glorifying this dogma as the surest test of sound orthodoxy! Orthodoxy!! There never was a more infamous libel on Jehovah! It would be hard to name another dogma which more violently outrages common sense. It is nonsense--absurd and utter NONSENSE! I would to God that it were not even worse than nonsense! Think what mischief it has wrought! Think how it has scandalized the law, the government, and the character of God! Think how it has filled the mouths of sinners with excuses from the day of its birth to this hour!

Now I do not mean to imply that the men who have held this dogma have intelligently insulted God with it. I do not imply that they have been aware of the impious and even blasphemous bearings of this dogma upon Jehovah;--I am happy to think that some at least have done all this mischief ignorantly. But the blunder and the mischief have been none the less for the honest ignorance in which they were done.

<http://www.gospeltruth.net/menbornsinners/mbs23.htm>

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/26 23:47

Amen to that, proudpapa!

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

Rom 6:7 For he that is dead is freed from sin.

This video has some really good insights.

Augustine and Original Sin.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KVQ1t5i058Q>

Protestantism has imbibed more than they realize from this Catholic Church "father".

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/27 0:12

Protestantism is Augustinianism.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/27 0:15

Hi Pilgrim,

I watched most of the video when you posted it before, I liked it, much of the research came away with the same conclusion that my research has led me to

Re: Is there a sin nature? - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/4/27 0:54

Hi Joe. I too have become interested in this area in recent years and as I have looked at the Bible (instead of what is said about the Bible), I have found no evidence for a sinful nature.

As you say, one of the main passages used in support of sinful nature is Romans 5 I stepped through the implications of each phrase and became convinced that there was indeed no definite teaching on a sinful nature. Likewise, most of the Scriptures offered by proponents of a sinful nature are just admissions that the one speaking has sinned, but never is it attributed to a sinful nature.

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/27 11:15

Pro 1:23 Turn you at my reproof: behold, I will pour out my spirit unto you, I will make known my words unto you.

Teaching about the sin nature is all through the bible just all you need is for God to open your eyes..

That's what happen to me after praying and fasting God opened my eyes, he open my eyes to the fact that sin nature remained in me after conversion and he opened my eyes to see that he has made a way for you to be set free from that nature.. When I saw that nature in me I wept for a month all that could every time I went to pray was get on my knees and weep..

But I thank God that he spoke to me that there was a cure for our pitiful condition..

Since that day when reading my bible I see things differently it's there in the scriptures all through the scriptures the problem and the cure..

Hidden in plain sight...

Eph 6:19 And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel

In Ephesians we are told that the Gospel of Jesus Christ was a mystery. However, Jesus told the Jews to search the scriptures because these testified about him. As we know the Jews did not understand the scriptures and did not embrace the Gospel of Jesus. We can clearly see that while Paul and the other apostles used the Old Testament as the basis for their message, very few of the Jewish leadership understood it. So was it hidden from them only? Or did they just choose not to see it?

Rom 16:25 Now to him that is of power to stablish you according to my gospel, and the preaching of Jesus Christ, according to the revelation of the mystery, which was kept secret since the world began.

In this letter to the church, God declares that which was being preached came as a result of a revelation being given. A revelation is a revealing of that which was hidden from plain view. It was written in their language, but they did not see it or perceive it.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/27 15:17

Quote:

-----by proudpapa on 2013/4/26 21:15:38

Hi Pilgrim,

I watched most of the video when you posted it before, I liked it, much of the research came away with the same conclusion that my research has led me to.

Glad you watched it. Scott did a very good job, I thought. He was raised Catholic, came to Christ, sat under Calvinist teaching and then got delivered from that and made the Augustine and Original Sin video. Scott employs some clarity on the subject I have not seen before.

God bless,
Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/27 15:25

Some "teachers" say you sin, because you have a "sin nature", and even after being born of the spirit ("old man" dead), they believe the same thing.

So, if you sin, BECAUSE you have a "Sin Nature", then what made Adam and Eve sin?

Does your logic apply to them? Did they sin BECAUSE they had a SIN NATURE?

No, they did not. They were tempted (which is not a sin), by the TEMPTER, and then drawn away from the TRUTH by choosing to lust after that which was forbidden. Is the knowledge of sin, sin? No. But choosing to imbibe that knowledge (become intimate with it, partake of it) is sin. Choosing the "Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil" over the Knowledge of the Holy (Christ who is Truth), is sin.

So, no sin nature involved at all in Adam and Eve's decision to obey the lust of their FLESH rather than the voice of the Lord.

Sin Nature was introduced by the NIV. Most of you know the story about this, so I won't bore you.

So, can anyone answer why Adam and Eve sinned if they did not have a sin nature?

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/27 17:15

It is clear that the bible does not use the term 'sin nature' and as has been pointed out the use of this term by the NIV has greatly distorted the truth. The word is 'flesh' not sinful nature.

What the bible does say is that there is 'an old man' (Adamic nature if you will) and there is the 'flesh'.

The bible teaches us that the 'old man' was crucified with Christ (Romans 6:6) As a result we are no longer under the power of Sin in the flesh and can choose not to sin.

So those who are truly regenerated (born again) do not have a sinful nature as the old Adamamic nature has been crucified with Christ and we have the new nature of Christ (Galatians 2:20). We do have the flesh which is subject to sin, but we can mortify this flesh because of the new nature. The flesh is NOT the sinful nature as mis-translated by the NIV.

I would disagree with some here who think that no one has a sin nature. All who are unregenerate are still in Adam and not in Christ. As such they have a rebellious (sinful) nature. Otherwise what is the old man that is crucified with Christ? Also see Ephesians 2:3 that says we WERE by 'nature' children of wrath.

1 Corinthians 15:22 says that in Adam all die, even so all in Christ shall be made alive.

Jesus Christ is called the 'last' Adam, but the second 'man' (1 Corinthians 15:45-47). As the last Adam He 'became sin' and put an end to Adam on the cross, hence we can say our old man was crucified with Him. As the second man He is the first of a new race of man (not descended from Adam), hence we are born again from above and we have a new nature.

To answer Pilgrim's question about Adam and Eve sinning without a sin nature. Absolutely they did. However once they did fall, then sin entered the human race and as 1 Corinthians 15 says 'all died'. Died spiritually not just physically. Being by nature a descendant of Adam and inheriting sin does not excuse anyone sinning.

These are my thoughts.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/4/27 18:50

Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/27 18:53

of unclean lips

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/27 18:56

Man is not guilty for being man, he is guilty because he holds the truth.

Re: Is there a sin nature? - posted by romanchog (), on: 2013/4/27 19:41

I have not formed an opinion on this subject, but there is this scripture in Ephesians 2:3: "among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, just as the others" (NKJV)

By saying that we are by nature children of wrath, does that mean we have a sin nature?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/27 20:30

Hi Heydave,

I am glad that we can agree that the NIV 'has greatly distorted the truth'.

Heydave wrote /////I would disagree with some here who think that no one has a sin nature. All who are unregenerate are still in Adam and not in Christ. As such they have a rebellious (sinful) nature. Otherwise what is the old man that is crucified with Christ?/////

Ephesians 4 tells us what the old man is: v 22 That ye put off concerning the ((former conversation)) the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;

The old man is the "former conversation" not some mystical sin that is part of the substance of the soul passed on thru conception.

Heydave wrote ///Ephesians 2:3 that says we WERE by 'nature' children of wrath.///

Eph 2:3 is also clearly speaking of the natural course of man the "former conversation" : "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."

further more Ephesians clearly tells us :

" Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience."

Paul is saying that men are going to try to deceive us with vain words, telling us that it is not the (things) (the disobedience) that we do, but something else that cause us to be children of wrath

Heydave wrote /////1 Corinthians 15:22 says that in Adam all die, even so all in Christ shall be made alive./////

All of Adams offspring Die! agreed

Heydave wrote /////Jesus Christ is called the 'last' Adam, but the second 'man' (1 Corinthians 15:45-47). As the last Adam He 'became sin' and put an end to Adam on the cross, hence we can say we our old man was crucified with Him. As the second man He is the first of a new race of man (not descended from Adam), hence we are born again from above and we have a new nature./////

1 Corinthians 15:45-47 is not at all speaking of a sinful nature.

Heydave is 1 Corinthians 15:45-47 speaking of a post fall or prefall Adam ??

Heydave wrote /// 1 Corinthians 15 says 'all died'. Died spiritually not just physically.///

Paul says "I was alive without the law once" (born innocent) : but when the commandment came,(age of accountability) sin revived,(revived from one generation to the next, natural course of man ever since Adam.) and I died. (when guilt entered)

tered Pauls soul, he calls it death)

Re: - posted by InLove, on: 2013/4/27 23:00

Thank you all for your wonderful posts! I'm sorry it has took me so long to respond. I have been super busy. I'm glad there are like minds with me. I am in a holiness school currently and I just don't see their doctrine, but they have a love for God. I just don't see the scriptures the way they explain them. Thank you so much for your answers!

In Love,
Joe

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/27 23:40

Amen Joe.

"Love for God is not in question", but it is important to know that sin no longer has to reign in our body and we no longer have to obey it in the lusts of the flesh.

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

Knowing that being "In Christ" (if you remain in Christ) sets us free from sin we no longer are a slave to sin and do not have to yield to it, anymore.

Rom 6:18 Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.

Wrong teaching has led many to believe that they are just freed from the guilt of sin, but not the power of sin.

God is Recovering the Truth of Godliness in the Believer, Today
<http://jesusourallinall.blogspot.com/2012/09/god-is-recovering-truth-of-godliness-in.html>

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2013/4/28 1:16

Romans 7:24 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

Colossians 1:22 In the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight:

Romans 7:25 I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

Romans 7:14 For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin.

Who sold us into slavery? Who is the ruler of this flesh of death I live in.

Romans 7:24-25 O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.

Sin nature; Yes. Set free and delivered from this nature and death; Praise God, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord I am free from sin and death but still live in the flesh with all the old man body pulls which only the Christ by the Holy Spirit in me can make me free indeed. Some of the old man body pulls get less and less and some go away completely, but some hang on for dear life and like a roaring lion on the prowl seeking whom he may devour and yet "1 John 1:7-10 But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/4/28 4:35

Hi murrcoir,

Thanks for the reply. I am not sure if you communicated what you hoped to, so please let me share with you how your post reads to someone besides yourself.

First, you have a "reproof". Then you let us know that we need God to "open our eyes" because this teaching is "all through the Bible", yet you didn't give a single verse that supports sin nature in your post. You did say it was "hidden in plain sight". Just a comment on this thought. In the first century, there was a group that associated with Christianity that claimed there was a specially revealed "hidden knowledge" about God. These were the Gnostics ("those who know"). So, potentially good points in your post, but when you cite Paul, please be sure to bring a clear teaching like he did. Paul didn't preach a cryptic message and tell his followers to fast and pray so that they could understand it. Although that is what you are telling us, Christianity doesn't work that way. I agree that fasting is good, but Jesus indicated it was more for spiritual strength than to have revelations.

Re: - posted by Koheleth, on: 2013/4/28 5:00

Quote:

-----I have not formed an opinion on this subject, but there is this scripture in Ephesians 2:3: "among whom also we all once conducted ourselves in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, just as the others" (NKJV)

By saying that we are by nature children of wrath, does that mean we have a sin nature?

Taken by itself, the phrase "by nature children of wrath" could mean that. But it could mean other things. How can we understand it? First, by asking what range of meanings the verse itself can have, and second, by asking which of those meanings best corresponds to the rest of the Scriptures.

So, to be fair, I can see where a person could read this verse and conclude that this "nature" is a congenital sinful nature. But are there other reasonable interpretations? I would reference 2 Peter 2:12-16, and say that through sin, the nature of ourselves and our situation with God has become one of judgment. We are condemned and judged because of our sin, our wrongdoing, our transgression of God's law, and not because of something we are born with when we had no sin or wrongdoing. Someone may point out that the first verse uses "born", but please note that is referencing the animals (creatures) and not the people. Peter explains in the following verses that the people are condemned because of their sins.

What do the rest of the Scriptures teach? Obviously there are differing perspectives on this, but I personally do not find any Scriptures that show we inherited sin from Adam.

If the view that we inherited sin from Adam means we cannot come to God unless he brings us to himself apart from our own will or understanding, then that opens up deeper issues of our understanding of God, as have been visited before on this website. I am not at all trying to raise those issues, but am just saying that this belief about the sinful nature may end up taking you there, so it leads to a whole system of doctrine.

Without recommending any particular view, we should all agree with Paul that we must "examine all things carefully". May we all do that before the Lord: our heart, our doctrine, our attitude, our works, and most of all our love.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/4/28 5:04

Quote: Man is not guilty for being man, he is guilty because he holds the truth.

We know that the wages of sin is death Rom 6:23

Before you're born in your mother's womb we knew one thing about you that one day you're going to die.

Man is guilty that is why he is born dead spiritually and condemned to death naturally.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/28 8:39

The bible teaches us that ALL have sinned and there is NONE righteous. If it is true that there is no inherited Adamic sin nature then that begs the question...why is there no one who has not sinned? Or..if people are born without sin then it is theoretically possible for someone to be sinless. However we know there is only one man (The Lord Jesus Christ) who is without sin. He was not of Adam's seed, born of a virgin and of the seed of God.

Take a close look at ROMANS 5:12-21. Note the phrases 'one man' (Adam) and 'all men'.

V12 - through ONE MAN (Adam) sin entered the world and death spread to ALL men.

V.14 - Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even to those who did not sin like Adam.

V.15 - by one man's offense many died.

V.18 - by one man's offense judgement came to ALL men.

V.19 - For by one man's disobedience were many made sinners.

Seems pretty conclusive to me. Don't you think Paul was trying to get a point across here?!

What is the point and need of us dying with Christ and being born again, if we can just decide not to sin? It sounds like a moral clean up rather than what salvation really is, a putting to death the old and receiving a new life in Christ.

Re: murrcolr - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 9:08

Hi murrcolr

murrcolr wrote ////Before you're born in your mother's womb we knew one thing about you that one day you're going to die.

Man is guilty that is why he is born dead spiritually and condemned to death naturally.////

Paul says it this way in Romans 5: 13 (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law)

Where there is no law, sin is not imputed, Romans clearly teaches that over and over again

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

Yes, all of Adam's offspring are born separated from the tree of life and will naturally die.

Children are born innocent not guilty! Jesus says it this way "for of such is the kingdom of God".

If children are born guilty because of what Adam did, then we must conclude, as what you have agreed with in past threads : that in conception we are by nature the children of wrath and deserving of Hell for no other reason than simply being created, and that all infants that die are in Hell.

I do not find that to be scripture but rather I find that to be Augustinian Catholicism, (tradition)

Such views are why Augustine taught infant baptism to save the infant from his original sin.

A good study is how thru out history those whom taught infant baptism have treated those whom taught believers baptism (it is a bloody history!)

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 9:26

Hi Heydave

you left out v 13 (For until the law sin was in the world: but (((sin is not imputed when there is no law.))) as what murrcolr pasted Isaiah 6:5 with a period after man, instead of finishing the rest of the verse.

If Men are born sinners as you claim, then you will have to conclude as murrcolr has conceded in the past that the infant that dies is in Hell.

Yet Jesus says it this way "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"

"Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: (((for of such is the kingdom of God.)))"

(Innocent!)

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/28 9:55

proud papa,

I think there is a misunderstanding of what 'imputed' means.

Having sin imputed means that it is reckoned against you. It does NOT mean you don't have sin, as v.18 clearly states. You keep quoting this part " sin is not imputed" to try and establish people do not have sin. However you ignore all the other parts of Romans 5 that tell us sin came to ALL MEN through Adam.

"Through ONE MAN'S disobedience many were made sinners" v.19

Every one who has had children knows they are not innocent. Even before they can talk or walk they show signs of disobedience. They don't learn this, it comes naturally!
However it is not imputed to them (reckoned to their account) before they are of an age of understanding, so will not go to hell.

Do you really think that children are without sin (even if they do not have a sin nature)? Up to what age can they remain sinless? According to your logic only those children who are sinless will go to heaven.

Quote: "Yet Jesus says it this way "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven"

This is talking about having the humility of a child to receive salvation, NOT saying we need to become sinless like children.

Sorry we seem to be at odds once again brother!

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 10:16

Hi Heydave,

Heydave wrote //// think there is a misunderstanding of what 'imputed' means.

Having sin imputed means that it is reckoned against you. It does NOT mean you don't have sin, as v.18 clearly states. You keep quoting this part " sin is not imputed" to try and establish people do not have sin. However you ignore all the other parts of Romans 5 that tell us sin came to ALL MEN through Adam.

"Through ONE MAN'S disobedience many were made sinners" v.19////

here again your conclusion is inconsistent with the context, because if verse 18 and 19 as you have quoted is imputed at birth. Then we must logically agree "even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon ALL MEN unto justification of life." happens at birth and that "so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." at birth. this would be universalism and obviously not scriptural

Heydave wrote ////Do you really think that children are without sin////

infants absolutely!

where there is no law, there is no sin, they do not have guilt in their soul because they have not yet disobeyed their conscience (law with in)

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/28 13:18

proud papa,

Quote: "here again your conclusion is inconsistent with the context, because if verse 18 and 19 as you have quoted is imputed at birth. Then we must logically agree "even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon ALL MEN unto justification of life." happens at birth and that "so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." at birth. this would be universalism and obviously not scriptural"

ALL humans are born of Adam, therefore all inherit sin and death from him. Not all humans are born of Christ, ONLY those who are born again through faith. Therefore all those who are 'in Christ' are made righteous. That is quite straightforward, is it not?

Quote: "where there is no law, there is no sin, they do not have guilt in their soul because they have not yet disobeyed their conscience (law with in)"

I agree, but just because there is no guilt does not mean there is no sin. It is just not imputed.

When we talk about the whole human race being 'in Sin' we have to understand this in a much broader sense than any particular sins. Sin is the condition of being separated from the life of God and living independently of God. This was The Sin of Adam and Eve - rebellion to act independently of God. This results in the fruit of sins, but Sin at its root is being o

ur own god. This is the condition of all men until they get reconciled to God through Jesus Christ.

You say infants are innocent and without sin, but at what age do you consider they don't violate their conscience? I would suggest it is very young. As soon as they understand 'no' and disobey they show they have a rebellious nature.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/4/28 13:27

Quote: Children are born innocent not guilty!

The Psalmist says Ps.58:3 "the wicked go astray from the womb, they err from their birth speaking lies.

Job 15:14 What is man, that he could be pure? And he who is born of a woman, that he could be righteous?

Job 25:4 How then can man be righteous before God? Or how can he be pure who is born of a woman?

David explained that his conception had sin involved. Ps 51:5: "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, and in sin my mother conceived me." We as David have a sin nature when we are born, it is not something we learn afterwards.

Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath"

Now I have given a scripture references to support what I believe, can you give me some scriptures that states plainly that a child is born innocent?

Re: - posted by richrock, on: 2013/4/28 14:20

This is a lengthy rambling on this topic, and I warn that I do express my opinion strongly at one point. I am not, however, going to retaliate on that point - but understand that I do not believe for a second we can reject a sinful nature present in man.

It's a hard teaching to understand that ALL have sinned and murrcolr has shown scripture that we are sinners from birth, which is inherited from Adam (Rom 3:23), we are all deserving of wrath because of that sin (Col 3:6). We who believe are being renewed - progressively sanctified, otherwise, why would Paul write encouraging us by the renewing of our minds (Rom 12:2)? This implies a continuous act, which finally brings me to my scripture:

"This is the message we have heard from Him and announce to you, that God is Light, and in Him there is no darkness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with Him and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; but if we walk in the Light as He Himself is in the Light, we have fellowship with one another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin. If we say that we have no sin, we are deceiving ourselves and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say that we have not sinned, we make Him a liar and His word is not in us.

My little children, I am writing these things to you so that you may not sin. And if anyone sins, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and He Himself is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for those of the whole world.

By this we know that we have come to know Him, if we keep His commandments. The one who says, "I have come to know Him," and does not keep His commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him; but whoever keeps His word, in him the love of God has truly been perfected. By this we know that we are in Him: the one who says he abides in Him ought himself to walk in the same manner as He walked."

1 John 1:5 - 2:6.

If we deny ourselves as having sin, we are deceived. If we confess our sins, He (Christ) is faithful. It is important to note that this epistle was written expressly to believers (1John 5:13), so there is no basis to deny the contents of the epistle do not apply to believers. John was presumed to be addressing heresies creeping in to the church at the time through Gnostic teachings.

So, we sin, naturally. Show me a child who behaves perfectly from birth to adulthood, and I'll give up Christianity. At some point we will sin. We will continue to sin. We are called to war against sin.

How can people deny a sinful nature and not see it around them in the news?

That even now, as a believer, I struggle with sin, sinful temptations, these are things I deal with before the Lord. I am sorry if this offends anyone, but I find the idea of rejecting sinful nature in man, implied in scripture explicitly or by general actions, utterly unbelievable and preposterous.

See also; Gen 4:8 - the first murder: one generation from the fall. Ps 51:5 as has been quoted. Ps 58:3, Ecc 7:20, Jer 17:9, Is. 64:6, Rom 5:12.

Paul struggled with ongoing sin : Rom 7:15, 7:20 - what was he fighting against? His own sinful desires, from the context. I recall others quoting Rom 7:24.

Also, a last thought that came to me: Jesus teaches we have to be born again (John 3:3-8). If we are not born sinners, why do we need to be born again? Without a sinful nature in every human being, the gospel is null and void.

Re: - posted by richrock, on: 2013/4/28 14:23

The other one I forgot to add was that sin came into the world by one man (Adam) in Romans 5:12.

Sorry about that.

Re: Is there a sin nature? - posted by InTheLight (), on: 2013/4/28 15:30

I just wanted to share something that Oswald Chambers wrote on the subject;

When the Bible touches the question of sin, it always comes right down to this incurable suspicion of God which never can be altered apart from the Atonement because it is connected with a great supernatural power behind. Paul talks about it and calls it the "carnal mind," he does not say it is at enmity with God, because that might mean it could be cured; he says it is "enmity against God." Remember the summit of all sin was a conscious red-handed revolt against God. Adam's sin was not a conscious revolt against God; it worked out ultimately through the race as a revolt against God, but Adam's sin instead of being at the summit of all sin is at the foundation of all sin. Consequently whatever sin you take, you will get the characteristics that were in this first sin, viz., the principle and the disposition of this infused suspicion, "Yea, hath God said . . ." ("Genesis 3:1ᒟ"). Absolute devastation awaits the soul that allows suspicion to creep in. Suspicion of God is like a gap in a dike, the flood rushes through, nothing can stop it. The first thing you will do is to accept slanders against God. Because it is peculiar to you? No, because it is according to the stock that runs right straight through the human race, from this first sin of infused suspicion in the intelligence, in the innermost part of man.

The majority of us prefer to trust our innocence rather than the statements of Jesus. It is always risky to trust your innocence when the statements of Jesus are contrary to it. Jesus says that "from within, out of the heart of men, proceed . . .," "then comes the awful catalogue. You say, "Why, that is nonsense, I never had any of those things in my heart, I am innocent." Some day you will come up against a set of circumstances which will prove that your innocence was a figment, and that what Jesus said about the human heart was perfectly true.

Chambers, O. (1996, c1960). The philosophy of sin : And other studies on the problem of man's moral life. Hants UK: Marshall, Morgan & Scott.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/28 15:34

If men inherit sin and it is somehow in their genes then they do not have to take responsibility for their actions, blaming all their propensity to sin on the previous generation. "I have a sin nature, I cannot help it".

Jesus was born into a human body. Notice that the body in and of itself is pure and innocent and not defiled. You can use the members of your body for the glory of God or evil.

Jesus says that we can now yield our members to righteousness instead of unrighteousness, now.

1Co_3:17 If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are .

1Co 3:17, implies that the temple of God does not have to be defiled.

1Co 3:16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

God is pleased to dwell in our temple and we are to keep it pure and holy for Him.

1Co 6:19 What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own?

1Co 6:20 For ye are bought with a price: therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.

Paul differentiates between sin and our mortal body. He commands us to not let sin reign IN our mortal body.

Rom 6:13 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.

The body is just a carton to contain your "new man". There is nothing inherently evil about your body. You either choose by the will of God to yield your members to righteousness or you choose by the lusts of men to yield your members to unrighteousness.

1Pe_4:2 That he no longer should live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God.

This is how Adam and Eve were able to sin without having a "sin nature". They received knowledge which was against the truth and they lusted for it, all without having a "sin nature". Their decision to derive their life from the Evil one instead of God, cost them everything.

Pilgrim

Re: Is sin natural? Is guilt real? - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2013/4/28 15:38

Augustine is probably regarded as the father of the institutionalized doctrine of the sinful nature. He took a number of scriptures as have already been mentioned, and concluded that a sinful nature was the natural condition of humankind. His contemporary, Pelagius, argued to the contrary but was ridiculed off the stage. All through the reformation, the sinful nature doctrine held its grip on the minds of theologians as they crafted the rebuttal to the traditions of the Roman church.

It wasn't until Charles Finney began to preach in America that a credible argument against the doctrine was brought forth with such a demonstration of power that it could not be ignored. Without benefit of media or even crude audio systems, Finney's call to repentance and denouncement of the sinful nature doctrine yielded thousands of converts who did not drift away the way so many do today. He taught them that they were totally guilty, in desperate need of salvation, and were totally without excuse. The Holy Spirit did the rest.

Trained as a lawyer and familiar with the rules of evidence, he thought it completely unreasonable that a loving God who was obligated to serve justly, could condemn anyone whose sin was outside of their control. As he searched the scripture, unfettered with pre-conceived theological notions, he saw that the law of God was simply a reasonable, do-able directive that was designed for the happiness of both God and man. Sin was just man trying to fulfill his own desires in ways that were destructive, but not rooted in his natural makeup. In no way, Finney would argue, is God responsible for your sin. You are.

For example, in Romans when it says one man sinned and so death passed to all men, it does not say sin passed to all men. An enormous difference, yet this passage has been used for hundreds of years to "prove" that man has a sinful nature.

But my suggestion is that one read carefully Ezekiel 18, the one passage where God through the prophet demands that

we not teach people that they have a sinful nature. Rather they will be held accountable for their sin, and rewarded for their righteousness. I am convinced that Paul was very much aware of this passage, and his teaching on the deeply rooted problem of sin did not stray from this theological foundation.

I know many will not be convinced, the sinful nature doctrine explains the vast public example of sin they see everywhere. I can only suggest that they take this in full honesty before God and let the Holy Spirit lead them to better truth than what they currently have.

For me, I came to realize that Jesus loved me and was willing to forgive my sin when I owned it and confessed it. He did not forgive my sinful nature, did not forgive me for Adam's sin, did not forgive me for my Dad's sin. He didn't forgive me in some apology for making me a sinner, gave me no consolation because righteousness was so out of reach for me.

Rather he forgave me because he loved me when I didn't deserve it.

It is important to know that the death of Christ does not obligate God to save anyone, but enables Him to save everyone. ..who repents.

I would also commend to those who believe in the sinful nature but are troubled by the massive insult to justice it presents, to find a copy of Finney's autobiography and read of the miracles the world and the church have forgotten about this man's life.

Or listen to some of Paris Reidhead's messages right here on Sermon Index. He is a student of Finney, and his life displays the fruit of credibility.

Re: - posted by Sidewalk (), on: 2013/4/28 15:41

Pilgrim-

Apparently, you were typing yours as I was typing mine! I love what you have written. Hope you like mine!

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/28 15:59

Hi Sidewalk,

I do like what you have written. Proud papa, Koheleh and others, too. My experience witnesses to what you guys write and to the scriptures, regarding our death with Christ and being raised up with Him. Notably, these two scriptures.

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

Rom 6:7 For he that is dead is freed from sin.

"body" here does not mean our flesh and blood body, because obviously, it is still very much alive, pumping blood and breathing air.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/28 16:23

Quote: The body is just a carton to contain your "new man". There is nothing inherently evil about your body.

What's wrong with the old man that we need a new man?

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. Roms 6:6

The Old man is the body of sin

That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts Ephesians 4:22

The old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts

Lie not one to another, seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds Colossians 3:9

The Old mans deeds are deceitful

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 Roms 8:3

The old man is "in the flesh"; the new man "in the Spirit." In the former "the works of the flesh" Gal 5:19-21 are manifest; in the latter "the fruit of the Spirit" Gal 5:22-23 One is "corrupt according to the deceitful lusts"; the other "created in righteousness and true holiness"

In the light excellent article

The majority of us prefer to trust our innocence rather than the statements of Jesus. It is always risky to trust your innocence when the statements of Jesus are contrary to it. Jesus says that "from within, out of the heart of men, proceed . . . , " then comes the awful catalogue. You say, "Why, that is nonsense, I never had any of those things in my heart, I am innocent." Some day you will come up against a set of circumstances which will prove that your innocence was a figment, and that what Jesus said about the human heart was perfectly true

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/28 17:11

Excerpts from John Wesley's Sermon no. 44 on Original Sin (May 15, 1754)

1. How widely different is this from the fair pictures of human nature which men have drawn in all ages! The writings of many of the ancients abound with gay descriptions of the dignity of man; whom some of them paint as having all virtue and happiness in his composition, or, at least, entirely in his power, without being beholden to any other being; yea, as self-sufficient, able to live on his own stock, and little inferior to God himself.

2. Nor have Heathens alone, men who are guided in their researches by little more than the dim light of reason, but many likewise of them that bear the name of Christ, and to whom are entrusted the oracles of God, spoken as magnificently concerning the nature of man, as if it were all innocence and perfection. Accounts of this kind have particularly abounded in the present century; and perhaps in no part of the world more than in our own country. Here not a few persons of strong understanding, as well as extensive learning, have employed their utmost abilities to show, what they termed, "the fair side of human nature." And it must be acknowledged, that, if their accounts of him be just, man is still but "a little lower than the angels;" or, as the words may be more literally rendered, "a little less than God."

3. Is it any wonder, that these accounts are very readily received by the generality of men? For who is not easily persuaded to think favourably of himself? Accordingly, writers of this kind are most universally read, admired, applauded. And innumerable are the converts they have made, not only in the gay, but the learned world. So that it is now quite unfashionable to talk otherwise, to say any thing to the disparagement of human nature; which is generally allowed, notwithstanding a few infirmities, to be very innocent, and wise, and virtuous!

4. But, in the mean time, what must we do with our Bibles? -- for they will never agree with this. These accounts, however pleasing to flesh and blood, are utterly irreconcilable with the scriptural. The Scripture avers, that "by one man's disobedience all men were constituted sinners;" that "in Adam all died," spiritually died, lost the life and the image of God; that fallen, sinful Adam then "begat a son in his own likeness;" -- nor was it possible he should beget him in any other; for "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" -- that consequently we, as well as other men, were by nature "dead in trespasses and sins," "without hope, without God in the world," and therefore "children of wrath;" that every man may say, "I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin did my mother conceive me;" that "there is no difference," in that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," of that glorious image of God wherein man was originally created. And hence, when "the Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, he saw they were all gone out of the way; they were altogether become abominable, there was none righteous, no, not one," none that truly sought after God: Just agreeable this, to what is declared by the Holy Ghost in the words above recited, "God saw," when he looked down from heaven before, "that the wickedness of man was great in the earth;" so great, that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."

This is God's account of man: From which I shall take occasion, First, to show what men were before the flood: Second

y, to inquire, whether they are not the same now: And, Thirdly, to add some inferences.

I. 1. I am, First, by opening the words of the text, to show what men were before the flood. And we may fully depend on the account here given: For God saw it, and he cannot be deceived. He "saw that the wickedness of man was great:" -- Not of this or that man; not of a few men only; not barely of the greater part, but of man in general; of men universally. The word includes the whole human race, every partaker of human nature. And it is not easy for us to compute their numbers, to tell how many thousands and millions they were. The earth then retained much of its primeval beauty and original fruitfulness. The face of the globe was not rent and torn as it is now; and spring and summer went hand in hand. It is therefore probable, it afforded sustenance for far more inhabitants than it is now capable of sustaining; and these must be immensely multiplied, while men begat sons and daughters for seven or eight hundred years together. Yet, among all this inconceivable number, only "Noah found favour with God." He alone (perhaps including part of his household) was an exception from the universal wickedness, which, by the just judgment of God, in a short time after brought on universal destruction. All the rest were partakers in the same guilt, as they were in the same punishment.

2. "God saw all the imaginations of the thoughts of his heart;" -- of his soul, his inward man, the spirit within him, the principle of all his inward and outward motions. He "saw all the imaginations:" It is not possible to find a word of a more extensive signification. It includes whatever is formed, made, fabricated within; all that is or passes in the soul; every inclination, affection, passion, appetite; every temper, design, thought. It must of consequence include every word and action, as naturally flowing from these fountains, and being either good or evil according to the fountain from which they severally flow.

3. Now God saw that all this, the whole thereof, was evil; -- contrary to moral rectitude; contrary to the nature of God, which necessarily includes all good; contrary to the divine will, the eternal standard of good and evil; contrary to the pure, holy image of God, wherein man was originally created, and wherein he stood when God, surveying the works of his hands, saw them all to be very good; contrary to justice, mercy, and truth, and to the essential relations which each man bore to his Creator and his fellow-creatures.

4. But was there not good mingled with the evil? Was there not light intermixed with the darkness? No; none at all: "God saw that the whole imagination of the heart of man was only evil." It cannot indeed be denied, but many of them, perhaps all, had good motions put into their hearts; for the Spirit of God did then also "strive with man," if haply he might repent, more especially during that gracious reprieve, the hundred and twenty years, while the ark was preparing. But still "in his flesh dwelt no good thing;" all his nature was purely evil: It was wholly consistent with itself, and unmixed with anything of an opposite nature.

5. However, it may still be matter of inquiry, "Was there no intermission of this evil? Were there no lucid intervals, wherein something good might be found in the heart of man?" We are not here to consider, what the grace of God might occasionally work in his soul; and, abstracted from this, we have no reason to believe, there was any intermission of that evil. For God, who "saw the whole imagination of the thoughts of his heart to be only evil," saw likewise, that it was always the same, that it "was only evil continually;" every year, every day, every hour, every moment. He never deviated into good. II. Such is the authentic account of the whole race of mankind which He who knoweth what is in man, who searcheth the heart and trieth the reins, hath left upon record for our instruction. Such were all men before God brought the flood upon the earth. We are, Secondly, to inquire, whether they are the same now.

1. And this is certain, the Scripture gives us no reason to think any otherwise of them. On the contrary, all the above cited passages of Scripture refer to those who lived after the flood. It was above a thousand years after, that God declared by David concerning the children of men, "They are all gone out of the way, of truth and holiness; "there is none righteous, no, not one." And to this bear all the Prophets witness, in their several generations. So Isaiah, concerning God's peculiar people, (and certainly the Heathens were in no better condition,) "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." The same account is given by all the Apostles, yea, by the whole tenor of the oracles of God. From all these we learn, concerning man in his natural state, unassisted by the grace of God, that "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is" still "evil, only evil," and that "continually."

2. And this account of the present state of man is confirmed by daily experience. It is true, the natural man discerns it not: And this is not to be wondered at. So long as a man born blind continues so, he is scarce sensible of his want: Much less, could we suppose a place where all were born without sight, would they be sensible of the want of it. In like manner, so long as men remain in their natural blindness of understanding, they are not sensible of their spiritual wants, and of this in particular. But as soon as God opens the eyes of their understanding, they see the state they were in before; they a

re then deeply convinced, that "every man living," themselves especially, are, by nature, "altogether vanity;" that is, folly and ignorance, sin and wickedness.

6. We have by nature, not only no love, but no fear of God. It is allowed, indeed, that most men have, sooner or later, a kind of senseless, irrational fear, properly called superstition; though the blundering Epicureans gave it the name of religion. Yet even this is not natural, but acquired; chiefly by conversation or from example. By nature "God is not in all our thoughts:" We leave him to manage his own affairs, to sit quietly, as we imagine, in heaven, and leave us on earth to manage ours; so that we have no more of the fear of God before our eyes, than of the love of God in our hearts.

7. Thus are all men "Atheists in the world." But Atheism itself does not screen us from idolatry. In his natural state, every man born into the world is a rank idolater. Perhaps, indeed, we may not be such in the vulgar sense of the word. We do not, like the idolatrous Heathens, worship molten or graven images. We do not bow down to the stock of a tree, to the work of our own hands. We do not pray to the angels or saints in heaven, any more than to the saints that are upon the earth. But what then? We have set up our idols in our hearts; and to these we bow down and worship them: We worship ourselves, when we pay that honour to ourselves which is due to God only. Therefore all pride is idolatry; it is ascribing to ourselves what is due to God alone. And although pride was not made for man, yet where is the man that is born without it? But hereby we rob God of his unalienable right, and idolatrously usurp his glory.

8. But pride is not the only sort of idolatry which we are all by nature guilty of. Satan has stamped his own image on our heart in self-will also. "I will," said he, before he was cast out of heaven, "I will sit upon the sides of the north;" I will do my own will and pleasure, independently on that of my Creator. the same does every man born into the world say, and that in a thousand instances; nay, and avow it too, without ever blushing upon the account, without either fear or shame. Ask the man, "Why did you do this?" He answers, "Because I had a mind to it." What is this but, "Because it was my will;" that is, in effect, because the devil and I agreed; because Satan and I govern our actions by one and the same principle. The will of God, mean time, is not in his thoughts, is not considered in the least degree; although it be the supreme rule of every intelligent creature, whether in heaven or earth, resulting from the essential, unalterable relation which all creatures bear to their Creator.

9. So far we bear the image of the devil, and tread in his steps. But at the next step we leave Satan behind; we run into an idolatry whereof he is not guilty: I mean love of the world; which is now as natural to every man, as to love his own will. What is more natural to us than to seek happiness in the creature, instead of the Creator? -- to seek that satisfaction in the works of his hands, which can be found in God only? What more natural than "the desire of the flesh?" that is, of the pleasure of sense in every kind? Men indeed talk magnificently of despising these low pleasures, particularly men of learning and education. They affect to sit loose to the gratification of these appetites wherein they stand on a level with the beasts that perish. But it is mere affectation; for every man is conscious to himself, that in this respect he is, by nature, a very beast. Sensual appetites, even those of the lowest kind, have, more or less, the dominion over him. They lead him captive; they drag him to and fro, in spite of his boasted reason. The man, with all his good breeding, and other accomplishments, has no pre-eminence over the goat: Nay, it is much to be doubted, whether the beast has not the pre-eminence over him. Certainly he has, if we may hearken to one of their modern oracles, who very decently tells us,

Once in a season beasts too taste of love;

Only the beast of reason is its slave,

And in that folly drudges all the year.

A considerable difference indeed, it must be allowed, there is between man and man, arising (beside that wrought by prevenient grace) from difference of constitution and of education. But, notwithstanding this, who, that is not utterly ignorant of himself, can here cast the first stone at another? Who can abide the test of our blessed Lord's comment on the Seventh Commandment: "He that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart?" So that one knows not which to wonder at most, the ignorance or the insolence of those men who speak with such disdain of them that are overcome by desires which every man has felt in his own breast; the desire of every pleasure of sense, innocent or not, being natural to every child of man.

10. And so is "the desire of the eye;" the desire of the pleasures of the imagination. These arise either from great, or beautiful, or uncommon objects; -- if the two former do not coincide with the latter; for perhaps it would appear, upon a diligent inquiry, that neither grand nor beautiful objects please any longer than they are new; that when the novelty of them is over, the greatest part, at least, of the pleasure they give is over; and in the same proportion as they become familiar, th

ey become flat and insipid. But let us experience this ever so often, the same desire will remain still. The inbred thirst continues fixed in the soul; nay, the more it is indulged, the more it increases, and incites us to follow after another, and yet another object; although we leave every one with an abortive hope, and a deluded expectation. Yea,

The hoary fool, who many days

Has struggled with continued sorrow,

Renews his hope, and fondly lays

The desperate bet upon tomorrow!

To-morrow comes! 'Tis noon! 'Tis night!

This day, like all the former, flies:

Yet on he goes, to seek delight

To-morrow, till to-night he dies!

11. A third symptom of this fatal disease, the love of the world, which is so deeply rooted in our nature, is "the pride of life;" the desire of praise, of the honour that cometh of men. This the greatest admirers of human nature allow to be strictly natural; as natural as the sight, or hearing, or any other of the external senses. And are they ashamed of it, even men of letters, men of refined and improved understanding? So far from it that they glory therein! They applaud themselves for their love of applause! Yea, eminent Christians, so called, make no difficulty of adopting the saying of the old, vain Heathen, *Animi dissoluti est et nequam negligere quid de se homines sentiant*: "Not to regard what men think of us is the mark of a wicked and abandoned mind." So that to go calm and unmoved through honour and dishonour, through evil report and good report, is with them a sign of one that is, indeed, not fit to live: "Away with such a flow from the earth!" But would one imagine that these men had ever heard of Jesus Christ or his Apostles; or that they knew who it was that said, "How can ye believe who receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour which cometh of God only?" But if this is really so, if it be impossible to believe, and consequently to please God, so long as we receive or seek honour one of another, and seek not the honour which cometh of God only; then in what a condition are all mankind! the Christians as well as Heathens! since they all seek honour one of another! since it is as natural for them so to do, themselves being the judges, as it is to see the light which strikes upon their eye, or to hear the sound which enters their ear; yea, since they account it a sign of a virtuous mind, to seek the praise of men, and of a vicious one, to be content with the honour that cometh of God only!

III. 1. I proceed to draw a few inferences from what has

been said. And, First, from hence we may learn one grand fundamental difference between Christianity, considered as a system of doctrines, and the most refined Heathenism. Many of the ancient Heathens have largely described the vices of particular men. They have spoken much against their covetousness, or cruelty; their luxury, or prodigality. Some have dared to say that "no man is born without vices of one kind or another." But still as none of them were apprized of the fall of man, so none of them knew of his total corruption. They knew not that all men were empty of all good, and filled with all manner of evil. They were wholly ignorant of the entire depravation of the whole human nature, of every man born into the world, in every faculty of his soul, not so much by those particular vices which reign in particular persons, as by the general flood of Atheism and idolatry, of pride, self-will, and love of the world. This, therefore, is the first grand distinguishing point between Heathenism and Christianity. The one acknowledges that many men are infected with many vices, and even born with a proneness to them; but supposes withal, that in some the natural good much over-balances the evil: The other declares that all men are conceived in sin," and "shapen in wickedness;" -- that hence there is in every man a "corrupt mind, which is enmity against God, which is not, cannot be, subject to" his "law;" and which so infects the whole soul, that "there dwelleth in" him, "in his flesh," in his natural state, "no good thing;" but "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is evil," only evil, and that "continually."

2. Hence we may, Secondly, learn, that all who deny this, call it original sin, or by any other title, are put Heathens still, in the fundamental point which differences Heathenism from Christianity. They may, indeed, allow, that men have many vices; that some are born with us; and that, consequently, we are not born altogether so wise or so virtuous as we should be; there being few that will roundly affirm, "We are born with as much propensity to good as to evil, and that every man is, by nature, as virtuous and wise as Adam was at his creation." But here is the shibboleth: Is man by nature filled with

all manner of evil? Is he void of all good? Is he wholly fallen? Is his soul totally corrupted? Or, to come back to the text, is "every imagination of the thoughts of his heart only evil continually?" Allow this, and you are so far a Christian. Deny it, and you are but an Heathen still.

3. We may learn from hence, in the Third place, what is the proper nature of religion, of the religion of Jesus Christ. It is *gerapeia* yuchs, God's method of healing a soul which is thus diseased. Hereby the great Physician of souls applies medicines to heal this sickness; to restore human nature, totally corrupted in all its faculties. God heals all our Atheism by the knowledge of Himself, and of Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; by giving us faith, a divine evidence and conviction of God, and of the things of God, -- in particular, of this important truth, "Christ loved me" -- and gave himself for me." By repentance and lowliness of heart, the deadly disease of pride is healed; that of self-will by resignation, a meek and thankful submission to the will of God; and for the love of the world in all its branches, the love of God is the sovereign remedy. Now, this is properly religion, "faith" thus "working by love;" working the genuine meek humility, entire deadness to the world, with a loving, thankful acquiescence in, and conformity to, the whole will and word of God.

5. But ye have not so learned the oracles of God. Ye know, that He who seeth what is in man gives a far different account both of nature and grace, of our fall and our recovery. Ye know that the great end of religion is, to renew our hearts in the image of God, to repair that total loss of righteousness and true holiness which we sustained by the sin of our first parent. Ye know that all religion which does not answer this end, all that stops short of this, the renewal of our soul in the image of God, after the likeness of Him that created it, is no other than a poor farce, and a mere mockery of God, to the destruction of our own soul. O beware of all those teachers of lies, who would palm this upon you for Christianity! Regard them not, although they should come unto you with all the deceivableness of unrighteousness; with all smoothness of language, all decency, yea, beauty and elegance of expression, all professions of earnest good will to you, and reverence for the Holy Scriptures. Keep to the plain, old faith, "once delivered to the saints," and delivered by the Spirit of God to our hearts. Know your disease! Know your cure! Ye were born in sin: Therefore, "ye must be born again," born of God. By nature ye are wholly corrupted. By grace ye shall be wholly renewed. In Adam ye all died: In the second Adam, in Christ, ye all are made alive. "You that were dead in sins hath he quickened:" He hath already given you a principle of life, even faith in him who loved you and gave himself for you! Now, "go on from faith to faith," until your whole sickness be healed; and all that "mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus!"

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/28 17:14

Quote:

-----by murrcoir on 2013/4/28 13:23:46

Quote: The body is just a carton to contain your "new man". There is nothing inherently evil about your body.

What's wrong with the old man that we need a new man?

Your kidding, right?

Eph_4:24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

Gal_3:27 For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2013/4/28 17:43

Pilgrim quoting murrcolr:

Quote:

by murrcolr on 2013/4/28 13:23:46

Quote: The body is just a carton to contain your "new man". There is nothing inherently evil about your body.

What's wrong with the old man that we need a new man?

Your kidding, right?

My response: dear pilgrim777,

The answer to that question was given immediately after the question. You stopped the quote too soon. You apparently took the question to mean that there is nothing wrong with the old man. Again, I ask you to look at murrcolr's post and read what he wrote immediately after writing that question.

To all the Pelagianists present I ask:

Why was it necessary for us to be crucified with Christ? According to some of you, the only thing sinners need is forgiveness because sinners are fully capable of being fully righteous and holy on their own.

Also, Why was it necessary for Jesus to be virgin born? Surely he performed enough miracles during his ministry that it wasn't just to prove he was from God.

Re: Heydave - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 17:50

Hi Heydave

Heydave wrote ////ALL humans are born of Adam, therefore all inherit sin and death from him. Not all humans are born of Christ, ONLY those who are born again through faith. Therefore all those who are 'in Christ' are made righteous. That is quite straight forward, is it not?////

The point I was trying to make was the fallacy of your usage of Rom 5 v 18 and 19 for proof text for a sinful nature and inherited sin. If the first part of verse 18:

"Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation"

is speaking as being imputed at birth, then we would logically conclude that the second half of the verse also is speaking as being imputed at birth which says:

"; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life."

you used the first part of 19 also, for a proof text for a sinful nature and inherited sin.

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

there again if these verses are implying as you say, we would have to conclude that the second half of the verse that says

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

is also speaking of being imputed at birth.

My point is not that any of this is imputed at birth.

My point is the fallacy of your usage of Rom 5 v 18 and 19 for proof text for a sinful nature and inherited sin.

I agree it is at the point of faith that we are born again likewise it is at the point of understanding that sin is accounted to us , at this point Paul said I died, Romans 7:9 :

"I was alive without the law once" (born innocent) : but when the commandment came,(age of understanding) sin revived,(revived from one generation to the next, natural course of man ever since Adam.) and I died. (when guilt entered Paul's soul, he calls it death)

Heydave wrote ////I agree, but just because there is no guilt does not mean there is no sin. It is just not imputed///

"for where no law is, there is no transgression."

"For without the law sin was dead."

Heydave wrote //// When we talk about the whole human race being 'in Sin' we have to understand this in a much broader sense than any particular sins. Sin is the condition of being separated from the life of God and living independently of God. This was The Sin of Adam and Eve - rebellion to act independently of God. This results in the fruit of sins, but Sin at its root is being our own god. This is the condition of all men until they get reconciled to God through Jesus Christ.////

Sin is the transgression of the Law, it is not the substance of man as the gnostics taught.

Heydave wrote ////You say infants are innocent and without sin, but at what age do you consider they don't violate their conscience? I would suggest it is very young. As soon as they understand 'no' and disobey they show they have a rebellious nature.////

A child's soul is freed from guilt (sanctified) by biblical chastisement, just as the adult's soul is freed from guilt (sanctified) by faith in the sacrifice of Jesus.

Adam was innocent, the Bible says it this way: "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

likewise the proof of an infant as being innocent is that they are naked and not ashamed!

I remember clearly when guilt before God entered my soul, I was 5 years old, I tried to cleanse the guilt by eating soap, it did not work, only the Blood can wash away sin at that point.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 18:02

speaking of sinful nature, original sin doctrine Paris Reidhead says :

"He (Augustine) now has the philosophy that is going to bring the church into babylonian captivity from that time unto the present, because He (Augustine) now has found away to completely contradict the Word of God....."

Re: TrueWitness - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 18:22

Hi TrueWitness

TrueWitness wrote ///To all the Pelagianists present I ask: ///

Augustine was a catholic he believed that one can only be saved in the catholic church.

he believed that putting to death the Donatist for their heresy was a loving thing to do. (do you know what the great heresy of the donatist was ??)

Augustine taught regenerative baptism, hence because of his original sin doctrine and his regenerative baptism doctrine he concluded to teach infant baptism for salvation from the original sin of adam.

Have you studied the bloody history of how those whom taught infant baptism, treated (persecuted) those whom taught regenerative baptism ?

The new Foxes Book of Martyrs John Fox rewritten updated by Harold J chadwick p.56 puts it this way :

referring to Papal persecutions and the Inquisition

/They justified the horrors they committed by wresting Old Testament Scriptures, and by appeal to (Augustine), who had interpreted luke 14:23 as endorsing the use of force against heretics: "Then the master said to the servant, 'Go out into the highways and hedges, and compel them to come in, that my house may be filled.'/"

"they believed a physical body was intrinsically evil" - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/28 18:25

p1118 Niv Student Bible 1 John commentary Zondervan 1992

//Gnostics balked at the Christian concept of Gods becoming human.because they believed a physical body was intrinsically evil,they denied a pure God could take on a body. Some dealt with the problem by claiming that Jesus was never a human being,but a phantom,a temporary appearance of God who looked human....

The apostle John debated in person with gnostics of his day,and had Gnostic thinking in mind when he wrote this letter...

..

throughout the letter especially in 4:2-3,the author lambastes those who deny that Jesus came in the flesh.//

Re: "they believed a physical body was intrinsically evil" - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/28 19:35

Here is a clear example of how Reformed Theology contradicts the tenet of Scripture...

Quote

V. This corruption of nature, during this life, does remain in those that are regenerated; and although it be, through Christ, pardoned, and mortified; yet both itself, and all the motions thereof, are truly and properly sin.

Westminster Confession, Article 6

http://www.reformed.org/documents/wcf_with_proofs/

Quote

II. This sanctification is throughout, in the whole man; yet imperfect in this life, there abiding still some remnants of corruption in every part; whence arises a continual and irreconcilable war, the flesh lusting against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh.

III. In which war, although the remaining corruption, for a time, may much prevail; yet, through the continual supply of strength from the sanctifying Spirit of Christ, the regenerate part does overcome; and so, the saints grow in grace, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.

Westminster Confession, Chapter 13

http://www.reformed.org/documents/wcf_with_proofs/

These passages allude to how they teach that a regenerated Christian remains inwardly defiled and thus double minded .

What they have done is confuse "temptation" with "sin."

The Bible teaches this...

Jas 1:14 But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed.

Jas 1:15 Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.

Under Reformed doctrine this "being drawn away in temptation and enticed by the lusts of the flesh" is a "sin nature" or "corruption of nature." Another word for the lusts of the flesh is the term "concupiscence" and it was Augustine who taught that the very existence of concupiscence was PROOF of "inborn sin" or "inborn corruption of nature" being passed down in the male sperm (Seminal Identity or Traducianism).

The Bible is clear that Jesus was...

Heb 4:15 For 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.

As well as that...

1Co 10:13 There hath no temptation taken you but such as is common to man: but God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that ye are able; but will with the temptation also make a way to escape, that ye may be able to bear it.

Temptation is not sin nor are the passions of the flesh sin. Nor is temptation or the passions of the flesh a "sinful nature," they are simply natural desires that God calls us to rule over. Sin is when the will is exercised in a manner to gratify carnal desire in discordance with the knowledge of the truth (right and wrong).

Gen 4:7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

Thus it is the mind set on the things of the flesh which is an enemy of God.

Rom 8:5 For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

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

Thus as can be seen by the above quotes from the Westminster Confession of Faith it is clearly evident that Reformed Theology teaches that the "temptation wrought by natural desire" is viewed as sin. Due to viewing this as sin they are forced to deny genuine heart purity in those whom are regenerated and thus preach a doctrine which caters to double-mindedness existing in a regenerated believer, ie. "In which war, although the remaining corruption, for a time, may much prevail;" WCF Ch. 13 Sec. 3

This is why they are compelled to rip out of context scriptures like Rom 7:14-25 and 1John 1:8 as proof texts for an ongoing state of sinfulness in a Christian.

Thus due to this "ongoing state of corruption" that they believe in they have forced an invented theology upon the "death of Christ" known as Penal Substitution in which they can teach a POSITIONAL/ABSTRACT salvation in that they view justification as purely based on the forensic swap of "Christ's Righteousness" for the "Believers Sin." This is often termed the "Double Imputation" of Reformed Theology.

This forensic transfer as the basis of being right with God utterly perverts what the Bible actually teaches. It is a complete denial of the true Gospel whereby people can be redeemed from all iniquity and made pure by the blood of Christ.

The Bible clearly teaches that the Holy Spirit is in the world convicting people of sin, righteousness and the judgment to come. When a sinner responds to this conviction through a godly sorrow working a genuine repentance whereby the rebellion to God is forsaken, that "former" sinner is found to be in a submissive and teachable state before God.

It is in this state that God raises the former sinner up unto newness of life whereby they are cleansed of their former sins by the blood of Christ and thus they can faithfully abide in the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ having been made inwardly pure via their faith. There is no inward corruption or root of iniquity in a Saint of God for they have been cleansed and purged of all sin.

1Pe 1:22 Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently:

1Pe 1:23 Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever.

1Jn 1:7 But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Yet "temptation" still exists and the "passions and desires" still exist, yet the passions and desires are CRUCIFIED for the old man has been put to death thus the mind's eye of a saint is set SINGLY on God.

Gal 5:24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

Mat 6:22 The light of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.

This is the true state of a genuine born again believer. If a professing Christian is not in that state they need to do what Paul teaches...

Eph 4:22 That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;

Eph 4:23 And be renewed in the spirit of your mind;

Eph 4:24 And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.

Eph 4:25 Wherefore putting away lying, speak every man truth with his neighbour: for we are members one of another.

Eph 4:26 Be ye angry, and sin not: let not the sun go down upon your wrath:

Eph 4:27 Neither give place to the devil.

Eph 4:28 Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth.

Eph 4:29 Let no corrupt communication proceed out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying, that it may minister grace unto the hearers.

Eph 4:30 And grieve not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.

Eph 4:31 Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice:

Eph 4:32 And be ye kind one to another, tenderhearted, forgiving one another, even as God for Christ's sake hath forgiven you.

Eph 5:1 Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children;

Eph 5:2 And walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.

Eph 5:3 But fornication, and all uncleanness, or covetousness, let it not be once named among you, as becometh saints;

Eph 5:4 Neither filthiness, nor foolish talking, nor jesting, which are not convenient: but rather giving of thanks.

Eph 5:5 For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.

Eph 5:6 Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience.

Eph 5:7 Be not ye therefore partakers with them.

Eph 5:8 For ye were sometimes darkness, but now are ye light in the Lord: walk as children of light:

It amazes me how readily people buy into these theological systems when the Bible so clearly and plainly contradicts their doctrinal tenets. So many people will argue in favour of being perpetually corrupt in this life and scorn any contention that genuine heart purity is possible.

The Bible says this...

Rev 22:11 He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be

righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.

Rev 22:12 And, behold, I come quickly; and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.

Rev 22:13 I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Rev 22:14 Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

Rev 22:15 For without are dogs, and sorcerers, and whoremongers, and murderers, and idolaters, and whosoever loveth and maketh a lie.

There is absolutely nothing forensic or positional implied in the above passage.

What you do is a reflection of who you are!

Pilgrim (on behalf of Scott)

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/29 5:25

Pelagius (c. 360-420) was a British monk after whom a heresy was named

Pelagianism has as its central theme the proposition that man's free-will is unimpaired, that no influence fetters or dominates his choice between good and evil, and that he has all the power he ever had, or needs to have, to will and to do what is spiritually good. This is in direct opposition to the concept of Adam's fall being the cause of man being, at first, a sinner. It argues that the consequences of Adam's sins were restricted to himself - that he did not transmit either guilt or corruption to his posterity. The Pelagian's argued that man enters the world with as pure a nature as Adam had possessed in innocence. This requires a re-modeling of the Gospels as a remedial scheme rather than a scheme to recover man from the damnable position of original sin.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/29 5:36

Proud papa,

The scriptures in Romans 5 are not 'proof texts', as you disparagingly call them, they are clear biblical statements as to the nature of mankind. It is very clear to me (and most others) what it is saying.

Are both sin and righteousness inherited at birth? Yes, Sin is inherited at our natural birth and righteousness is inherited at our new (second) birth. I think this is sound theology and is what is being said in Romans 5, you just don't want to see it because it does not fit your view.

You keep quoting Augustine as a reason why inherited sin must be wrong because he taught it. Who cares who taught or did not teach something. That is not the basis for understanding truth, the bible is. According to this argument then the trinity and virgin birth is wrong because Augustine taught these too.

Quote: "A child's soul is freed from guilt (sanctified) by biblical chastisement, just as the adult's soul is freed from guilt (sa

nctified) by faith in the sacrifice of Jesus."

This is nonsense and unbiblical! Maybe some more soap would have help to sanctify you! lol.

Quote: "p1118 Niv Student Bible 1 John commentary Zondervan 1992"
Are you now appealing to your hated NIV to support your position?!

Please tell me what your gospel is? Why did Jesus die on the cross? Was it just to forgive our sins or was it to release us from the bondage to sin? Why MUST we be born again? Is it because we are dead in sin and no amount of reformation can improve that which is corrupt and dead.

Jesus said "A good tree brings forth good fruit and a bad tree brings forth bad fruit" and "A bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit". What's the answer to a bad tree? Cut it down and plant a new 'good' tree!

You imply that without law there is no sin. However the bible tells us that before the law sin reigned from Adam to the present day. For example the Canaanites did not have the law, but their sin was before God and eventually brought judgment. So Ok you will say they had a conscience, but then so do young children, as said of yourself at 5 years), but I think it starts even younger. So why as soon as they know what is right and wrong to they choose wrong? Where does this disobedience (sin) come from? I would suggest it comes from within and was there from birth, just waiting for a command to disobey!

Re: - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2013/4/29 5:48

Pilgrim Quote: The body is just a carton to contain your "new man". There is nothing inherently evil about your body.

What's wrong with the old man that we need a new man?

Don't you want to answer or is it you can't answer it because you can't face up to the truth in scripture.

Proud papa Quote: Children are born innocent not guilty

Still waiting for scriptures that we are born innocent or are you just going to keep rabbling on about Augustine...

O beware of all those teachers of lies, who would palm this upon you for Christianity! Regard them not, although they should come unto you with all the deceivableness of unrighteousness; with all smoothness of language, all decency, yea, beauty and elegance of expression, all professions of earnest good will to you, and reverence for the Holy Scriptures. Keep to the plain, old faith, "once delivered to the saints," and delivered by the Spirit of God to our hearts. Know your disease! Know your cure! Ye were born in sin: Therefore, "ye must be born again," born of God. By nature ye are wholly corrupted. By grace ye shall be wholly renewed. In Adam ye all died: In the second Adam, in Christ, ye all are made alive. "You that were dead in sins hath he quickened:" He hath already given you a principle of life, even faith in him who loved you and gave himself for you! Now, "go on from faith to faith," until your whole sickness be healed; and all that "mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus!" Quote by John Wesley

Re: affirmative - posted by wombat1 (), on: 2013/4/29 6:07

Yep (we have one of course). I guess another question could be asked when do we become accountable for our sin nature? The Jews called a child a man at around thirteen, not sure when Jesus first preached in the temple. He had gone missing and was returning from a feast, which I find interesting.

So, is this a type or shadow? I don't think so of necessity as I have seen a child of ten or maybe eleven willingly under the influence of a demon and a child saved and spirit filled. However I think there is a transition of full culpability upon reaching a certain point of understanding of consequences for one's actions.

Wishing you well. Oskar.

Re: murrcolr - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/29 7:42

Hi murrcolr

murrcolr wrote ////Still waiting for scriptures that we are born innocent or are you just going to keep rabbling on about Augustine's...////

Adam was innocent, the Bible says it this way: "they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

The infant is innocent, they are naked and not ashamed

Paul says it this way

"I was alive without the law once" (born innocent)

The thing I respect about you murrcolr is that you are consistent with your belief, You believe the infant that has died is in Hell.

murrcolr wrote to prove children are born wicked ////The Psalmist says Ps.58:3 "the wicked go astray from the womb, they err from their birth speaking lies.////

This is a stereotypical out of context verse that is often used by men blinded by this catholic tradition to prove that the infant is wicked and deserving of the wrath of God lets look at Psalms 58:3 in its context :

psalms 58

3 The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.

is this really speaking of all infants ??

4 Their poison is like the poison of a serpent: they are like the deaf adder that stoppeth her ear;

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

5 Which will not hearken to the voice of charmers, charming never so wisely.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

6 Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O Lord.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

7 Let them melt away as waters which run continually: when he bendeth his bow to shoot his arrows, let them be as cut in pieces.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

8 As a snail which melteth, let every one of them pass away: like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

9 Before your pots can feel the thorns, he shall take them away as with a whirlwind, both living, and in his wrath.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

10 The righteous shall rejoice when he seeth the vengeance: he shall wash his feet in the blood of the wicked.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

11 So that a man shall say, Verily there is a reward for the righteous: verily he is a God that judgeth in the earth.

how about this verse is it speaking of all infants ??

Break their teeth, O God, in their mouth: break out the great teeth of the young lions, O Lord.

infants do not have teeth and I doubt it is the will of God to break their teeth out.

find me any writings before Augustine that taught infants are born sinful and deserving of hell!

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/29 11:51

Those are good scriptures, proudpapa. Adam was born, pure and innocent, that is true. He had no sin nature. Everything God made was good, and creation reflected His righteous character! Show me in scripture where Adam had a sin nature that made him sin, murrclor. The fact that he had no sin nature, proves that one can sin without a "sin nature".

The Jews never had this system of thought and don't have it today, that babies are born sinful and deserving of hell.

In 2 Samuel 12, King David's newborn son fell terminally ill. After seven days, the child died. In verses 22 and 23, the Bible records that David said: "While the child was alive, I fasted and wept; for I said, 'Who can tell whether the Lord will be gracious to me, that the child may live?' But now he is dead; why should I fast? Can I bring him back again? I shall go to him, but he shall not return to me." It is clear that David's dead infant son would never return to this Earth, but David also said that one day, he would go to be with his son. Through inspiration, David documented that his own eternal destination was going to be "in the house of the Lord" (Psalm 23:6). Therefore, we can conclude that "the house of the Lord" would be the eternal destination of his infant son to whom David would one day go. King David was looking forward to the day when he would be able to meet his son in heaven. Absolutely nothing in this context gives any hint that the dead infant son's soul would go to hell.

Furthermore, Jesus said in Matthew 18:3-5:

Assuredly, I say to you, unless you are converted and become as little children, you will by no means enter the kingdom of heaven. Therefore whoever humbles himself as this little child is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Whoever receives one little child like this in My name receives Me.

And in Luke 18:16-17, Jesus remarked: "Let the little children come to Me, and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God. Assuredly, I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will by no means enter it."

Therefore, we have been given a specific example in the Old Testament of an infant who died and would live forever in heaven. And Jesus Christ Himself, in the New Testament, stated that little children retain the qualities that make a person eligible to inherit the kingdom of God. We see, then, that infants and small children that die are in a safe state, and will live eternally in heaven.

With such clear statements from the Bible about the eternal destiny of dead infants and small children, why have religious people mistakenly taught that babies go to hell when they die? Due to the influential nature of John Calvin (via Augustine) and his teachings, many people have taught that sin is "passed" from one generation to the next. It is believed by many religious people that children "inherit" the sins of their parents. Yet, the Bible pointedly and explicitly teaches that such is not the case. In Ezekiel 18:20, the Bible says: "The soul who sins shall die. The son shall not bear the guilt of

the father, nor the father bear the guilt of the son.” Also, in Exodus 32, Moses pleaded with God to forgive the sins of the Israelites when he said: “Yet now, if You will forgive their sin—but if not, I pray, blot me out of Your book which You have written. And the Lord said to Moses, ‘Whoever has sinned against Me, I will blot him out of My book’” (Exodus 32:32-33). The Bible is plain in its teaching that babies do not inherit the sins of their parents.

Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2013/4/29 13:26

Look the issue is Sin Nature....why do both of you insist on taking the post off subject?

Is it because you have no proof?

Proud papa states that we don't have a sin nature and his proof is that we are born innocent without a sinful nature

The evidence he has supplied so far would be laughed out the court because he has none.

Pilgrim777 Your evidence does not prove that we are not born with a sin nature either..

In 2 Samuel 12 doesn't prove a child hasn't got a sin nature.

Luke 18:16-17 doesn't prove a child hasn't got a sin nature.

Quote: Show me in scripture where Adam had a sin nature that made him sin, murrclor. The fact that he has because he had no sin nature, proves that one can sin without a "sin nature".

The fact that Adam sinned without a sin nature does not prove that we don't have a sin nature today does it?

Let's look at before the flood, let's look at the condition of men

God "saw that the wickedness of man was great:" -- Not of this or that but man; not of a few men only; not barely of the greater part, but of man in general men. The word includes the whole human race, every partaker of human nature. And it is not easy for us to calculate their numbers, to tell how many thousands and millions they were.

"God saw all the imaginations of the thoughts of his heart;" -- of his soul, his inward man, the spirit within him, the principle of all his inward and outward motions. He "saw all the imaginations:"

God saw that all this as the whole and it was evil; -- contrary to the nature of God, which necessarily includes all good, contrary to the divine will, the eternal standard of good and evil, contrary to the pure, holy image of God, that man was originally created with, and when God stood, surveying the works of his hands, saw them all to be good.

It was above a thousand years after, that God declared by David concerning the children of men, "They are all gone out of the way, of truth and holiness; "there is none righteous, no, not one."

Now surely over all that thousands of years of men being born innocent, you'd think that there might be just one that would make it who could be declared righteous...

But what do we hear "there is none righteous, no, not one"

Edit spelling

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/29 13:38

Pilgrim said: "Those are good scriptures, proudpapa. Adam was born, pure and innocent, that is true. He had no sin nature. Everything God made was good, and creation reflected His righteous character! Show me in scripture where Adam had a sin nature that made him sin, murrco1r. The fact that he had no sin nature, proves that one can sin without a "sin nature".

Your not serious are you?! Are you really suggesting that this scripture said about Adam and Eve BEFORE they sinned is the basis for saying every today is born innocent? No one would dispute the fact that Adam and Eve were born innocent and without sin, the question in hand is what is the condition of mankind after the fall. As has been shown the bible clearly states that sin and death has passed to all men because of Adam's sin.

To answer your question, is it possible if someone who does not have a sin nature to sin, well yes obviously it is possible. However that does not answer the question about the nature to sin being inherited through Adam.

Is this all you have to base your belief on the innocence of man, two scripture, one pre-fall and one where Paul's subject is the law, not original sin.

The scriptures you quote that Jesus said about children are just repeating what PP said. They are NOT saying they are sinless, but that they are humble and will receive easily what God offers them.

What no one has answered is, why was Jesus born of a virgin and not from the seed of Adam?

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/29 15:05

HeyDave, you are saying a baby is not sinless. Then what sin did they commit?

The example of Adam and Eve is a powerful example of choosing to sin on your own volition and not because some "nature" made you do it. Yes, they chose to sin, when they were pure and innocent. Babies, will eventually choose to sin, too if they live long enough. This is a dangerous world to be a baby in.

The condition of mankind after the fall is that they have a 100% propensity to sin. But, it's not because it is in their genes.

It is because there is a Tempter, it is because we live in weak flesh and cannot overcome the lusts of the eyes, the lust of the flesh and the pride of life in our own strength.

Remember, temptation is not sin, until it is conceived.

Adam and Eve are very important, they offer great insight to us.

What is a baby guilty of? How have they sinned against God? Does your Bible say that God will not hold one guilty for the sins of the father?

Is there more than forgiveness? Is there freedom from sin? Many respond to these questions by talking about the sin nature in the believer, saying one can never be free from sin because sin will always be in him until he dies. They say the righteousness of Christ in no way changes the carnal nature, neither does the carnal nature affect the divine nature. Here man finds himself in a schizophrenic dualism of confusion and failure. The emphasis is upon "saved IN sin" rather than "saved FROM sin". One finds himself living in a two story house with no connecting stairway. On one floor there can be no sin, while on the other floor there is nothing but sin.

So that God could indwell a human body (a body thou hast prepared for me, Hebrews) and die for our sins, the just for the unjust. Dave, Adam sinned against God in the flesh and because of this, salvation could only come in the flesh. Salvation had to be won for us in the flesh. Sin had to be overcome in the flesh. That is why God inhabited a fleshly body.

So, you think sin is in our DNA? Seed of Adam? It is a very simple answer, Dave. If Jesus was born from man's seed instead of God, then He would be human. Not, God in the flesh."

If He was born human then eventually He would sin because of the weakness of the flesh.

We have made things complicated and also invented ideas to support theologies.

Man sins, because he chooses to, not because he is made to sin. He chooses to turn away from the Lord, he chooses the easy, fleshly way. The flesh hates the cross, Dave. The cross is repugnant to the fleshly desires.

This same philosophy is carried over into the Christian life where people are saying, "Thank God I am set free from guilt, because I can't be set free from the power of sin."

What sadism is that? That God would save us from guilt but leave us imprisoned and in bondage to sin? I don't believe that is what Romans 6 talks about, Dave.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/29 15:55

Pilgrim,

It seems you are saying pretty much what I am saying. We are just using different terms. You call it propensity, others call it nature.

You say that every human being has 100% propensity to sin. I agree. Why is that? You say because of the weakness of the human flesh. Where did that weakness come from? It was not there when Adam and Eve were created, because God said everything He made was good.

So it must be a weakness inherited through Adam after he sinned, as the bible teaches...

"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin." (Rom 7:14).

Even so no one can claim that they do not choose to sin. We are responsible.

Regarding Christians being free from sin, I agree with you that it is wrong to say or think we are just saved from the guilt of sin. We are saved from the power to sin. This is my point, that the gospel is the power of God to set us free from the bondage of sin, by taking our old man (Adam nature) to the cross and giving us a new life, even the life of Jesus Christ. It is wrong for a true Christian to say he has a sin nature if he is born again of the seed of God.

My point about the virgin birth you sort of touched on. If Christ was of Adam's seed he would have the propensity (or nature) to sin. But he came as the perfect man, born of God like Adam before he sinned. Jesus overcame sin and dies as the sinless sacrifice. This is why He is called the last Adam (as our substitute He put Adam to death) and the second man, in that he begins a new race of man where he is now the ancestor of all those who are born of Him. We trace our lineage back to Christ and not to Adam!

Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2013/4/29 16:23

Pilgrim Quote: Man sins, because he chooses to, not because he is made to sin. He chooses to turn away from the Lord, he chooses the easy, fleshly way

I don't think there is any of us on this site that would say we didn't choose to sin, we are not saying man is an automaton and we are not saying we are blameless for our sins...

But I am glad to see that you admit at least that there is some weakness although you call it the "fleshly way"

But what does scripture say

Col 2:13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

(1) Being dead in your sins and (2) the uncircumcision of your flesh ---- We are doubly dead to God, not only wallowing in

trespasses our outward sins, but also in the uncircumcision of your flesh. This is a beautiful expression for original sin that is an inbred corruption of your nature, your uncircumcised heart.

The fleshy way is the sinful nature inherited from Adam.

And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that which was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. I Cor 15:45-49

It can't really be more simple and easy to understand that I dare not add anything "we have borne the image of the earthy"

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/29 20:45

Quote:

-----by Heydave on 2013/4/29 12:55:16

Pilgrim,

It seems you are saying pretty much what I am saying. We are just using different terms. You call it propensity, others call it nature.

Yep, it is a fine line between what we are saying, maybe, but a line, nevertheless.

Even Jesus says what I am saying. Er, I am saying what Jesus is saying. :-) the flesh is weak.
Mar_14:38 Watch ye and pray, lest ye enter into temptation. The spirit truly is ready, but the flesh is weak.

Jesus was born into this weak and overcame the weakness of the flesh.

Quote:

-----You say that every human being has 100% propensity to sin. I agree. Why is that? You say because of the weakness of the human flesh. Where did that weakness come from? It was not there when Adam and Eve were created, because God said everything He made was good.

What was there when Adam and Eve sinned was free choice. God has never usurped or taken away man's free choice. And, Adam and Eve were flesh, were they not? There is nothing inherently evil in being weak. We are to overcome temptation, and Adam did not overcome. On the other hand, the 2nd Adam did what the first failed to do. He overcame the world, the flesh and the Devil.

Quote:

-----So it must be a weakness inherited through Adam after he sinned, as the bible teaches...
"For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin." (Rom 7:14).

It wasn't something inherited. We are all born into carnal flesh. Carnal does not necessarily mean sinful. Carnal is also human nature and passions.

Carnal just means, pertaining to flesh, earthly.

As in: "Who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life." Heb 7:16

sar-kee-kos'

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is there a sin nature?

From G4561; pertaining to flesh, that is, (by extension) bodily, temporal, or (by implication) animal, unregenerate: - carnal, fleshly.

Quote:

-----Even so no one can claim that they do not choose to sin. We are responsible.

Quote:

-----Regarding Christians being free from sin, I agree with you that it is wrong to say or think we are just saved from the guilt of sin. We are saved from the power to sin.

I think you mean set free from the guilt of sin, through forgiveness and saved from the power OF sin.

Quote:

-----This is my point, that the gospel is the power of God to set us free from the bondage of sin, by taking our old man (Adam nature) to the cross and giving us a new life, even the life of Jesus Christ. It is wrong for a true Christian to say he has a sin nature if he is born again of the seed of God.

AMEN and AMEN!

Quote:

-----My point about the virgin birth you sort of touched on. If Christ was of Adam's seed he would have the propensity (or nature) to sin.

Yes, he would have human nature instead of God's nature. And human nature in and of itself is only carnal, not sinful. And because it is carnal, earthly and not of divine seed, it will eventually give in to temptation, as Adam did. God was not taken by surprise, when Adam sinned.

Quote:

-----But he came as the perfect man, born of God like Adam before he sinned.

I don't believe Jesus Christ was just like Adam before he sinned. Otherwise, Adam would have overcome if he had more than an earthly, human, carnal nature.

Quote:

-----Jesus overcame sin and dies as the sinless sacrifice. this is why He is called the last Adam (as our substitute He put Adam to death) and the second man, in that he begins a new race of man where he is now the ancestor of all those who are born of Him. We trace our lineage back to Christ and not to Adam!

Yes, praise the Lord, that is all true.

Did you get a chance to check out Augustine and Original Sin?

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/29 21:00

Quote:
-----by murrcoir on 2013/4/29 13:23:33

Pilgrim Quote: Man sins, because he chooses to, not because he is made to sin. He chooses to turn away from the Lord, he chooses the easy, fleshly way

I don't think there is any of us on this site that would say we didn't choose to sin, we are not saying man is an automaton and we are not saying we are blameless for our sins...

There may be some on this site that believe man has no choice but I don't think there is anyone in this thread that believes that.

Quote:
-----But I am glad to see that you admit at least that there is some weakness although you call it the "fleshly way"

Well, Jesus calls the flesh weak, not I.

Matt_26:41 Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.

Quote:
-----But what does scripture says

Col 2:13 And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;

And, Paul is not talking to babies, is he? He is talking to people in the church that have sinned (forgiven you all trespasses).

Quote:
----- (1) Being dead in your sins and (2) the uncircumcision of your flesh ---- We are doubly dead to God, not only wallowing in trespasses our outward sins, but also in the uncircumcision of your flesh. This is a beautiful expression for original sin that inbred corruption of your nature, your uncircumcised heart.

I do not see how you arrive at that conclusion.

Quote:
-----The fleshly way is the sinful nature inherited from Adam.

I don't know, Colin. I had all that drilled into me growing up as a Catholic but I just don't see it in the Scriptures as you are presenting them.

Quote:
-----And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual. The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven. As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly. I Cor 15:45-49

I am glad you brought up those Scriptures because just as I just mentioned to HeyDave, being earthly ("first man is of the earth"), and natural are just that, earthly and natural, and human. But to equate those with being sinful is a conclusion I think is in error.

Quote:
-----It can't really be more simple and easy to understand that I dare not add anything "we have borne the image of the earth"

As I said, there is nothing inherently sinful in being earthly. Adam was earthly before and after he sinned. Before he sinned when he was earthly (made out of the dust of the ground), he was not considered sinful. Only after he sinned, was he sinful.

So, I think you have failed to make the case of original sin and that infants would go to hell because they have a sinful nature.

The Bible says, "All have sinned and fallen short of the glory of God", not all have a sinful nature and have fallen short...

Great chatting with you, Colin.

Pilgrim

- posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/29 23:05

Hebrews 4:15

For 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.

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/4/29 23:50

The scriptures tell us that as a new creature in Christ there is no temptation which God Himself will permit us to be tempted with, which we are not able to endure. Clearly something which has to be endured speaks of that which is inevitable. If we could not be tempted we would not have to endure anything. To the innocent all things are innocent. Reconcile those two things and you have the basis for understanding this problem, of whether mankind inherently has a sinful nature.

In my view the key to understanding this question lies in three things.

What was Adam's sin?

What is sin?

Where does the power of sin reside?

All the rest is just words!

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/4/30 0:32

hi there Andrew , I hope everything is going well ,,,,

maby if you have time you could start a new thread and answer those 3 question ,,,,,I was reading a thread on the flesh and what that is in another site that the moderator here Robert partisapated in ,,, , bless you and your family ,,and bles s the other members on semon indx

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/30 0:40

Hi murrclor

murrclor wrote ////Proud papa states that we don't have a sin nature and his proof is that we are born innocent without a sinful nature. The evidence he has supplied so far would be laughed out the court because he has none.////

murrclor, you are the one whom used psalms 58:3 as a proof text to prove children are not innocent!!

I believe my statement of the fact that Adam was innocent, and that the the Bible says it this way: "they were both naked , the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

and likewise the proof of an infant as being innocent is that they are naked and not ashamed!

Would be much less laughed at by an unbiased court than your interpataion of psalms 58:3

murrclor, you used one of the most convincing verses in the scripture for your posititon and that is Job 15:14

Job 15:14

14 What is man, that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?

What about Jesus ?? was he born of a woman or not ? ,

it is interesting the gymnastics with scriptures that those of your tradition have used through out history to say that we m an have a sinful nature and yet Jesus did not, but yet still make a case that He did still have a sarx.

murrclor another verse that you used was Isaiah 6:5, part of it anyhow:

murrclor wrote ///Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man./// but the verse does not put a period after man as what you did.

Isaiah 6:5

Then said I, Woe is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips,..... by ommitting of unclean lips how are we not distorting the verse significantly ? especially with the relization of the point that you are trying to make.

murrclor wrote //// Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't j ust make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by natur e the children of wrath" ////

murrclor how does this not conflict with what you later wrote in response to Pilgrims question of : "Show me in scripture w here Adam had a sin nature that made him sin, murrclor. The fact that he has because head no sin nature, proves that o ne can sin without a "sin nature ??

murrclor response was as he wrote ////The fact that Adam sinned without a sin nature does not proof that we don't hav e a sin nature today does it?////

Which is it murrclor ?

So what was Adams nature before the Fall ??

If it where a good nature before the fall how then could he by your logic do any actions other than express to that good n ature ??

Where does compassion come from ??

Do unsaved people ever have compassion ??

who is our neighbor ??

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/4/30 1:04

What was Adam's sin? He was given a law, by being given a law, he then was capable of transgression of that law. Without a law to break there is no guilt, there can be no transgression without a law. Adam's sin was that he transgressed the law.

What is sin? sin is the transgression of the law.

Where does the power of sin reside?

the power of sin resides in (holding the truth),(having the law) because then and only then is one capable of sin. (NO Law, NO SIN)

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/30 5:30

Pilgrim,

Although there is much we agree on, I find that your understanding of the fall of man to be faulty, if not incredulous. Reading some of your comments I think it is possible that you are reacting to your Catholic upbringing and therefore distancing yourself from its doctrines. That's good where those doctrines are un-biblical, but you need to be careful not to reject a truth just because a false religion believes it as well.

How can you say that there is no difference between men born today and Adam and Eve when they were created? The whole bible record tells us at the point they sinned the whole creation was subject to bondage and sin entered the world (Romans 8:20-23). Jesus was the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, because in God's foreknowledge He made provision to reconcile sinful man back to himself. Adam was created in flesh, BUT NOT sinful flesh. The flesh was weak only in the sense it needed to depend upon God, but not that it had 100% propensity to sin (like you agree it does today).

Jesus came in the weakness of the flesh, but not in sinful flesh, but in the LIKENESS of sinful flesh (Romans 8:3). He was the 'new man', the second created man, untainted by sin and not descended from Adam. Where Adam failed, Jesus overcame every temptation thrown at Him and proved it was possible for Adam not to have sinned. Having obtained victory over sin, He became the captain of our salvation to bring us into His glory (Hebrews 2:10).

If as you say, everyone born today is just the same as Adam and Eve pre-fall, then there really is no saviour needed. There would be at least a few who would choose not to sin and not need saving, but you know that is not true. 100% of mankind sin. On the other hand if as you say Adam was created weak and is inevitable that he would sin you are saying God created Adam imperfect.

I think you are missing the glorious truth of Jesus Christ being God's firstborn son in that He is beginning of a perfect new creation, of which he will have many brethren (Rom 8:29 & Col 1:15). Jesus is God and always was God, but He did not use His divine nature when he came in the flesh to redeem mankind. So here we are emphasising the 'man Christ Jesus'.

Proud papa: Quote "the power of sin resides in (holding the truth), (having the law) because there and only there is one capable of sin. (NO Law, NO SIN)"

This is weak theology to say no law, no sin! Look again at what Romans 5:13 says 'For until (up to) the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law.' So it is clear that sin was around before the law, but only imputed (accounted to us) when the law came.

Also in Galatians 3:19 we are told that the law was 'added because of transgressions' and Romans 7:7 'the law shows us what sin is'.

Do you really think if we remove all laws tomorrow then sin will cease. God's eternal righteousness (and laws) always exist and anything less than God's righteousness is sin. Ignorance to these laws is no excuse.

Re: - posted by proud papa, on: 2013/4/30 8:02

Hi Heydave

Heydave wrote /////Pilgrim,

Although there is much we agree on, I find that your understanding of the fall of man to be faulty, if not incredulous. Reading some of your comments I think it is possible that you are reacting to your Catholic upbringing and therefore distancing yourself from its doctrines/////

I think Pilgrim is reading and believing the Scriptures rather than muffled commentaries and reformed traditions.

Heydave, can you provide us with one writing of the church fathers before Augustine whom held the position that you hold on this subject?

Heydave wrote /////This is weak theology to say no law, no sin! Look again at what Romans 5:13 says 'For until (up to) the law sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed when there is no law.' So it is clear that sin was around before the law, but only imputed (accounted to us) when the law came.

Also in Galatians 3:19 we are told that the law was 'added because of transgressions' and Romans 7:7 'the law shows us what sin is'./////

"for where no law is, there is no transgression."

"For without the law sin was dead."

Are Christians under the Law or under Grace??

Romans 6:14

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

Galatians 3:23

But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed

Galatians 5:18

But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.

Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?

Jesus came to free us from the Law, not so that we can do as we please but so that we by faith can be led by Him.

Romans teaches clearly "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold (not suppress) (but hold!) the truth in unrighteousness"

Romans ch 2 goes into detail how it is that all men on earth are guilty, (not because they are born guilty as Augustine believed by conception), but because all men hold the law within their conscience, and Paul proves this by proving that all men judge others and fail their own judgment, and when this happens, Which happens to the entire human race at the age of reason, at this point and without exception, Romans 7:9 then becomes the state of all men.

just my thoughts

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/4/30 8:57

proudpapa wrote: "I think Pilgrim is reading and believing the Scriptures rather than muffled commentaries and reformed traditions."

Do you presume to speak for another in such a arrogant way! I have never read a commentary or reformed tradition on original sin that I can remember.

Proudpapa wrote: "Heydave, can you provide us with one writting of the church fathers before Augustine whom held the position that you hold on this subject?"

I don't look to the church father's writings or Augustine, but to scripture. The only church father's writings that are infallible are those in holy scripture (such as Paul's) and this has already been provided to you in abundance. Is your faith based on the church fathers above scripture.

Remember you hold the minority view, so the burden of proof is with you and you have provided none from scripture as far as I am concerned.

This is now getting to be a tennis match between a few of us and I see no point in going around the same circle over and over again. You can hold to your view if you want, but others have the right to challenge this when you make such bold and sweeping statements.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/30 9:49

Quote:

-----by proudpapa on 2013/4/29 20:05:43

Hebrews 4:15

For 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.

Hi proudpapa,

I am just getting around to reading all the latest posts and I really like this verse. Notice what is missing here.

It does not say, "yet without a sin nature". I think that is a very important omission. Sin is not something you are both with, but something you bring on yourself, as Adam did.

I will have to catch up and read the other posts, later. I'm grateful that we are allowed to exchange our understand with each other in a peaceful way.

Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2013/4/30 12:54

Lets look at Pslam 51 step by step

Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.

Two washings one from iniquity and the other from sin

For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

Two acknowledgements one of transgressions the other his sin

Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. Pslam 51:2-5

And the last two verses deal with his sins that he has committed, the other he confess the condition he is born in.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/30 14:21

proud papa, good response to murrclor. I await his response to you.

Quote:

-----by Heydave on 2013/4/30 2:30:01

Pilgrim,

Although there is much we agree on, I find that your understanding of the fall of man to be faulty, if not incredulous. Reading some of your comments I think it is possible that you are reacting to your Catholic upbringing and therefore distancing yourself from it's doctrines. That's good where those doctrines are un-biblical, but you need to be careful not to reject a truth just because a false religion believes it as well.

You are right about one thing, Dave, I am definitely reacting to the false teaching I was fed by an Apostate religion. But what distanced me from the RCC and caused this reaction in me is the Word of God and the Spirit of God, not my own thoughts.

In my mind the early "church fathers" are the writers of the New Testament, not men that came afterward and were conferred this title of "Church Father" upon them. My observation through the years and through much reading has been that the reason those who have had the title of "church father" conferred upon them, was to give their words more weight than the writers of the NT (this is when the shift in true theology started). I reject any man's words, "church father" or not that does not agree with the writers of the NT. Titles are meant to impress people and I am not impressed by many of the things I have read by so-called "church fathers".

Ok, back to your comments.

Quote:

-----How can you say that there is no difference between men born today and Adam and Eve when they were created? The whole bible record tells us at the point they sinned the whole creation was subject to bondage and sin entered the world (Romans 8:20-23).

So, take those scriptures at their face value. What happened when Adam sinned? Creation was subject to bondage and sin entered the world. Exactly! But who else entered the world besides Adam and Eve? "Greater is He who is IN you, than he who is IN the world" (1 Jn. 4:4). Hint: Luke 4 - Adam gave his authority for dominion to someone through his disobedience.

Romans 8:20-23 would have been another good place for the writer to explain that the "sin nature" was formed in man. But, again they did not. I wonder why?

You have to be careful about reading into verses, thoughts to support your theology. (eisegesis).

John_3:6 That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.

Jesus simply says, flesh is flesh. He did not say that they which are born of flesh are sinful, though we know that all will sin, eventually. But for Jesus to be extremely accurate, He could not say "That which is born of flesh is sinful" (because babies are not and He knows that), so He simply said "That which is born of flesh is flesh". And that coheres with what the Hebrews in the OT believed.

Quote:
-----Jesus was the lamb slain before the foundation of the world, because in God's foreknowledge He made provision to reconcile sinful man back to himself. Adam was created in flesh, BUT NOT sinful flesh.

The flesh was weak only in the sense it needed to depend upon God, but not that it had 100% propensity to sin (like you agree it does today).

But that is not true. The flesh has always been weak, and that is only bad when we choose to give into fleshly desires which cause us to turn our back on God. Adam needed to depend upon God and chose not to. Satan appealed to lust of the eyes, of the flesh and pride of life.

Adam's propensity to sin was always there but as long as he depended upon God (looked to Him and obeyed His voice), he would not sin. It all depends on Who you look to and eat of.

Jesus repelled Satan in the wilderness with the word of God. Jesus refused to "eat" Satan's words and He refused to derive His life and identity from Satan. Contrast that with Adam who turned away from God to the lusts of his flesh (while he had no "sin nature" in him). Adam turned away from God and towards Satan. That is really what happened. You will understand better if you keep reading.

The popular Christian teaching, since the time of Augustine, has been that humanity was corrupted by the Fall into sin, and became inherently sinful, capable of self generating sinful character. The reason that I do not agree with that thesis, is because of what Jesus spoke to the Pharisees (and many more scriptures), "Ye are of your father the devil." But since the time of Augustine, Satan has sought to make humanity into sinful devils, that self-generate evil in which case they would be adversaries of God and not objects of His love. But we know who the Adversary of God is, not men. Just I look into the Gospels to see how Jesus loved sinners.

I also do not accept the belief, derived from Augustine's teaching that man is sub-human because now he is a "sinful devil."

Jesus was giving us some great insight when He told the Pharisees they were of their "father the devil and ye always do the things of your father."

Human beings, function spiritually, psychologically and physiologically and through freedom of choice are indwelt and energized by either God or Satan. This is what the Bible teaches and why I am convinced of this. Keep reading.

The Christian has Christ in him (Col. 1:27; II Cor. 13:5), the unbeliever has the "prince of the power of the air, the spirit working IN the sons of disobedience (Eph. 2:2).

The Christian is "in Christ" (II Cor. 5:17), the whole world of unregenerate persons are "IN the evil one" (1 Jn. 5:19).

The Christian has an adequacy (II Cor.3:5), of love (I Jn. 4:7) and goodness (III Jn. 11) derived out of God, the non-Christian expresses a character of sin derived out of the devil (I Jn. 3:8).

Christians have become "partakers of the divine nature" (II Pt. 1:4), the unregenerate are "BY NATURE children of wrath" (Eph. 2:3).

Christians have the "treasure (Christ) in earthen vessels" (II Cor. 4:7), those without Christ put forth evil things FROM an evil treasure" (Matt. 12:35).

These are a few of the either/or scriptures and there is no 3rd option or option of self-sufficiency for man.

Man is a spiritual being created in such a way that he must look to another for spiritual identity. He looks outside of himself for spiritual "life".

With these verses are you now seeing what the real source of evil is? We either eat (take in) Christ and out of this good treasure in our heart bring forth fruit pleasing to God or we eat Satan, (take in his words, look to him) and out of this evil treasure in our hearts we bring forth all manner of evil fruit.

Satan is very clever, don't you think?

I am not proposing dualism where we have a standoff, because God and Satan are not equal. The presence and activity of God or Satan within regenerate and unregenerate human beings, is not a standoff where neither can overcome the other. Through Christ we can overcome the Evil One.

God, in Christ, has defeated the forces of evil. In the death of Jesus Christ, Satan has been rendered powerless (Heb. 2:14), and the works of the devil destroyed (I John 3:8). A universal victory has been won, when Christ "disarmed and triumphed over the rulers and authorities of evil (Col. 2:15) by His death on the cross.

Notice, that the writers of the NT put the focus where it should be...on Satan. No mention of the "sin nature" (above).

So, what is the message?

No human being needs to remain indwelt and enslaved by Satan. A spiritual exchange is available to all men, where they can be turned/converted from the dominion and authority of Satan to the Lordship of Jesus Christ (Acts 26:18), and experience "Christ in them, the hope of glory" (Col. 1:27).

And from now on, it can be declared of the Christian, "Greater is He who is IN you, than he who is IN the world" (I Jn. 4:4).

I know I sound like a broken record, but notice none of those verses I gave are dealing with the fictitious "sinful nature". It does not say, "Greater is He who is in you, than your sinful nature".

This is BIBLE, Dave.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/30 14:34

Quote:
-----by murrcoir on 2013/4/30 9:54:33

Lets look at Pslam 51 step by step

Wash me throughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin.

Two washings one from iniquity and the other from sin

For I acknowledge my transgressions: and my sin is ever before me.

Two acknowledgements one of transgressions the other his sin

Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight: that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest.

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me. Pslam 51:2-5

And the last two verses deal with his sins that he has committed, the other he confess the condition he is born inÂ...

For such a major doctrine ("sinful nature") to be accepted, it should have 2 or 3 witnesses (other scriptures) and does not. What is more believable is that David is talking about his mother. Because of that premise, this explanation has always made more sense to me.

Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me (Ps. 51:5)

This verse concerns two people Â– King David and his mother. No one else is spoken about so we can't assume that all the people in the world are referred to here. The event spoken of is the conception of David and not the birth of David and he is not saying that he was born a sinner but possibly that his mother was in sin when she got pregnant. It could very well be that she was sinning when she conceived him. A strong case can be made that this is talking about the defilement of David's mother because she was previously the wife of, or the concubine of, a heathen king. Psalms is a poetic book and this means it can be taken literally or figuratively depending on the context, so we must therefore be careful. Taking a verse in Psalms and make a doctrine out of it, contrary to other more clear verses in the Bible, is not a good idea.

a. David had two half-sisters named Zeruiah and Abigail (1 Chron. 2:13-16).b. The father of David's half sisters was not Jesse but Nahash (2 Sam. 17:25).c. Nahash was an Ammonite king (1 Sam. 11:1; 1 Sam. 12:12).d. David's father was Jesse, not Nahash, but David's half sisters were daughters of Nahash. This could explain why Nahash showed kindness toward David (2 Sam. 10:2).

e. David's mother was most likely the second wife of Jesse. The first wife of Jesse would have been considered superior to his second wife, which had been either the concubine or wife of a heathen king.

f. This would explain why David's half brothers viewed themselves as superior to David, and why David was considered prideful for thinking he was as good as them (1 Sam. 17:28-30).

g. This may explain why David was not called before Samuel the prophet amongst the other sons, as he was viewed as the embarrassment of the family and possibly was an illegitimate child (1 Sam. 16:11).

h. David's mother apparently had a good relationship with the Lord (Ps.86:16; 116:16). But she would have been, in the eyes of Jewish law, considered defiled by her previous relationship with an Ammonite (Num. 25:1,2; Deut. 7:3,4; 1 Kings 11:2-4, Ezra 9:2; Neh. 13:23,25; 2 Cor. 6:14-17).

It may simply be that David's mother was not married to Jesse when she became pregnant, or that she was still the concubine of, or married to, Nahash the heathen king when she conceived. David was not blaming his sin on his birth. David was simply stating that even the circumstances of his birth were surrounded by sin. David said that he was "wonderfully" and "marvelously" made by God in the womb (Ps. 139:13-14).

Psalms 51 goes on to say:

Psalm 51:7 Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow. 8 Make me to hear joy and gladness; that the bones which thou hast broken may rejoice...

which few would understand literally. Can hyssop make even our sins go away? Can broken bones rejoice? We should be careful to not base any doctrines on poetry but we should rather read poetic text through more clear texts. Poetry might speak the whole truth or it might mirror the truth poetically. David was in jeopardy of losing the Spirit, because God had broken the covenant with him:

Ps 51:11 "Cast me not away from thy presence; AND TAKE NOT THY HOLY SPIRIT FROM ME."

David's mother was apparently a Jewish woman, because "no Ammonite shall enter the congregation of the Lord to the 10th generation" (Deu 23:3), and yet in Ps 86:16 and Ps 116:16, David refers to himself as "the son of thy handmaid", which would seem to testify to his mother's relationship with the Lord. David's mother was, in the eyes of Jewish law, considered "defiled" by her previous relationship to an Ammonite. David is in Psalms 51 speaking to the Lord and he is not trying to ask God for forgiveness for that he (David) has had the nerve to be born in sin. Being born with a sinful nature would hardly be David's fault but something that he could blame GOD for IF it were true – which it isn't. This psalm has often been used as an attempt to prove that David and ALL people under the sun are born in sin, but it fails miserably.

Psalm 22:9 But thou art he that took me out of the womb: thou didst make me hope when I was upon my mother's breasts. 10 I was cast upon thee from the womb: thou art my God from my mother's belly.

<http://bjorkbloggen.wordpress.com/2012/04/04/king-david-said-in-sin-did-my-mother-conceive-me-but-its-no-support-for-a-sinful-nature-ps-515/>

<http://bjorkbloggen.wordpress.com/category/english/reformed-church/no-sinful-nature-or-depravity/>

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/4/30 17:03

Quote: If it were a good nature before the fall how then could he by your logic do any actions other than express to that good nature ??

Quote: good response to murrcolr. I await his response to you.

Here is my response...

It is often heard within the prevailing philosophies of the day that people are basically good by nature. There is in all of us, it is said, a 'core of goodness' which in truth is the 'real us.' People are intrinsically good and this professed 'intrinsic goodness of man' is now fervently being set forth and upheld as a fundamental truth which must finally be acknowledged. It must be acknowledged, we are told, and acted upon. It must come out from behind the shroud of archaic and impeding thought, like that of Bible believing Christianity, which has stalled the advancement of man and hindered the development of the power of human potential. The fruit of this 'core of goodness' must finally be allowed to spring forth and flourish on the stage of human history. This is a 'new age,' we are told, in which mankind is casting off the shackles of archaic thought that have bound it for so long. The time has come in man's development for man to be able to know and fulfill his destiny through a proper understanding and appreciation for who and what he really is. This is what we are told, and at the center of all of this realization of who and what man really is, is the essential truth of the 'intrinsic goodness of man.'

It should come as no surprise to us that this is the world's thinking and that men by nature fail to see themselves for the sinners and unrighteous beings that they really are. It is the nature of sin itself to contradict God and to 'change the truth of God into a lie.' When God, therefore, declares that men are "dead in trespasses and sins" and that "there is none righteous, no, not one," it is the 'nature of the beast of sin' to deny what God says and to contradict it. And this is just what we see on this thread.

But the lie of man having an 'intrinsic goodness' teaming up with the pride of man's heart deceives many into thinking that their works have value to them in God's eyes and that they are acceptable to His Holiness and Righteousness. They, therefore, believe a perverted Gospel of Christ.

In the light of all of this it would be profitable to briefly remind ourselves of exactly what God says about what men are by nature, and what His own estimate is regarding men's good works. For in the face of the prevalence of 'the lie' it is easy to become desensitized to just how false the idea of man's 'intrinsic goodness' really is.

In Philippians 3 we have a passage in which the apostle Paul through the use of one very particular and descriptive word sets forth for us just how it is that God views men's own righteousness. What makes this testimony of special importance is the fact that Paul sets it forth as one who used to believe he possessed by nature an 'intrinsic goodness.' Paul had been a Pharisee, who in accordance with Pharisaic doctrine believed he possessed a natural righteousness and holiness in God's sight. He, therefore, as he says had "confidence in the flesh." He had confidence that he by nature was good, and that he not only could, but actually did, bring forth works and deeds that God would accept and would be "gain" to him in God's sight. But all this he found out to be untrue. However, not only was it false, it was outlandishly false, as he declares in a very descriptive way when he says...

But what things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ.

Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, AND DO COUNT THEM BUT DUNG, that I may win Christ,

And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith:" (Philippians 3:7-9)

"AND DO COUNT THEM BUT DUNG", that's what Paul realized all his own good works really were in God's sight. They were "dung." They were the waste products of a defiled nature. They were not a sweet smelling savor to God at all. Instead, they had the stinking repulsive odor of manure to Him. They were refuse; a good for nothing accumulated dung pile. What Paul realized about his own good works is just what God had declared to Israel in Isaiah's day.

"But WE ARE ALL AS AN UNCLEAN THING AND ALL OUR RIGHTEOUSNESSES ARE AS FILTHY RAGS; and we all do fade as a leaf; and our iniquities, like the wind, have taken us away." (Isaiah 64:6)

There it is again! Men's righteousnesses; men's good works and deeds; are "as filthy rags" to God. They are not clean and pure with the attractiveness of finely woven cloth or exquisite lace work. They are not beautiful to Him and lovely to behold like a tapestry of fine workmanship. But in stark contrast they are "as filthy rags." They are as rags that have been wiped in some foul and offensive excretion and are therefore filthy and unclean.

What a stinging rebuke to 'the lie' about the 'intrinsic goodness' of man. In truth men by nature are sinners, and are completely unable to bring forth any good works God's Justice will accept. The best of man is but "dung" and "filthy rags" in God's sight. No wonder man needs a Saviour! Even his best efforts, as Paul himself testifies to, and is evidence of, are but the foul stench of worthless refuse.

<http://www.enjoythebible.org/studies/righteous1.html>

Edit spelling

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/4/30 17:51

Murrcolr,

I knew you officially left the conversation and OP, when you posted about "intrinsic goodness", which I doubt anyone here believes.

Let me bring you back from your rabbit trail for a minute.
Do you believe Adam had intrinsic goodness?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/1 0:48

pilgrim777 wrote ///Murrclor,
I knew you officially left the conversation and OP, when you posted about "intrinsic goodness", which I doubt anyone here believes.
Let me bring you back from your rabbit trail for a minute.
Do you believe Adam had intrinsic goodness?////

Well answered pilgrim777.

.....
Murrclor, your response has nothing to do with your contradiction that I pointed out.

The last 3 questions I asked about compassion were not meant to be questions directly related to your contradiction, that is why I spaced them apart from the first 2 questions that were directly relating to your contradiction.
And I was not trying to make a case that man is intrinsically good.

this is the Question:

Murrclor you wrote //// Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath" ////

I then asked : "murrclor how does this not conflict with what you later wrote in response to Pilgrims question of : "Show me in scripture where Adam had a sin nature that made him sin, murrclor. The fact that he has because he had no sin nature, proves that one can sin without a "sin nature ??"

murrclor response was as he wrote ///The fact that Adam sinned without a sin nature does not prove that we don't have a sin nature today does it?////

Which is it murrclor ?

So what was Adams nature before the Fall ??

If it were a good nature before the fall how then could he by your logic do any actions other than express to that good nature ??

do you see your contradiction ?

.....
murrclor wrote ///Lets look at Psalm 51 step by step////

murrclor you should look at psalms 58 step by step, It is the chapter that you used to prove that infants are not innocent

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/1 1:26

Hi Heydave,

Heydave wrote ///Do you presume to speak for another in such a arrogant way! I have never read a commentary or reformed tradition on original sin that I can remember///

Heydave wrote /// I find that your understanding of the fall of man to be faulty, if not incredulous. Reading some of your comments I think it is possible that you are reacting to your Catholic upbringing and therefore distancing yourself from it's doctrines. That's good where those doctrines are un-biblical, but you need to be careful not to reject a truth just because a false religion believes it as well.///

Is it arrogant by your judgment ? , to suggest that perhaps the reason Pilgrim differs with you on scriptural interpretation is because he is distancing himself from his Catholic upbringing ?

Heydave wrote ///I don't look to the church father's writings or Augustine, but to scripture. The only church father's writings that are infallible are those in holy scripture (such as Paul's) and this has already been provided to you in abundance. Is your faith based on the church fathers above scripture.///

I do not put faith in any of the church fathers either, and that is not my point, my point is however, would you not think that doctrines as biblically obvious as you seem to feel that Augustines original sin doctrine is, would have been discovered and written about by someone before 387 ?

Would you not think, as what Pilgrim has brought up, that such doctrine that uses so much of the Old Testament scriptures for supposed proof text would have been held by the Jews ??

Heydave wrote ///Remember you hold the minority view, so the burden of proof is with you and you have provided none from scripture as far as I am concerned.///

If my views were held by the majority, I would have more reason to doubt them.

Search Church History of those whom promoted such doctrines the strongest (It is a bloody history)

Heydave wrote ///This is now getting to be a tennis match between a few of us and I see no point in going around the same circle over and over again. You can hold to your view if you want, but others have the right to challenge this when you make such bold and sweeping statements.///

You can hold to your view if you want, but others have the right to challenge this when you make such bold and sweeping statements

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/1 1:32

Quote:

-----by proudpapa on 2013/4/30 21:48:00

pilgrim777 wrote ///Murrcoir,

I knew you officially left the conversation and OP, when you posted about "intrinsic goodness", which I doubt anyone here believes.

Let me bring you back from your rabbit trail for a minute.

Do you believe Adam had intrinsic goodness?///

Well answered pilgrim777.

Thank you, proudpapa.

Murrcolr you wrote ///// Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath" /////

I showed you many scriptures where Jesus and the Apostles indicate that our actions are directly related to who we are abiding in. We are deriving our character and nature from either God or Satan. You make it sound like men are not abiding in Satan (the powers of darkness), and deriving their character and nature from him. Man cannot stand alone as an independent being. That is not how God created us. He made us dependent, derivative creatures, not self-generating and independent. Anthropology has shown that man looks to "another" to derive his spiritual "life". Of course many are deriving death thinking it is life. That's why I put LIFE in parentheses. Notice that Adam did not self-generate evil. The Tempter had to be there. The Tempter even wanted Jesus to abide in him (fall down and worship me). That is how simple it is. We either abide in God or Satan, reflect their natures and character, and bring forth fruit from their spirits. The "works of the flesh" are the character of Satan.

Eph 2:2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience:

Again, no mention of "sin nature". What we have here is the prince of the power of the air (Satan) working by his spirit in the children of disobedience (those without Christ).

Mat 13:38 The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one;

Who are the "tares"? The "children of the wicked one". Children reflect their father, who they are abiding in.

You may want to read 1 John 3 and ask yourself all through it, "where is the sin nature"? The Apostle John does not give the "sin nature" as the cause of sin.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/1 1:36

///who they are abiding in.///

When I read that, several scriptures and thoughts flashed before me, very insightful pilgrim777

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/1 1:43

I just edited my post proudpapa and added more. When you see this abiding thing is not just with Jesus but with Satan, then you see many old scriptures in a new way. At least that is what happened with me. I see the cosmic battle for man's soul more clearly between God and Satan when I realized that we are children of one or the other, we abide in one or the other, and reflect the nature of one or the other bring forth their fruit.

One is the Tree of Life and one is the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil. We are eating from one of them.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/1 1:58

I understood, that is why I wrote, very insightful pilgrim777 !

Thanks for all of the good insight pilgrim777!

Re: , on: 2013/5/1 5:54

Pilgrim

I am really enjoying your posts on this thread - they are excellent.

My own understanding, is that God creates all men equal, being a just and fair God, so Adam and all men are created innocent and must choose at some point - with a child I guess it is about age 4 - whose side they are on. There comes the temptation to accept what God has said through conscience, which when it involves something that generates great desire, the fall is inevitable - we decide for our lust. It has been noted many times how children have a very strong conscience, but over time they lose its clearness.

Experiments have been conducted on young children to see when they start lying, and three year olds do not generally but by four, most do when they are tested.

The fall of each man is inevitable because God willed it that way, so that we need to be redeemed and give mature love to Him. Love must be freely given but in innocence it is incapable.

All have sinned because without law there is no sin, and when the law comes, through the conscience, the man has chosen his spiritual father and is immediately endowed with the same nature of rebellion. He may have a really sweet and gentle disposition, and have much love for his fellow men, and even believe in a kind of Christianity, where God is seen as a distributor of kindness and tolerance but when faced with judgement and the removal of his own will, the man shows his allegiance which is deeply embedded in the depth of his heart.

Augustine said that men are corrupted through and through but they are not. At that point of bending the knee to God, and denying their deepest desires, even for good things, however, the father of lies shows his face.

So in a way we can call it a sin nature, but there is no scriptural evidence that we are born with it as Pilgrim has so skillfully shown.

But now the man does have the same nature or natural inclination of the enemy of our souls, he can be redeemed from it and restored to the state in which he was intended, that is, perfection, the state that Adam would have achieved if he had passed the test when it came.

This is where people misunderstand Pelagius due to him having a blackened reputation. He never denied the need of a man to be redeemed by Christ's work on the cross.

The question is however, does this `thing` leave us when we first come to Christ on hearing the gospel and are we restored to the state which God intended for us ie perfection?

I say no, and agree with Colin here, but not with Pilgrim. The gospel most hear fails to lay out the requirements and most stumble along until hopefully they hear the full gospel, otherwise they are not actually walking in true holiness laid out in the sermon on the mount which even forbids a thought which is not holy. It must be more than intention, or just love towards God, there must be perfect behaviour and thoughts otherwise we are still at heart in allegiance with the enemy.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/5/1 6:21

Quote: I knew you officially left the conversation and OP, when you posted about "intrinsic goodness", which I doubt any one here believes.

I was a thrown a bit yesterday as the Nigerian Immigration Service lost my passport so now I am stuck in Nigeria with no passport... but hey TIA... ..

What I am surprised at is that you can't see my point in my prior post, because it's a direct challenge to the mind set of day which influence men's thinking both inside and outside the church. Statements such as "men are born innocent", "capable of showing kindness" and "compassion" only go to prove the worldly thinking behind the doctrine you support. So the question needs to be asked by what standards are you judging the condition of men and the works of men.

What does a Holy God think of men's "works" of compassion and kindness? What is man's condition when he is measured against a Holy God?

What you both seem to miss is at the fall man was separated from God, this means simply that man now functions void of a Holy God; simply put man became flesh.

But can man act independently on his own; what came in to fill the void; Paul tells us we are sold under Sin, so we now have a new owner his name is Sin, Paul explains further that Sin works death in us and that our actions are now influenced by Sin that lives in us. Man (Flesh) has a carnal nature which is a nature that is controlled by the Sin which lives in him and works death in him. The lust that resides in flesh opposes the desires of God's Spirit and there is enmity (hostility) between both parties and you believe a lie if you think differently.

Flesh (Man) there is nothing good in him.

There is nothing that the flesh can do that can justify itself in the eyes of a Holy God. Flesh cannot and will not inherit the kingdom of God, as corruption cannot and does not inherit incorruption, why because the flesh is filthy, the flesh is corrupted and it cannot stand in the presence of a Holy God.

Unsaved man (flesh) greatest work can only be compared to a "sac de merde" (you can translate that from French to English if you want)... in the sight on Holy God...

Is a man innocent at birth; I ask how can something that's been corrupted, has a new owner called Sin, who resides in man causing both lusts and wrong actions that oppose a Holy God be pure and innocent?

If a baby/child dies will they inherit the Kingdom of God, I believe they do but not because they are innocent and pure but because God is Good and merciful....

So what I see in the doctrine you both support is worldly thinking...

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/1 8:06

RE:///What I am surprised at is that you can't see my point in my prior post, because it's a direct challenge to the mind set of day which influence men's thinking both inside and outside the church///

Did Finny and Paris Reidhead whom denied strongly this Augustinan doctrine teach "intrinsic goodness",??

RE: ///simply put man became flesh///

Genesis 2:21

And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the ((flesh)) instead thereof;

Genesis 2:23

And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and (((flesh))) of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was

taken out of Man

Genesis 2:24

Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one (((flesh))).

1 John 4:3

And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the (((flesh))) is not of God: and this is that spirit of antic hrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

The flesh is not sinful in and of its self, it is the obeying the flesh when it contradicts the Spirit, that produces sin.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/1 9:43

Hi Brenda,

Thank you for your post. You said some really good things and I want to understand what you don't agree with me about . Not that you have to agree with me, but somehow I have missed what it is. Once I understand, maybe I can clarify. I have to go pick my mother up from the airport, but I will respond when I can. Same for murrcolr and proudpapa.

This is the Day that the Lord has made, let us rejoice and be glad in it!!

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/1 10:36

Quote:
-----I knew you officially left the conversation and OP, when you posted about "intrinsic goodness", which I doubt anyone here believes.
Pilgrim777

“God saw all that He had made, and behold, it was very good. And there was evening and there was morning, the sixth day”. Genesis 1:31

That which was “very good” here at the beginning before the fall of man, before the curse upon creation and before the fear of man of animal, was everything including Adam. Everything was very good.

Beside this Adam was innocent. He was not "innocent" as a baby is said to be innocent, he was a fully formed man created in the image and likeness of God, and innocent. He was good and he was able to walk with the Almighty. He was capable of naming every living creature from his own abilities given by God. He immediately recognised that Eve was “flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone” and so out of his own abilities he named Eve “woman”. In short he was innocent and not ignorant.

To speak of a baby in the same terms as the first Adam, is astonishing.

Quote:
-----So what was Adams nature before the Fall ??  If it were a good nature before the fall how then could he by your logic do any actions other than express to that good nature ??   do you see your contradiction ? Proud papa

There is no contradiction, just a lack of understanding on your own part. Adam was good and he was capable of doing nothing but good. This is not the same as speaking of an ability to sin. Neither is it the same as speaking of innocence. Goodness is not a question of knowledge. It is a matter of obedience. Christ was good, though He said “call no man good” yet for all that He was good. Yet Christ most assuredly did comprehend both good and evil. The knowledge of good and evil is the difference between the first man Adam before the fall and the second Adam, Christ. In all other respects they are both truly sinless men. The scripture tells us that “no man” has sinned after the likeness of Adam’s sin. Why is this? It is because no man was ever going to be a fully formed man again and be innocent. In short no man was ever

going to be born of a woman who would reach adulthood and be accounted innocent before God. This speaks of the sinful flesh which by nature is always inclined to sin.

You ought to move on from the church fathers brother and read the scriptures.

With regards to Adam's sin of disobedience, Christ Himself had the power to be disobedient as well. This has nothing to do with sinful flesh because Christ clearly was another man. He was not of the first man Adam. He was the second Adam and the last man. If Christ was tempted in every way as we are, yet without sin, as it is written....how do some say that Adam was not intrinsically good because he sinned. Adam was not created with any imperfection whatsoever, otherwise God could not have called him "very good". Instead of debating the theological errors of our forefathers we would be better served debating present realities.

Quote:

-----I showed you many scriptures where Jesus and the Apostles indicate that our actions are directly related to who we are abiding in. We are deriving our character and nature from either God or Satan. You make it sound like men are not abiding in Satan (the powers of darkness), and deriving their character and nature from him. Man cannot stand alone as an independent being. That is not how God created us. He made us dependent, derivative creatures, not self-generating and independent. Anthropology has shown that man looks to "another" to derive his spiritual "life". Of course many are deriving death thinking it is life. That's why I put LIFE in parentheses. Notice that Adam did not self-generate evil. The Tempter had to be there. The Tempter even wanted Jesus to abide in him (fall down and worship me). That is how simple it is. We either abide in God or Satan, reflect their natures and character, and bring forth fruit from their spirits. The "works of the flesh" are the character of Satan. Pilgrim777

This is heresy. What you are saying here is so fundamentally wrong it makes for a separation of necessity. If taken to its conclusion this teaching would have men appear innocent of all of their actions, including Adam, and therefore there could be no such thing as accountability, hell or death. It lends itself to Universalism. Adam was not a puppet he was a fully formed man. His actions were made in the full light of his own choosing to listen to his wife (not Satan) and in so choosing he sinned by reason of knowing disobedience to a commandment of God.

Quote:

-----I just edited my post proudpapa and added more. When you see this abiding thing is not just with Jesus but with Satan, then you see many old scriptures in a new way. At least that is what happened with me. I see the cosmic battle for man's soul more clearly between God and Satan when I realized that we are children of one or the other, we abide in one or the other, and reflect the nature of one or the other bring forth their fruit. Pilgrim777

Thats for sure!

Re: , on: 2013/5/1 11:58

Hi Pilgrim

I seem to remember from past discussions that you don't believe in the `second blessing`. Have I got that right?

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/1 14:14

krautfrau,

Would you mind briefly describing that to me, again. I may know it as a different term and then again I may not.

Thank you

Re: , on: 2013/5/1 15:31

Pilgrim

By second blessing, I am referring to the teaching of such as Wesley where a carnal believer consents to the crucifixion of his old man.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/1 16:05

The Cross is indispensable in the Christian life. No Cross, No Christ, No Life. I don't object to crucifying the flesh. It is a command of the Lord.

I believe that is required in order to live and walk in the Spirit.

Gal 5:24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.

Gal 5:25 If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.

Re: , on: 2013/5/2 4:49

Hi Pilgrim

Sorry but I don't understand your reply. I am sure that you know what is meant by second blessing holiness. You asked me to tell you where I think we differ, but what you responded with is not disputed amongst believers.

If you don't want to discuss it then that's fine. I don't want to distract from the excellent discussion already taking place. Thanks.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/2 7:43

amrkelly wrote ///There is no contradiction, just a lack of understanding on your own part. Adam was good and he was capable of doing nothing but good. This is not the same as speaking of an ability to sin.///

The contradiction of murrcolrs that I pointed out had nothing to do with Adams ability to sin.

The contradiction with murrcolrs logic is because Adam indeed did sin.

Murrcolr had wrote ///// Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath" /////

If 'Our actions only express what our nature is' then When Adam did sin was his actions only expressing a good nature ?
NO!

murrcolr also had written ///The fact that Adam sinned without a sin nature does not prove that we don't have a sin nature today does it?////

still seems like a contradiction to my simple mind.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 9:48

Quote:
-----by proudpapa on 2013/5/2 4:43:13

amrkelly wrote ///There is no contradiction, just a lack of understanding on your own part. Adam was good and he was capable of doing nothing but good. This is not the same as speaking of an ability to sin.///

The contradiction of murrcoirs that I pointed out had nothing to do with Adams ability to sin.

The contradiction with murrcoirs logic is because Adam indeed did sin.

Murrcoir had wrote //// Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath" ////

If 'Our actions only express what our nature is' then When Adam did sin was his actions only expressing a good nature ? NO!

murrcoir also had written ///The fact that Adam sinned without a sin nature does not proof that we don't have a sin nature today does it?////

still seems like a contradiction to my simple mind.

Exactly, proudpapa.

Adam was not acting according to his nature, he was acting according to Satan's nature. But, Adam did not possess Satan's nature or was created with it. What happened?

He chose to be conformed to the nature of Satan by receiving his words into his heart, thereby opening himself up to a false spirit instead of the holy spirit. A transaction took place. Idolatry was conceived in Adam's heart as he chose to turn away from God's words (truth) and turn towards Satan's words (lies), thereby partaking of Satan's nature.

Whose nature are we partaking of? Who are we deriving our life from?

Pilgrim

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/2 10:21

Although I clearly cannot speak for another man, I believe the words from Murrcoir speak for themselves.

Quote:
-----"Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath"

Clearly these words are not speaking about original sin, rather they are speaking about the power of sin and death working in the members of the body, which body is the inheritance of all who are born of Adam. The Adam of which men are born, is not the sinless and perfect man before the fall, but the Adam who begot sons in his own image and likeness after sin and death came into him.

If therefore we speak about the sinless perfect man and why he sinned rather than why all other men sin, we may have a basis for understanding why believers sin today.

If we want to present this in a way which makes more sense we could do no better than to speak about the first Adam and the second Adam.

So also it is written, "The first man, Adam, became a living soul." The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. However, the spiritual is not first, but the natural; then the spiritual. The first man is from the earth, earthy; the second man is from

heaven. As is the earthy, so also are those who are earthy; and as is the heavenly, so also are those who are heavenly. Just as we have borne the image of the earthy, we will also bear the image of the heavenly. 1 Corinthians 15:45-49

This passage does not speak about sin and death, rather it speaks about that which is "natural" and that which is "spiritual". The natural man here is the first Adam and he is described as being a "living soul". This agrees with this: "And Jehovah God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul" (Genesis 2:7). So the emphasis here is not on what Adam became after the fall (flesh), it speaks about the first Adam in his perfection before the fall. The spiritual man in 1 Corinthians 15:45-49 is the second Adam. Nothing of what is said about the first Adam has to do with the fallen man, it is a simple reference to his pre-fallen condition and of itself partly explains how it was that he was able to sin in the first instance. This does not tell us what his sin was or what motivated him to disobey God, but it does tell us that he was natural.

In contrast the second Adam speaks of Christ begotten of the Father. Just as the natural or earthly man begets in his own image and likeness, so does the spiritual man give life in his own image and likeness. None of this speaks about sin and death. It all speaks about the substance of two men, the first man Adam, and the last man Christ. In the passage of time between these two men is the history of all flesh. After the resurrection of the second Adam from the dead, the second Adam becomes a "life giving spirit".

I don't say that there is no benefit to understanding why Adam sinned, I just say that it is vain to understand that from a fallen position. Then again this post was about asking a question..."is there a sin nature". I have no wish to contribute to that question so as they say "just passing through".

What Murrcoir shared however was clear enough and does not contain any contradiction to the truth of scripture.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 11:00

Quote:
-----"Our actions only express what our nature is. The sin nature is the basis for all sinful habits. We don't just make up our mind to sin or make a mistake and go from being innocent to being sinful. Eph. 2:3 "and were by nature the children of wrath"

If we are "by nature" the sons of God, is it your nature or God's nature?

so then...if we are "by nature", children of wrath, whose nature is it?

Man cannot stand alone and be an independent self. He is constantly deriving his nature either from God or Satan.

"Ye are of your father the devil".

This is how Adam, an innocent man who had no guile and had not known sin, could sin.

Yes, Adam who was innocent, went from being innocent to sinful by his desire to choose to follow and receive Satan's words and reject the Word of God.

Whose words you receive, is who you become. Whose words you receive is whose nature you receive.

These are important truths that are plainly taught in the Word and this is not hidden knowledge. If this were taught more, then Christians would not walk so foolishly.

1Pe_5:8 Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour:

2Co_11:4 For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we have not preached, or if ye receive another spirit, which ye have not received, or another gospel, which ye have not accepted, ye might well bear with him.

If you receive another spirit as Adam did, you will reflect that spirit's nature.

Re: - posted by Heydave (), on: 2013/5/2 11:21

I just want to let you know I won't be adding or replying anymore to this topic. Partly because of work commitments I have over the next couple of weeks prevents me, but mainly because I have clearly stated what I believe with scriptures and am satisfied myself of what I wrote.

If others do not accept my position, that is their right and I cannot do anything about that. Adding more to the discussion will clearly not benefit anyone, because it is clear what I have already said. No amount of arguing will change my mind or those of an opposite position.

Obviously others are free to continue, I am not.

May God bless us in our quest for truth, but much more in the doing of it.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 11:27

HeyDave,

Thanks for all your contributions.

I just wanted to post these two pictures that illustrate the "flesh nature" is the nature of Satan.

<http://www.theovercomer.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Walking-in-the-flesh1.jpg>

and the Fruit of the Spirit is the nature of Jesus Christ.

<http://www.theovercomer.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/Walking-in-the-Spirit.jpg>

These are the two sources of nature that man derives his "nature" from.

We are conformed to the image and nature of Christ or conformed to the image and nature of Satan by turning to one or the other and "giving them our heart" (receiving their words=receiving them).

I have presented my case and I think the Scriptures are clear about this.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/5/2 15:07

Quote: If you receive another spirit as Adam did, you will reflect that spirit's nature.

When you received Christ he entered your heart, wouldn't you agree?

Logically then when Adam received another spirit it would have entered his heart...

What does scripture say about the heart.

The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it? Jeremiah 17:9

Would this not point out to us an evil power residing in the heart of men?

edit spelling

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 16:02

Hi murr,

Seems we are in agreement, now. Yes, a spirit entered Adam's heart. He was innocent then chose to take orders from Satan and not God anymore, thereby receiving another spirit.

The first doctrine of demons was, "hath God said?"

John 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

Well, at this time in my life, this is the way I see things in the Word, but I am always ready for adjustment (remain teachable) and God has "adjusted" my understanding many times through the years. I reject Augustine and Original Sin because I DON'T see it in Scripture. I see much more regarding who we derive our "life" from by looking to and partaking of them. Of course most people would protest vehemently that they are partaking of the powers of darkness, but if they are not partaking of the Lord, there is only one other choice.

I don't believe man has any wiggle room and can blame his condition on anyone else except himself.

I believe we are called to walk in holiness because through partaking of Christ's divine nature, we can walk in holiness and be righteous.

If anyone has anything else to add, feel free to contribute.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 17:45

The consequences of sin and death that were activated in Adam were not limited to him individually, but were collectively applied to all of mankind. (Jim Fowler).

I want to share this link. I just learned some very important things that filled some "holes" in my understanding.

The Natural Man

A study of the effects of Adam's sin upon the entire human race.

<http://www.christinyou.net/pages/natman.html>

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/2 18:53

As far as Adam's nature was concerned before the fall it was precisely because he was made in the image and likeness of God that he was able to be like God. In fact God offered Adam the fruit of the Tree of Life whilst he was still without sin. It is this same uncreated life of God which was then subsequently denied him lest "he should eat and live forever".

If we get to thinking that Adam did not have the ability to obey God of himself we will end up in a position in which all judgement of God becomes unrighteous. If Adam did not have the ability to obey God, the commandment not to eat was itself unjust. This is the very roots of Universalism and the reason why today more and more men and women are moving towards its meaning, both saved and unsaved.

Adam was a natural man yet he was for all that created in the image and likeness of God. If God Himself is by His own nature righteous, then Adam could have been no less capable of acting righteously as well. Otherwise "image and likeness" has no real meaning at all.

Your belief that Adam had no moral compass is based on a single scripture which was spoken to the Jews. Who not only

He insisted that God was their Father, but accused the Lord of labouring in the power of Satan. It was the supernatural character of the Lord's actions which brought this accusation not the Lord's general conduct. It wasn't all that long ago that the Evangelical churches openly preached that miracles today were also the work of the devil. Today most of these brethren limit their opposition to softer tones. Yet for all that, in many instances they still believe the very same thing. Regardless as to why they have come to this place of thinking, the Pharisees and the Jews both witnessed these things first hand and on the basis of the miracles they personally witnessed and examined by trial of those who were healed, still accused Jesus of being of Satan.

The words "your father is the devil" is spoken to a few men, not the whole of humanity. Moreover it is spoken specifically to a number who are said to have believed in Jesus. Read the passage again. If they believed in Jesus how then does Christ call them children of the devil later on?

It was the exceptional nature of their accusations of the Lord which proved this fact and later resulted in a few of these men being cut off from life. Satan is called the father of lies. Those who believe his lies become his children in that respect alone. Those who believe lies speak lies. Jesus was simply showing the Pharisees and the Jews in generality that their believing that the good things which He did in full visibility was in reality the evidence that He had come from the Father. In contrast their believing that his words concerning knowing Abraham, demonstrated that Satan had become their father, because they had believed his lies. When men become so absorbed in the world so that the ruler of this world influences their very thoughts in defiance of the visible evidence of God, those same people become increasingly more and more demonic in their thinking.

In direct contrast those to whom there was given no light at all are called God's children. Read Acts 17:19-33.

Judas Iscariot is a perfect example of just how this mind of Satan works when a man lays hold of it. Jesus said to the disciples "have I not chosen all of you, yet one of you is a devil". Not like a devil or possessed of the devil, but a devil. When men reject the truth of God which is presented to them so plainly wherein other men repent and turn immediately, they press their own minds into a rebellious and fleshy inclination which turns them into devils. Only after Jesus spoke the words "one of you IS a devil" did Satan enter into Judas. Revelation demonstrates the very same thing at the end of his age. Paul called it an increasing "day of lawlessness" and this is what it means. When the truth is presented so well that it ought to turn even the most wretched man, and is declined, that man becomes a worse man afterwards that before he was shown the truth. It is the dog to its own vomit. This is the nature of the flesh into which mankind descended and led to the need for the flood. Noah, a preacher of righteousness, was given for 100 years to turn this effect aside. It was declined. The result was the flood.

You say that Adam believed Satan in the garden. No he did not. Had he believed Satan's lie spoken to Eve, he would have been deceived as well. You know that Adam was not deceived. Not only this but God Himself does not say to Adam "because you listened to Satan." It is written "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat from it'". Adam's motive for disobedience had nothing whatsoever to do with believing Satan. It was entirely motivated by his affection for his wife. Eve on the other hand did listen to Satan and she was deceived. Yet we do not have the nature of Eve passed down to us, but the nature of Adam.

Man has his own nature it was in the first instance in the likeness of God Himself. After the fall that nature of God descended in a short season to what is called in Genesis chapter six "flesh". The fact that the "flesh" of men corresponds to much of Satan's own activities, does not make man a puppet incapable of thinking or comprehending moral reality. Nor does it prevent him from comprehending the invisible attributes of God. Creation itself speaks of the invisible power and attributes of God. This alone is sufficient of itself to cause a right minded man to seek for God. How much more the one who is born again? Adam was not and never did become a vacuous garment either for God's purposes or the devil's.

Satan cannot be the father of anyone because he cannot give life. It is one thing to say that those who believe God become His children if by that we mean that they are born again of His Spirit or if it means believing that we are created by God. It is another thing to claim the same meaning of those who believe Satan's lies.

"Let no one say when he is tempted, 'I am being tempted by God'; for God cannot be tempted by evil, and He Himself does not tempt anyone. But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death". James 1:13-15

You have summed up your doctrine very well in your last post :

Quote:

-----Babies are an empty carton, no evil or Godly power residing in them. They have not received either one by their free choice, yet. But Satan is clever, and disguises himself and eventually people do receive the spirit of the world, spirit of lust, lying spirit, jealous spirit, spirit of envy, adultery, idolatry or any number of spirits that inhabit the kingdom of darkness. Man's only safety is found in Jesus Christ, alone.   John 1: 12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:   Well, at this time in my life, this is the way I see things in the Word, but I am always ready for adjustment (remain teachable) and God has "adjusted" my understanding many times through the years. I reject Augustine and Original Sin because I DON'T see it in Scripture. I see much more regarding who we derive our "life" from by looking to and partaking of them. Of course most people would protest vehemently that they are partaking of the powers of darkness, but if they are not partaking of the Lord, there is only one other choice.

What strikes me as profoundly difficult in your teaching is this:

“He was innocent then chose to take orders from Satan and not God anymore, thereby receiving another spirit”

Who knows anything about following Satan's orders? Or are we just playing with a fancy idea? As one who once did follow Satan openly before men I have to tell you that you have no idea what you are saying. Apart from what you have read in the scriptures have you any understanding of who the evil one is? Do you have any true comprehension as to his motives or his complete hatred of man, precisely because man is made in the image and likeness of God? Do we truly believe that Adam started taking orders from Satan? If we do believe it we make of Satan one who is like God. In doing this we make of him that which he himself desires. To be like God. No such person exists. There is only One true God. It is not Satan.

Satan does not give orders to men ordinarily, he deceives men. Except that he could not deceive Adam because Adam was first and could not be deceived. Eve was deceived because she was taken from the man Adam and was not first. How much more are those who are born of a woman according to the flesh of their father Adam according to the flesh vulnerable to deception? If believers continue to live in sin he may also deceive them in some measure as well despite that they have a new life in Christ. In the natural mind of the flesh they can be yet deceived in some measure. Of all living creatures man alone is able to blaspheme the Father and the Son and escape with his life. Why do you suppose that it is so.

“What is man, that You remember him?

“For both He who sanctifies and those who are sanctified are all from one Father; for which reason He is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, “I will proclaim Your name to My brethren, In the midst of the congregation I will sing Your praise.”

Who are these brethren of the Lord Jesus? If the Jews being brethren how then does Christ speak of them “your father is the devil?”

It is because they have believed the devil's lies not orders. Later on in that passage from John which you quote, Jesus acknowledges that their true Father is Abraham. Read it yourself. Well if there are any little children reading this post I hope that they understand that Satan was never their father and they were never just an envelope left empty from their mother's womb waiting for them to make an inevitable choice to make Satan their father. Perhaps they will in their childish hearts comprehend that their father of the flesh Adam sinned and brought sin and death into all of his progeny by reason of his creative power to make many sons after his own image and likeness. That the very body in which they live is the body of sin and working in it from their earliest days the power of it had its inevitable and dreadful way. For which cause Christ died. If they believe that contrary teaching they may hate God yet and not comprehend that sin is accounted by Adam not God.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2013/5/2 21:59

Andrew, in all of this you are saying that man has his own spirit, which Adam chose to give control of to Satan. When man's spirit chooses to be in Christ it is man's doing by the choosing on his own to give control to Christ.

Adam, was he spirit that whom he chose to believe would give his spirit to the one believed? This would give his spirit to Eve whom she had given her spirit to Satan, the one who deceived her.

How is it the one in whom we believe is the one whose spirit we are given? It is the soul/mind that believes not the spirit. Adam believed his wife, acquiring the spirit of Satan in whom she was deceived and believed.

Mark 1:15 And saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel.

Mark 9:23-26 Jesus said unto him, If thou canst believe, all things are possible to him that believeth. And straightway the father of the child cried out, and said with tears, Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief. When Jesus saw that the people came running together, he rebuked the foul spirit, saying unto him, Thou dumb and deaf spirit, I charge thee, come out of him, and enter no more into him. And the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him: and he was as one dead; insomuch that many said, He is dead.

John 1:12 But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name:

Something received must be given even to them that believe on the Name Of Jesus Christ.

John 6:29 Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

That work of God produces; John 6:32-33 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven. For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

The finality of the will and plan of God in Christ Jesus, to those that believe;

John 6:63 It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life.

By this we are born again, receiving the Spirit of Christ, the spirit of the devil out, and because of the quickening spirit belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, we now have the Spirit of Christ birthed in us.

John 6:65 And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.

Rom 8:9 But ye are not 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.

2Co 3:3 Forasmuch as ye are manifestly declared to be the epistle of Christ ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in fleshy tables of the heart.

The spirit of satan out and the Spirit of Christ birthed in us.

Jesus Christ is come in His Flesh and mine, by His eternal Spirit that now live in me.

1 John 4:3 And every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God: and this is that spirit of antichrist, whereof ye have heard that it should come; and even now already is it in the world.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/2 22:39

Good post, Philip.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: As far as Adam's nature was concerned before the fall it was precisely because he was made in the image and likeness of God that he was able to be like God. In fact God offered Adam the fruit of the Tree of Life whilst he was still without sin. It is this same uncreated life of God which was then subsequently denied him lest "he should eat and live forever".

Amen

Quote:
-----amrkelly: If we get to thinking that Adam did not have the ability to obey God of himself we will end up in a position in which all judgement of God becomes unrighteous. If Adam did not have the ability to obey God, the commandment not to eat was itself unjust. This is the very roots of Universalism and the reason why today more and more men and women are moving towards its meaning, both saved and unsaved.

Amen

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Adam was a natural man yet he was for all that created in the image and likeness of God. If God Himself is by His own nature righteous, then Adam could have been no less capable of acting righteously as well. Otherwise "image and likeness" has no real meaning at all.

And Adam was made to depend on God continually thus continuing to derive his nature and character and LIFE from GOD.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Your belief that Adam had no moral compass is based on a single scripture which was spoken to the Jews. Who not only insisted that God was their Father, but accused the Lord of labouring in the power of Satan. It was the supernatural character of the Lord's actions which brought this accusation not the Lord's general conduct. It wasn't all that long ago that the Evangelical churches openly preached that miracles today were also the work of the devil. Today most of these brethren limit their opposition to softer tones. Yet for all that, in many instances they still believe the very same thing. Regardless as to why they have come to this place of thinking, the Pharisees and the Jews both witnessed these things first hand and on the basis of the miracles they personally witnessed and examined by trial of those who were healed, still accused Jesus of being of Satan.

Adam's "moral compass" was his conscience and the Word of God.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: The words "your father is the devil" is spoken to a few men, not the whole of humanity. Moreover it is spoken specifically to a number who are said to have believed in Jesus. Read the passage again. If they believed in Jesus how then does Christ call them children of the devil later on?

But you and I were of our father the Devil, too. We were children of disobedience and by nature children of wrath. There are only two Fathers in the world, not 3. God and Satan. There is good and evil, life and death, blessing and cursing. Never 3 options. The parameters in this life are two options only. Heaven and Hell are two more.

We are spiritual beings who were created to look to another spiritual source for our image and likeness. You cannot stand alone. Humanists and New Agers think that they can stand alone. Atheists say they don't believe in God or Satan, but Jesus says if you are not with me, you are against me. Therefore if one is not with Jesus then he is by default a child of the devil. People don't like to hear this but it is BIBLE.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: It was the exceptional nature of their accusations of the Lord which proved this fact and later resulted in a few of these men being cut off from life. Satan is called the father of lies. Those who believe his lies become his children in that respect alone.

All men believe his lies before any of them are born-again. This world system is built on his lies. He is the god of this world.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Those who believe lies speak lies. Jesus was simply showing the Pharisees and the Jews in general that their believing that the good things which He did in full visibility was in reality the evidence that He had come from the Father. In contrast their believing that his words concerning knowing Abraham, demonstrated that Satan had become their father, because they had believed his lies. When men become so absorbed in the world so that the ruler of this world influences their very thoughts in defiance of the visible evidence of God, those same people become increasingly more and more demonic in their thinking.

What Jesus said to all men applies to all men.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: In direct contrast those to whom there was given no light at all are called God's children. Read Acts 17:19-33.

No, these men were commanded to repent.

Act 17:30 And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent:

The only people that are children of God are believers in Jesus Christ.

Gal_3:26 For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Judas Iscariot is a perfect example of just how this mind of Satan works when a man lays hold of it. Jesus said to the disciples "have I not chosen all of you, yet one of you is a devil". Not like a devil or possessed of the devil, but a devil. When men reject the truth of God which is presented to them so plainly wherein other men repent and turn immediately, they press their own minds into a rebellious and fleshy inclination which turns them into devils. Only after Jesus spoke the words "one of you IS a devil" did Satan enter into Judas. Revelation demonstrates the very same thing at the end of this age. Paul called it an increasing "day of lawlessness" and this is what it means. When the truth is presented so well that it ought to turn even the most wretched man, and is declined, that man becomes a worse man afterwards than before he was shown the truth. It is the dog to its own vomit. This is the nature of the flesh into which mankind descended and led to the need for the flood. Noah, a preacher of righteousness, was given for 100 years to turn this effect aside. It was declined. The result was the flood.

Men, like Judas can give themselves over completely to the devil. Most men are obeying and following the Devil without even realizing it.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: You say that Adam believed Satan in the garden. No he did not. Had he believed Satan's lie spoken to Eve, he would have been deceived as well. You know that Adam was not deceived. Not only this but God Himself does not say to Adam "because you listened to Satan." It is written "Because you have listened to the voice of your wife, and have eaten from the tree about which I commanded you, saying, 'You shall not eat from it'".

Adam believed Satan's lie transmitted through Eve. Besides, he was standing right there and not correcting Eve.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Adam's motive for disobedience had nothing whatsoever to do with believing Satan. It was entirely motivated by his affection for Eve.

ction for his wife. Eve on the other hand did listen to Satan and she was deceived. Yet we do not have the nature of Eve passed down to us, but the nature of Adam.

The command was given to Adam straight from the Lord. "In Adam" we have all sinned. Adam was not deceived, he knew the truth. Adam's transgression was pure rebellion as he chose to turn away from the Lord, towards Satan. He knew the Serpent was there. He heard the Serpent.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: Man has his own nature it was in the first instance in the likeness of God Himself. After the fall that nature of God descended in a short season to what is called in Genesis chapter six "flesh". The fact that the "flesh" of men corresponds to much of Satan's own activities, does not make man a puppet incapable of thinking or comprehending moral reality. Nor does it prevent him from comprehending the invisible attributes of God. Creation itself speaks of the invisible power and attributes of God. This alone is sufficient of itself to cause a right minded man to seek for God. How much more the one who is born again? Adam was not and never did become a vacuous garment either for God's purposes or the devils.

Most people think that when a person has received another spirit that they are frothing from the mouth, but that is not the case. The Pharisees had a religious, lying spirit amongst many others and they were not rolling on the ground, tearing their clothes. There are men that are considered gentlemen by worldly standards that have evil spirits.

Man is not an independent self, he is always partaking of either God or God's Enemy. New Agers think man can stand all on his own apart from God or Satan. That they can be their own god and that is just another lie. Man cannot stand alone. He is either receiving another spirit or abiding in the Spirit of God. Atheists also think they can stand alone and that there is no God or Satan. That there is only man and that's all. But they are really abiding in the Evil one. Satan even has the church deceived into thinking that very nice men and women who are not Christians are only abiding in themselves, but they are not. This is how deceiving and clever Satan is. He has convinced many that there is no spiritual realm and that he does not exist...and for good reason.

Quote:
-----Satan cannot be the father of anyone because he cannot give life.

That is a euphemism because Satan is a counterfeit father. You see, he still wants to "be like God". He wants to dwell in people, he wants people to look to him. But he hides in the shadows because if he presented himself, no one would want anything to do with him. Contrast that with Jesus, who presented Himself to the world and said, "Here I am, this is what my character is and He that receives me will never die".

Satan gives counterfeit life (which is death). You cannot tell people of other religions that they do not have life because they believe they do. Satan is the father of many because they are deriving their nature from him which makes them his children.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: It is one thing to say that those who believe God become His children if by that we mean that they are born again of His Spirit or if it means believing that we are created by God. It is another thing to claim the same meaning of those who believe Satan's lies.

Again, you are a child of whoever's nature you have.

Quote:
-----amrkelly: "Let no one say when he is tempted, 'I am being tempted by God'; for God cannot be tempted by evil, and He Himself does not tempt anyone. But each one is tempted when he is carried away and enticed by his own lust. Then when lust has conceived, it gives birth to sin; and when sin is accomplished, it brings forth death". James 1:13-15

Yes, they are not tempted by God. Who are they tempted by? Who was Eve tempted by? Same Tempter, today.

Ok, I will sum up the rest.

When I said that Adam began taking orders from Satan, I am saying that he is obeying an evil spirit, not the Spirit of God

We are to obey the Lord and the Lord alone. Adam clearly disobey the Lord.

We are told not to give place to the devil.
Eph_4:27 Neither give place to the devil.

The Devil still tries to snare people.

1Ti_3:7 Moreover he must have a good report of them which are without; lest he fall into reproach and the snare of the devil.

Paul knew quite well about Satan and exhorted the church to not be ignorant of him.

2Co_2:11 Lest Satan should get an advantage of us: for we are not ignorant of his devices.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/2 23:28

Hi pilgrim777,

As I am meditating on this, It seems that all of the scriptures flow together, unlike with the traditional perspective that derives its thoughts from out of context half omitted verses, and the usage of selective blindness to all the scriptures that would indicate otherwise.

but believed by many because it is craftily put together by professional Orators down through history.

Once again very insightful and helpful, Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/3 3:20

Hi proudpapa,

Thank you. It's not something I have made up and I certainly was not taught this in Bible college. It is actually right there in the Bible, not some hidden knowledge. The traditional perspective has had far reaching negative ramifications in the Church and will continue to have as long as it is supported. The traditional perspective is probably the most insidious thing I know of that Satan has perpetuated on the Church. This particular "doctrine of demons" in my estimation keeps the Church in a self-centered (and defeated) position rather than fully Christ centered.

By making excuses for the flesh (which clever theology does) we are continuing to grant Satan and the powers of darkness access to our lives. What did Jesus say about "clever theologians"?

"Ye are of your father the Devil".

Eve looked "unto Satan". Adam looked unto Eve but knew what was going on and had God's word delivered to him, personally. Eve was deceived but Adam rebelled. We all know the story.

There is a reason that we are to LOOK UNTO JESUS, the Author and Finisher of our faith. To look unto Him, we must look away from everything and everyone, else. Jesus won't be one of our lovers. He wants to come in and drive out "all the moneychangers". All the spirits we are making transactions with.

If we have a difficult time looking fully unto Him it is because we have idols in our heart, and what no one wants to believe, let alone admit to, is that they have received another spirit.

They have whittled the battle down to Jesus and the flesh. Satan does not exist anymore.

And now, Jesus just saves us from the guilt of sin, not the power because the church does not believe you can be set free from the power of sin. So, since you supposedly cannot be set free from the power of sin, a new theology must be made up to make us all feel better and convince all of us that we are indeed Christians, and that is that Jesus saves us from guilt.

How can we read the Bible and not see that Jesus wants us to walk in victory, here and now and to overcome, here and now? He will overcome in us if we turn away from all that is not of Him and have no other idols in our heart.

The problem is that we don't want to give up our idols. We really don't take Jesus words in the Gospels seriously.

But, isn't that what He means when He says that we should "love the Lord thy God with ALL our heart and ALL our soul and our mind (other places say "might")".

All, means there is no other room in our heart for someone else to receive our complete and total affection. Our heart belongs to the Lord. He gave us all and expects the same in return. That is union with Christ, that is marriage, that is covenant.

Whatever turns our heart away from Him, will also cause us to receive that something or someone to the end that we abide in that something or someone, and this should be rejected. But we think (in many cases) that we are not turning away from the Lord and that we are receiving Him and that is how subtle the Enemy is. Paul says, "We are not ignorant of his devices". Today, we are so very naive regarding the Adversary.

We are being told today by many that "this is the Lord", and "that is the Lord" and so people receive this or that.

This is not an easy battle. Our enemy is fierce and the battle is for your life. In order to win we must be willing to do what Adam did not do and that is to obey God's word and I don't mean legalistically. We must hear His voice to us, personally in the reading of His word, in prayer and other ways that He chooses to communicate with us. This is where many are being defeated. This is where we will always be defeated or victorious. By obeying His word to us or rebelling against it.

The Cross is repugnant to the flesh. Like oil and water they don't mix. We must exercise our will energized and strengthened by the Spirit of God to dominate our flesh and yield all the members of our body to the Lord. Body, mind and spirit. All of us.

We just cannot keep going through life saying we "are saved by grace". There is much more in the Scriptures than that.

And grace is not really free, is it? Yes, it is free to come to Jesus. You don't have to pay any money or get dressed up. Come as you are, broken and beaten down and in captivity. However, Jesus is not satisfied to leave us in the condition we come to Him in. Repenting will cost you everything. We must turn away (repent) from everything in our lives that is not of Him.

Grace is not free because it will cost you everything to follow Jesus. But this is not taught anymore. People call this works. They call obedience and holiness, works.

What has happened to Christianity? How did 12 men and another 120 people change the world?

What kind of people were they? Do you think they understood the seriousness of sin and what the ramifications were and who they were opening the door to when they sinned? Paul was very good at teaching and exhorting and admonishing the church but his words would have meant nothing if he was not "buffeting his body" each day so that he was not a "castaway" (a hypocrite).

Jesus' life was an example of fierce loyalty to the Father and all consuming love for His word.

The heart of Jesus towards His Father:

Joh 4:34 Jesus saith unto them, My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

Psalm 40 depicts the nature and character of Jesus and it should depict us, too if we are abiding in Him.

Psa 40:7 Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it is written of me,

Psa 40:8 I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is within my heart.

Psa 40:9 I have preached righteousness in the great congregation: lo, I have not refrained my lips, O LORD, thou knowest.

Psa 40:10 I have not hid thy righteousness within my heart; I have declared thy faithfulness and thy salvation: I have not concealed thy lovingkindness and thy truth from the great congregation.

No compromise!

Peace to all,

Pilgrim

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/3 10:01

Quote:

-----Andrew, in all of this you are saying that man has his own spirit, which Adam chose to give control of to Satan. When man's spirit chooses to be in Christ it is man's doing by the choosing on his own to give control to Christ.  Adam, was he spirit that whom he chose to believe would give his spirit to the one believed? This would give his spirit to Eve whom she had given her spirit to Satan, the one who deceived her.  How is it the one in whom we believe is the one whose spirit we are given? It is the soul/mind that believes not the spirit. Adam believed his wife, acquiring the spirit of Satan in whom she was deceived and believed. Phillip

I am not sure what all this talk of giving spirits away or control of one's spirit away has to do with. Man was formed from the dust of the ground, received the breath of life, and became a living being. So far as I know when Adam took cognizance of his wife he did it with his being. It was his affection or love for the woman which inclined him to listen to her. "Know you no that when a man loves his wife he loves himself?"

There is nothing theological about it. It is straight forward self interest exercised without knowledge of good or evil in disobedience to God. Nor is it some astonishing act of rebellion either. Its consequences were appalling but the action was innocently entered into. No trick of Satan as far as Adam himself is concerned, just disobedience of Adam. All that which followed the Genesis account of the fall, including the remedy of the promised seed is an history of how God Himself worked that promise out. In the end it proved to be Immanuel, God is with us. It proved to be God Himself becoming flesh and taking the sins of the world upon Himself. Being raised from the dead, by which evidence are we justified before God. And the very first benefit of this wonderful goodness and mercy of God is that a man can henceforth be born again. What is the part of man which is born again? It is the very thing which was first cut off from the life of, and dependency on, God. It is the spirits of men made alive together in Christ Jesus. "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit". Thereafter the only issue of salvation has to do with the soul and the body. The body is saved in an instant or else it is renewed in the first or the second resurrection from the dead. Even unbelievers will get a new body in which body they will stand before the Christ to give an account. This leaves the soul and it is the soul which is the battle ground of Satan. God does not work through the souls of men. He works through the renewed spirits of men, which is Christ in us both to will and to work according to God's good pleasure.

As I say I know nothing of this business of giving up our spirits to anyone. Let alone Satan. We cannot give our spirits to Satan and he cannot take possession of them either. Our spirits are either dead or alive. If they are dead they are useless and if they are alive they are alive with the very life of God in Christ which was eventually denied Adam, "lest he should eat and live forever" in a fallen state. The soul is the power which Satan desires. The soul is the instrument by which men express their lives. A renewed spirit on the other hand is the first opportunity men have to both know God and to truly worship Him. The body becomes an instrument of Satan if the soul itself is yielded to him not by an instruction, but by reason of deception. Yet for all of this reality the soul does not always sin. There are countless millions of sound men and women in the world who having no direct knowledge of God beyond what they comprehend from the creation itself, yet who seek to live sound natural lives. This is what Paul means when he says to the Athenians "for in Him we live and move and exist, as even some of your own poets have said, 'For we also are His children.'" (Acts 17:28).

All men belong to God. The only legitimate distinction, is children of obedience or children of disobedience. Yet for all that they are children. What do we suppose the parable of the prodigal son means? Everyone who is born of Adam is born into the world. The whole world is in Satan's direct influence. Yet Paul said to the Athenians "in Him we live and move and have our being". Satan is not simply a usurper he acts according to God's permission and limitations. The legitimacy of his influence in the world has to do with another day, and his ability to influence men has to do with man being s

parated from God. By Satan are many men driven in finality of comprehending his wickedness in their own lives to see k the goodness of God. Such was the facts in my own conversion. Satan cannot give life he can only perpetuate death. He is not a true father he is a rebellious son. Jesus made an open display of him on the cross and hence forth he is judged and his sentence will be the lake of fire.

Further as far as the spirit is concerned. "In the day you eat thereof you shall die"

"In the day you eat" God said, not 930 years later. The consequence of disobedience according to God was instant death. Separation from the life of God was the instantaneous outcome of sin entering into Adam, which sets Adam in the dominion of death. This is evidenced the moment God called out for the man. It is fear of God by reason of sin. It is the same sin which produced in the first instance, spiritual death. In speaking of Satan, he does not work in the spirits of men, he works in their souls. Yes all men are spirits. They also have souls and bodies. If you strip away the spiritual life of a man he doesn't immediately perish physically because he has a soul which is itself alive. The living soul of man ought not to be independent of God yet by reason of spiritual death it is become independent of God. Your claim is that this separation does not truly mean independence but becomes dependance of Satan is a lie. We do not depend on Satan not even in our worst moments of unbelief and not even when we openly give our lives to Satan and invite him in, as I once did. If you understood anything at all about true wickedness you would know that what Satan is about through disobedient and rebellious men, is precisely to press them into an independent mind, so that they will act in their own wickedness in the power of their own souls in agreement with Satan. If you want to speak of Satan's children then speak of those who by reason of their own wickedness wilfully enter into agreement with him, comprehending it or not, yet by reason of wickedness, a true agreement for all that. In modern vernacular they are called henchmen. These henchmen lord it over other men on Satan's behalf. These men have written down all the philosophies which presently keep men in unbelief. Other men press their meanings in cruelty and destruction of other men. In all of this Satan had only one ambition, this is to bring humanity to a condition in which he becomes their god in the visibility of a man, even another christ.

Satan is just one man. He is not able to control men directly in every place. He is not God. He is one son of rebellion leading many other sons of rebellion. His dominion of influence is the world and the world is a great deal more than those men who are alive in it at any given moment. It is the whole system of Satan's activities in disobedient men who lend themselves to his ambitions by reason of their own wickedness. In this these men are personally and unequivocally accountable for their own actions. They will not be able to say in that day "Satan made me do it" because their activities will be weighted in the scales of a just and righteous Saviour, even the man, Christ Jesus. They will be either judged under the law or without the law. Jew or Gentile. They will be accountable every man and woman and they will not be able to say that God is unrighteous but will bend their knee and declare "My Lord and God". They will stand and go unto destruction or eternal life. Satan's part in this is by permission of God and he is not an originator but a counterfeiter for his own wicked purposes. Men on the other hand having their own lives, will give an account for their lives. Stating anything which given rise to an ability to question this will lead to stumbling.

Quote:
-----But you and I were of our father the Devil, too. We were children of disobedience and by nature children of wrath. There are only two Fathers in the world, not 3. God and Satan. There is good and evil, life and death, blessing and cursing. Never 3 options. The parameters in this life are two options only. Heaven and Hell are two more. Pilgrim777

This sounds more like dialectic philosophy. It amounts to yin and yang not Spirit and Truth. You make Satan to be as God Himself. Believing in God is a matter of righteousness and obedience. No one is required to believe in Satan. Obeying God is a matter of righteousness. No one is required to obey Satan. When men do that which is evil they do it out of their own nature. Men do not need another nature they have a fallen one and it is always inclined to evil. Where this nature resides is the real question. According to you babies are just envelopes and only become evil when they choose to serve Satan. What complete nonsense. The number of men who actually choose to serve Satan are as a city in the midst of an empire. Its a complete myth. No such choice exists. Adam did not have a choice as to whether to obey or disobey God. No such choice exists nor has it ever existed. Obeying God is not a matter of choice. Yet for all that because man has a life of his own he has the power to disobey God. This is not the same as having a choice. Yin and Yang is a choice of two equals neither one nor the other being fully ascendent. God on the other hand is over all. Perhaps in the end of this age many men will indeed openly disobey God. The question one has to ask is by what power do they do so? If it is by the power of Satan working in them then there is no basis for them to be condemned because they are acting against their own desires. If on the other hand they themselves desire it they are acting out of the power of their own lives.

You state the case of Satan's influence on men more fully than is wise or true. If men do not exercise their own will to do that which is by their own understanding either good or evil, then Satan has no basis for pressing anyone. Even then he knows not the least part of men. He is just one man. God on the other hand knows all men.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/3 11:36

amrkelly,

Who did Cain give himself over to? Who did he yield to? Who did he open his heart to? I don't know how many ways I can describe it to you, but he received a spirit of murder and who is the "murderer from the beginning"?

Who conspired to murder Jesus Christ? It was the children of the "Murderer from the beginning".

Who did King Saul turn away from? Who did he turn to?

Who did Stalin give himself over to? Who did Marx yield himself to? Marx was a Satanist by the way. Many have given themselves completely to him. Hitler, Pol Pot, Idi Amin. But, all who are not in the Kingdom of God are children of the Devil residing in the Kingdom of Darkness.

God desires to inhabit man. Someone else desires to inhabit and control man.

Satan is not a man. He is a spirit.

Paul says "we are not ignorant of his devices", yet many today, are. Why do you think Paul spoke about Satan so much? Was Paul always just looking at the physical realm?

Let me just say it again. We are spiritual beings who look to another for spiritual "life" even if we don't think we are doing that. Satan has created the world's systems to hide himself. His goal is for people to yield to the powers of darkness. He does have a kingdom. The Bible calls it the Kingdom of Darkness.

Yes, Satan does not give spiritual life. He just makes people think they are partaking of life. Moonies, Mormons, Hindus, and many who name the name of Christ but don't "depart from sin", will say they have life.

Do you still not see the spiritual battle that is being waged for men.

Satan still wants to be like God, he still wants to be worshipped. He still wants people to yield to him and not to Jesus Christ.

Men will talk about what they love. You will know whose kingdom someone lives in and who they are deriving their identity from if you listen closely to someone for about half an hour. Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaks.

Jesus says, we cannot serve two masters. Everyone is serving Jesus or Satan. If you listen closely to people, you will hear.

That is all I have time for now.

2Ti_2:26 And that they may recover themselves out of the snare of the devil, who are taken captive by him at his will.

Joh_10:10 The thief cometh not, but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy: I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/3 13:50

Cain didn't give himself over to anything. He yielded to that which was already in him. "sin is crouching at the door....you must master it" does not mean that Satan was crouching at the door. It means that sin was crouching at the door. This is entirely in keeping with Paul's words "that which I would, I do not, and that which I would not, I do". All the other men you mentioned gave themselves over to themselves. They too failed to master sin in their lives, even though every one of them you named apart from Saul and Cain, rejected Christ. Unless you believe that Cain was to somehow master Satan, which I believe you do, then it may make more sense to accept the simplicity of the saying itself. Paul alone in your list is the man chosen by God to know Christ despite himself and Paul is an apostle according to Christ.

Yes I know that Satan is not a man. It was making a point not expressing a theology. When Satan entered into Judas at the supper table he was not at the same time in some other place as well. When he carried the Lord to the pinnacle of the temple he was not yet in the dessert. He is just one man.

Yes I know that there is a war, but its not here on the earth in that sense its in the heavens against principalities and powers of wickedness. The battle here on earth is already won. It was entered into by Christ Himself and Satan was defeated. The rest as they say is just a matter of time and the obedience of the saints.

As far as Paul was concerned he had every reason to be mindful of Satan as he once lent himself to murder as well. And as it is written Satan was a murderer from the beginning. The passage from John "your father is the devil" was in context of the Jews seeking to murder the Lord Jesus. This was the sense in which those Jews who desired to murder Jesus, demonstrating their opposition to God, and by it imagined themselves to be serving God. Given that I don't anticipate that all men everywhere are either believers or murderers I would say that it is unreasonable to say of all unbelievers that their father is the devil. Its both offensive and unnecessary. What is even worse is to begin to speak about those who are believers as children of the devil. Yet this too is what is happening based on this very same doctrine. It is simply an excuse by some who feel a need to explain the condition of the churches and yet cannot fathom it.

You don't have to keep on explaining anything to me brother. I will not receive it and you ought to know it well.

Quote:

-----"Do you still not see the spiritual battle that is being waged for men? Pilgrim777

The spiritual battle which is being waged as I said is being waged in heaven. There is no battle here on the earth because all men are already of the world the moment they are born. That part was lost the moment Adam sinned. The rest is being worked out not least that Christ Himself has already the victory in His own body. When we are saved we are become citizens of another kingdom. Yet Jesus said the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto a field. Then explained that the field is the world. How is that possible? The very centrality of the parable of the sower makes the point. You yourself quoted it earlier on. The good seeds are the sons of God and the bad seed are the sons of the devil. You said this to make the point that the devil is the father of all unbelievers. Yet the meaning of the parable is not to make of Satan a father of men, it is to demonstrate that the kingdom of heaven is near at hand. The very world is included in it. It is a dominion which encompassed Satan's kingdom as well. And so it must if God is indeed God. In the end the angels will gather out of this world all stumbling blocks and then the world itself will become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ. Our responsibility and the very reason we have been both called and chosen is to preach Christ crucified for sin and to pray that the Father establish His will here on earth as it is already established in heaven.

The real battle if we do speak in such terms is in the hearts and minds of men. Not least the saints that they fight a good fight for the sake of those who are being saved. Just as the real battle for Cain was not a wrestling with Satan, it was a man wrestling with his own flesh. The sin which Cain needed to master was in his own body. That is the meaning of "near at hand". It is the same for each and every one of us who are saved and not just for unbelievers. This is because we are waiting for the removal of our bodies to what "our adoption as sons of the living God". As long as we have this fleshly garment with its power of sin and death yet working in it we will always have the same conflict. The Holy Spirit is given to us not only to quicken our spirits unto God and to impart the very life of God in Christ Jesus, but He also wrestles with the flesh in order that we might not do that which we would otherwise do. Hence why walking in the power of the Spirit is the only sure victory here and now.

Just to conclude what I have shared already I would draw your attention to the fact that when men do that which is in opposition to God they are called satan as well. This is nothing to do with the wicked one in a direct sense it is to do with the fact that the name Satan itself simply means "God's opponent". Anyone who opposes God is a satan. In like manner did Jesus rebuke Peter with the words "get thee behind me, Satan: thou art a stumbling-block unto me: for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men". Jesus did not say "you mindest the things of Satan" nor could Jesus have said to Satan himself "you mindest the things of men". If this is a speaking to Satan directly and amounts to proof that Peter was simply expressing a Satanic ambition to turn Christ away from the cross, then it is the same as saying that Satan himself is minded with the things of men and not his own things. Satan did not comprehend the cross nor the victory which was in it. It was hidden from men and angels and was not revealed in its true meaning until after the Lord's resurrection. Even though Jesus stated it plainly to the disciples they did not yet understand the meaning of the cross until the resurrection. Thomas even then would not believe it but demanded physical proof.

The character of men who stand in opposition to God's will is no less wicked than the character of Satan whose very name means God's opponent. This is why I shared earlier about Judas and the meaning of the passage from John regarding Israel and especially some of the Pharisees.

To make the point that there are two "Father's" one called Satan and the other a reference to the Father in heaven is well short of the true meaning of who and what Satan means and is, as a fallen angel, or what a man is when he is overcome by the lusts of the flesh, as a fallen man. It also disguises the real meaning of Who the Father is as well. I know of only one explanation for the reason why men sin. It is because they have inherited the physical constitution of Adam. I know of only one reason why men are able to be delivered from the power of sin. It is because they have been crucified in Christ Jesus, and have become a new creature in Him. He is the new creature because He was raised from the dead having conquered sin and death. We are new creatures in Him because we have become inheritors of His life according to the will of the Father.

If men press their minds in defiance of the truth concerning the Son of Man then in the end even men will become demonic themselves. What I have seen in the past 25 years is an increasing hiding of demonic activity and an increasing outworking of men. There is a good reason why demonic activity has taken to hiding in the Western World. It is because men themselves are becoming demonic. If you want to understand that read the trial of the Lord Jesus. A Governor and a King wanted to release Jesus and accounted Him innocent. It was some of the Pharisees who pressed for the Lord's death. And when asked the question "do you not want me to release unto you your King?" cried with a loud voice "away with Him. We have no king but Caesar".

That is the meaning of being children of the devil. It is to become like the devil Himself.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/3 15:02

Great chatting with you amrkelly.

Glad we could discuss these things, openly.

Have you read Ephesians 6, lately? Who are the players in spiritual warfare?

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2013/5/3 21:27

that was an extremely interesting few posts brother Andrew ,,those types of post make it worth reading through the different threads ,,I hope everything is going well for you ,,blessings

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/3 23:20

RE: ///Who did Cain give himself over to? Who did he yield to? Who did he open his heart to?///

RE: ///Cain didn't give himself over to anything. He yielded to that which was already in him. "sin is crouching at the door....you must master it" does not mean that Satan was crouching at the door. It means that sin was crouching at the door.///

1 John 3:12

Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one,.....

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/3 23:49

Quote:

-----by proudpapa on 2013/5/3 20:20:49

RE: ///Who did Cain give himself over to? Who did he yield to? Who did he open his heart to?///

RE: ///Cain didn't give himself over to anything. He yielded to that which was already in him. "sin is crouching at the door....you must master it" does not mean that Satan was crouching at the door. It means that sin was crouching at the door.///

1 John 3:12

Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one,.....

proud papa,

Again brings out a cogent scripture. John is identifying for us who Cain was deriving his life from...the wicked one.

Are we overcoming the "sin nature" or overcoming the wicked one?

Satan is sin personified, so you could also say "Satan was crouching at the door". Demons were crouching at his door and he needed to know that he should rule over them.

Gen 4:7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

John says this:

1Jn_2:14 I have written unto you, fathers, because ye have known him that is from the beginning. I have written unto you, young men, because ye are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and ye have overcome the wicked one.

proud papa, thanks for producing that scripture. You in turn stimulated my mind to think of more.

Jesus tells us that the tares are "children of the wicked one."

Mat_13:38 The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one;

It's pretty evident that these concepts are not hidden from Scripture but that people have to take out their "virtual" scissors and cut these verses out so they don't exist in their mind.

1Jn_5:18 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.

amrkelly, you said earlier that we don't fight Satan, implying that we don't fight the powers of darkness. But Paul in Ephesians says: "For we wrestle.....against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places." Eph 6:12

Is it not plain that we sit with Christ in heavenly places and that we war against the spiritual forces of darkness in high places?

Eph_2:6 And hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus:

Why are we fighting? What are we trying to prevent?

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/3 23:52

RE:/// What is even worse is to begin to speak about those who are believers as children of the devil. Yet this too is what is happening based on this very same doctrine. It is simply an excuse by some who feel a need to explain the condition of the churches and yet cannot fathom it.///

Mark 8:33

But when he had turned about and looked on his disciples, he rebuked Peter, saying, Get thee behind me, Satan: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.

Re: , on: 2013/5/4 0:00

I suppose to comprehend at what point Cain became of that wicked one would produce a similar countenance in some men as was on Cain's face when God rejected the fruit of a cursed earth as an acceptable sacrifice. Then again perhaps having a brother who was the first prophet might explain why Abel made a good choice. At what point in Cain's mortal existence did he become of that wicked one? Perhaps the scriptures will tell us. After all the answer to this puzzling question will determine if all men are of Satan before they believe or whether they only become "of Satan" after they start growing vegetables!

"Not as Cain, who was of that wicked one, and slew his brother. And wherefore slew he him? Because his own works were evil, and his brother's righteous"

You are of your father the devil, and you want to do the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning John 8:44

There we have it then. It wasn't the vegetable plot which got him into difficulties with the prince of the power of the air, it was a desire to murder his brother. It wasn't the spuds after all!

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 0:04

(I edited the previous post of mine).

It is not difficult to fathom the condition of the churches, today. No surprise or shock at all, when you consider what is being taught today and then line it up with what Jesus and the Apostles teach us.

The Scriptures already explain what is happening today and why it is happening. No need to make anything up, just say what the Bible says.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/4 0:08

///There we have it then. It wasn't the vegetable plot which got him into difficulties with the prince of the power of the air, it was a desire to murder his brother. It wasn't the spuds after all!///

the prince of the power of the air is another good point, Eph 2:2 tells us that this is the natural course of all humanity.

Ephesians 2:2

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

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 0:16

Once there was a very hard working and industrious man who had a heart to seek God. We know that he could "hear" the Lord God's voice because the Scriptures reveal that he was greatly encouraged and counseled by God. He had a desire to please God so he brought to God part of all that God had blessed him with.

So far, according to popular religious standards this fellow has all the qualifications of a leader of the people of God -- very hard working, a heart to seek God, a desire to give unto the Lord and experience of fellowship with God. This is the type of person that the church is actively seeking, a spiritual mover and shaker. The problem is, "that the things that are highly esteemed among men are an abomination in the sight of God".

And he said unto them, Ye are they which justify yourselves before men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is highly esteemed among men is abomination in the sight of God.

Luke 16:15

The Lord was not pleased with this fellow's offering. We can only expect our offering to be received by God when we come to Him according to His terms and not in a way that seems good to us.

The man, whose name was Cain, had a brother named Abel. Somehow, Abel had an understanding of what was acceptable to God. Cain was taught the same. God implied by His conversation with Cain that he knew the "right" thing to do.

The rest of the story revealed the orientation of Cain's heart and from whom, his "understanding" came from (of the wicked one).

Re: , on: 2013/5/4 1:49

Quote:
-----Ephesians 2:2
Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience proudpappa

The passage from which this verse is selected speaks for itself as does the whole of Scripture if we give things their context and proper circumstance. The sons of disobedience are the Jews because they rejected Christ. Try reading the whole passage and not just one verse (Ephesians 2:1-14) Just as Cain rejected God's advice about sin crouching at the door, just as the Pharisees rejected God's will for their lives (Luke 7:30). And so on. There is no mystery in all of this. If God speaks to you and you reject the direct commandment of God you place yourself in the direct path of Satan and one ought not to be surprised thereafter if he finds a use for you after all. Whether you know it or not.

Quote:
-----What causes quarrels and what causes fights among you? Is it not this, that your passions are at war within you? You desire and do not have, so you murder. You covet and cannot obtain, so you fight and quarrel. You do not have, because you do not ask. You ask and do not receive, because you ask wrongly, to spend it on your passions. You adulterous people! Do you not know that friendship with the world is enmity with God? Therefore whoever wishes to be a friend of the world makes himself an enemy of God. Or do you suppose it is to no purpose that the Scripture says, "He yearns jealously over the spirit that he has made to dwell in us"? (James 4:1-5)

So what going on here then brethren? Does the Spirit of God dwell in these saints to whom James is writing? Or is James the Lord's brother lying about them? If it's true and these men and women are believers then your theology is dumped because they must be producing this hating, quarrelling, fighting and love of the world generally from somewhere. Perhaps it's the same place unbelievers dig up their evil inclinations from as well! It must be the body of sin and death which they use to get around. Unless of course Satan has taken up residence with the Holy Spirit Himself and made peace!

Being evil on the other hand is the portion of all men from God's perspective of what constitutes a good and acceptable sacrifice in His sight. You don't have to believe this but if we read the whole of the scriptures and not just a few verses here and there out of context and with no means to connect them together other than the imagination, inevitably we are

going to come to some pretty alarming ideas. One of them might be the idea that men are just envelopes waiting to be filled up with God or Satan.

Yet Jesus seemed to have no problem with understanding that men can be both evil and yet do good things. "If you being evil know how to give good things to your children...." (Matthew 7:11).

Of course the "you being evil" is in God's sight, according to God's measure of what constitutes a good thing. And a good thing according to the flesh, as regards the natural affections of men and women towards their children.

"Speak to the sons of Israel, saying, 'If a person sins unintentionally in any of the things which the Lord has commanded not to be done.....'(Leviticus 4:2)

Sinning unintentionally! How on earth is that possible? No no sin cannot be unintentional it must come from actively inviting Satan into your life and serving Him. How can that possibly be unintentional?

But they fell on their faces and said, "O God, God of the spirits of all flesh...(Numbers 16:22)

What! God of the spirits of all flesh! Argh that's horrible Governor!

Indeed, there is not a righteous man on earth who continually does good and who never sins. (Ecclesiastes 7:20).

I'm not surprised that there is not even one righteous man on the earth who continually does good. Satan must get really bored even with one righteous man. Nothing to do there! Still when the righteous man does sin, well desires to sin anyway, Satan will no doubt move right back in and do the business, even if it's just a little sin!

It's not as simple as saying that men are just envelopes waiting to be filled up. In the sight of God all men are evil in the flesh, yet He is still "God of the spirits of all flesh".

Here is a truly clear example of just how swiftly the prince of the power of the air moves in to do his work when men do that which is truly against God. Then it is no joke and it cost men their eternal hope!

The question though is who sinned here in this verse? Aron perhaps!

Speaking to Moses:

Aaron said, "Do not let the anger of my lord burn; you know the people yourself, that they are prone to evil. "For they said to me, 'Make a god for us who will go before us; for this Moses, the man who brought us up from the land of Egypt, we do not know what has become of him.' "I said to them, 'Whoever has any gold, let them tear it off.' So they gave it to me, and I threw it into the fire, and out came this calf." (Exodus 32:22-24)

"Out came this calf" said Aron. Now there is a lying sign and a wonder by the hand of Satan if it is true. God's very elect supernaturally provided with an idol to worship according to their hearts desire in concern for Moses whereabouts. Yet before this assistance by the prince of the power of the air, sin is crouching at the door of their hearts "where is Moses?" "God has abandoned us" "make a god for us who will go before us".

Satan didn't force these men and women to despair of Moses....Satan didn't demand of Cain that he murder his brother....Satan didn't insist that the pharisees reject God's will for their lives and murder their Messiah. It was sin working in these men and women in defiance of the direct and determined efforts of God in their presence which made their actions exceptional and an opportunity for Satan.

It is one thing to know that God looks upon the heart, but if the heart itself becomes evident by speech then even the prince of the power of the air will get in on the act. He goes about looking for just such opportunities. It is God's own people whose sins sometimes exceed even the wickedness of unbelievers (1 Corinthians 5:1).

How is that possible in God's children born of His Spirit. New creatures in Christ!

I can't see any possibility of claiming that the only reason men sin is because they are tempted by Satan and this because they have a reliance upon one spirit or another for guidance. Men are quite capable of guiding themselves.

If they have the advantage of God's will in their lives they are without excuse. Lastly it is God's will that all men are saved and come to a knowledge of Christ.

Edit

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2013/5/4 5:54

Quote: "" Unless of course Satan has taken up residence with the Holy Spirit Himself and made peace!""

I hope you don't have any inclinations that this could possibly true.

Darkness cannot exist in the Light.

How is one born again, born again from what, into or receiving what? What is God's greatest gift to Man?

It is birthing His Son in the believer.

Colossians 1:27-28 To whom God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles ; which is Christ in you, the hope of glory: Whom we preach, warning every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom; that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus:

1 Peter 1:3-9 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, To an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you, Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations: That the trial of your faith, being much more precious than of gold that perisheth, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise and honour and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ: Whom having not seen, ye love; in whom, though now ye see him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory: Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.

What have we received and who birthed Him by His own incorruptible Seed in us?

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

1 Peter 1:25 But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

Satan no longer owns us, Jesus paid the price and defeated Satan completely, we give Satan too much recognition, we are no longer under His domain, we are under the Lordship, domain, as a bride to her husband, brother's with Jesus, a new Spirit birthed in us, being new creatures in Christ Jesus our Lord, Savior, King and God.

Ephesians 1:3-6 Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: According as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love: Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, To the praise of the glory of his grace, wherein he hath made us accepted in the beloved.

The weakness of God is stronger than the power of Satan or man. It is God who has done it. For without Christ I can do nothing.

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

cy, 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.

Now "If we sin"; 1 John 1:8-10 If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. (((((((If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.))))))))) If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us.

Christ has us in His hand NOW, NOW is where we are and Now is the time; Ro 13:11 And that, knowing the time, that now it is high time to awake out of sleep: for now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. 2Co 6:2 (For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)

I believe more now than the day of my salvation. Faith upon Faith, Word upon word, precept upon precept, Grace upon Grace, forgiveness upon forgiveness, and on and on, it is was finished, it is finished and it will be finished.

It is all of God for man is as the Grass; 1 Peter 1:24-25 For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away: But the word of the Lord endureth for ever. And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you.

2 Corinthians 6:2 (For he saith, I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succoured thee: behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.)

In Christ: Phillip

In Christ: Phillip

Re: , on: 2013/5/4 6:07

Quote:

-----Quote: "" Unless of curse Satan has taken up residence with the Holy Spirit Himself and made peace!""

"I hope you don't have any inclinations that this could possibly true"

No Philip I don't believe it is true. Its what is called an ironic statement. It is in context of the thread which has men as cartoons just waiting to be directed by whispers of either God or Satan. My point was to exaggerate the claim by asserting an ironic question. I am surprised that you even need to ask!

It really is a pity that the meaning of things seems so lacking in the end. Perhaps we should just read what is stated and comprehend the implications of what is stated both of one another and of the scriptures and we would all be better off. I can't see that happening anytime soon however. I think I have just fallen off that cliff again!

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/4 7:36

by amrkelly on 2013/5/3 22:49:11

Quote:
-----Ephesians 2:2
Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience proudpappa

amrkelly wrote ///The passage from which this verse is selected speaks for itself as does the whole of Scripture if we give things their context and proper circumstance. The sons of disobedience are the Jews because they rejected Christ. Try reading the whole passage and not just one verse (Ephesians 2:1-14)

The context for (Ephesians 2:1-14) is all of humanity not just the Jews.
Paul is writing the letter addressing those whom are the Church that were dwelling at Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks. Paul says to them and God says to us, in verse 1 which begins the context : "And ((you)) hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (this is speaking to both Jews and Greeks of Ephesus specifically, but includes all of the Saints through out the ages.

verse 2 likewise says "Wherein in time past ((ye)) walked...".
The ((Ye)) represents the Saints with both Jewish and Greek backgrounds, and Paul says of them and God says to us, That we "in time past walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air"

verse 3 "Among whom also ((we all)) had our conversation..."
Paul is including himself and likewise all of humanity.

the rest of those scriptures flow likewise, with verse 11-12 actually saying this:
11 Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past ((Gentiles)) in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands;
12 That at that time ye were without Christ, being ((aliens from the commonwealth of Israel)), and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world:

verses 11 and 12 would appear to be speaking to those Believers in Ephesus whom were of Gentile background.

My Bible does not use the phrase "The (sons) of disobedience" but rather the phrase "children of disobedience" which is used also in Ephesians 5:6, and Colossians 3:6 in which all of these allude to be speaking to those whom are whoremongers, fornicators, unclean persons, covetous idolaters, those of inordinate affection, and evil concupiscence.

So by its context it would appear that the phrase "children of disobedience" is used in a much broader since, that includes all of humanity, instead of referring only to those ///Jews because they rejected Christ./// as you suggest that the context suggest.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 8:46

Eph_2:2 Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the CHILDREN of disobedience:

Eph_5:6 Let no man deceive you with vain words: for because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the CHILDREN of disobedience.

Col_3:6 For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the CHILDREN of disobedience:

My Bible says CHILDREN of DISOBEDIENCE, too.

We know that the Temple of God CAN BE undefiled because Paul says:

1Co 3:17 If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are.

"If any man defile" - in other words, it should not be defiled!

1Co 3:16 Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?

According to you amrkelly, the temple is defiled regardless if the Spirit of God is in you.

1Co 3:17 If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; FOR THE TEMPLE OF GOD IS HOLY, WHICH TEMPLE YE ARE.

1 Cor 3:17 does not support your theology, too well.

Does your Bible say that? FOR THE TEMPLE OF GOD IS HOLY, WHICH TEMPLE YE ARE.

If your temple is not holy, should you not take action (repent) and remove the unclean thing?

So, far we have seen that we have a spiritual enemy and that we can partake of his spirit just as we can partake of the Lord's spirit.

Can the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience, work in someone who names the name of Christ?

Obviously, only the Lord knows them that are His.

2Ti_2:19 Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his. And, Let every one that nameth the name of Christ depart from iniquity.

Many name the name of Christ that ARE NOT, departing from iniquity. They are partaking from the Evil one and defiling their temple.

Does "naming the name of Christ", make you a son of God.

What wars against the soul? Sin nature which would mean the temple of God is constantly defiled or "fleshly lusts"?

1Pe 2:11 Dearly beloved, I beseech you as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul ;

Abstain means to cease and desist! Meaning you CAN STOP that thing that is warring against your soul. That means no struggle if you stop what is producing the warring.

Warring = struggle, battle, conflict

Would Paul and Peter tell us to do these things if it were not possible. They were speaking by the Holy Spirit, were they not?

Pilgrim

Re: , on: 2013/5/4 13:13

Quote:
-----"And ((you)) hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins." (this is speaking to both Jews and Greeks of Ephesus specifically, but includes all of the Saints through out the ages. proudpapa

Verse eleven brother settles who this letter is addressed to very well. No need to argue the point really. If you do decide to read the passage again it might be worthwhile considering the context, not from an imaginary historical one, as through a telescope, but through a mind of comprehension, as by reason of grammar. If you do it becomes clear that the "you the Gentiles" is the same as the "you" of verse one. Similarly the "we" of Paul which concerns the Jews, forms the "now working in the sons of disobedience" as opposed to the "you the Gentiles" which forms the first part of the statement. This has nothing to do with doctrines it is simply a matter of grammatical comprehension.

Of course if you can't see this for what ever reason then the passage can be made to mean anything at all. Just for the record why don't you and Pilgrim actually say what you mean and stop alluding to it by reason of selective verses of scripture. State the thing and not something like it. After all if I believed that Adam had no natural moral character of his own, but depended completely on God for every whim or motive of thought or deed I would just say so. I find Pilgrim's cartoon theory a bit of an empty box!

Re: , on: 2013/5/4 13:15

Quote:
-----According to you amrkelly, the temple is defiled regardless if the Spirit of God is in you. pilgrim777

Given that I have no idea what this means you had better explain it to me brother. Sorry about that I must have communicated that one via Satan or something!

Re: - posted by murrclor (), on: 2013/5/4 13:17

Quote: Does your Bible say that? FOR THE TEMPLE OF GOD IS HOLY, WHICH TEMPLE YE ARE.

Quote: If your temple is not holy, should you not take action (repent) and remove the unclean thing?

Are you Holy, is your temple clean, are you without idols, are you without sin, have you abstained from fleshly lusts?

Come on your the one claiming to be innocent from birth, claimng to have no sinful nature...

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 13:22

No doubt about that, amrkelly.

You and I were dead in trespasses and sin. When you came to Christ, had you not sinned, like the rest of us?

But, going back to the OP, we are talking about "original sin".

If Jesus says do not "defile the temple", and that the "temple which is you" is holy and if you name the name of Christ, He commands us to "depart from sin", is the Lord's theology wrong?

Is He telling us something that we cannot do, in Christ?

After you depart from sin and remove the thing that is defiling your temple as the Lord commands, then where is this sinful nature?

Don't defile your carton.

We have several "trails" going in this thread. Original sin is one of them, "Can a person depart from sin" and "cleanse their temple" is another "trail".

Bottom line, are we taking Jesus and His word seriously, or are we playing theology games with it, to justify or match our condition/experience?

Gotta run...

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 13:29

Quote:

-----by murrcoir on 2013/5/4 10:17:51

Quote: Does your Bible say that? FOR THE TEMPLE OF GOD IS HOLY, WHICH TEMPLE YE ARE.

Quote: If your temple is not holy, should you not take action (repent) and remove the unclean thing?

Are you Holy, is your temple clean, are you without idols, are you without sin, have you abstained from fleshly lusts?

Come on your the one claiming to be innocent from birth, claimng to have no sinful nature...

murrco,

You are twisting my words, making them "murky".

I did not say I was innocent from birth. You know that!

And you have not shown in the word where we have a sinful nature. I did not say I had no sin. Once again, I do not see (and many others do, too), a "sinful nature" in the Scriptures.

As the Spirit of God uncovers sin in our lives, idols in our heart, are we not supposed to yield to the Spirit that we say we are being "led by" and deal with what He leads us to deal with? If you don't deal with sin it is called rebellion.

What's your problem with that?

The Bible says "mortify the deeds of the body" not the "sinful nature".

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.

My Bible says we are a "holy people". I know many Bibles do not say that. What does yours say?

1Pe_2:9 But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an HOLY NATION, a peculiar people; that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light:

2Pe_1:21 For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but HOLY MEN of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.

1Pe_1:15 But as he which hath called you is holy, SO BE YE HOLY in all manner of conversation;

1Pe_1:16 Because it is written, BE YE HOLY; for I am holy.

2Pe_3:2 That ye may be mindful of the words which were spoken before by the HOLY PROPHETS, and of the commandment of us the apostles of the Lord and Saviour:

2Pe_3:11 Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all HOLY CONVERSATION AND GODLINESS.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2013/5/4 14:29

Quote: ""No Philip I don't believe it is true. Its what is called an ironic statement. It is in context of the thread which has men as cartons just waiting to be directed by whispers of either God or Satan. My point was to exaggerate the claim by asserting an ironic question. I am surprised that you even need to ask! ""

Well, that a relief, Just checking. Ironic huh. Pots of clay.

Love ya brother.

IN
Christ
Phillip

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 16:23

I think it is important to do a little sanity check, right now.

No one is saying they are without sin.

The OP is about whether we have a sinful nature or not.

No one has demonstrated by the word that we have a sinful nature.

Let's try to stick to that.

Pilgrim

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/5/4 16:27

Quote: I did not say I was innocent from birth. You know that!

Proud papa did and you said on your next comment wrote well said Proud papa.. Lets see what murrcolr answers.

It read like you were in agreement...but feel free to clarify your point...Are children born innocent?

Quote: The Bible says "mortify the deeds of the body" not the "sinful nature".

So what's influencing the body so it has deeds to mortify?

Quote: After you depart from sin and remove the thing that is defiling your temple as the Lord commands, then where is this sinful nature?

What is this thing that needs removed

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 17:04

I think we are going round and round and round in circles Murrc.

All 3 of your questions have been answered.

Children are born innocent. I do not see in the word where they have a genetic sin. Although, "in Adam all sinned". Do you know what that means?

Remove the sin in your life is what the word is telling us.

How did Adam and Eve lust without a sinful nature? That is how you and I lust. Mortify what you covet with your eyes and desire with your flesh..."the deeds of the body".

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/5/4 18:35

Quote: No one has demonstrated by the word that we have a sinful nature.

That's is what you say

Paul's formula for 'rightly dividing' the word. Paul, right here in 1 Corinthians 2:13, reveals how the Spirit opens up the "hidden, secret, deep things of God." How does the Spirit "teach" us?: BY "COMPARING SPIRITUAL THINGS WITH SPIRITUAL!" The Holy Ghost teacheth; comparing spiritual things with spiritual. It is not accomplished in any other way. When Paul says that spiritual discernment is "not in words that man's wisdom teacheth," he is not saying that the Holy Spirit teaches in a secret 'unknown tongue.' Not at all. What Paul means is that man's 'context' oriented understanding of the scriptures is no substitute for that "which the Holy Spirit teaches; comparing spiritual things with spiritual." If you think that simply keeping the scriptures in their proper context is going to assure that you are on the right path to understand scripture you are dead wrong. That is what the scriptures refer to as "carnal reasoning." If there were any truth to that teaching, then anyone could read the scriptures, consider the context and see clearly 'the things of the Spirit.' If this carnal minded reasoning were true, then the very next verse would have to read like this: 'The natural man can easily receive the things of the Spirit of God, for the scriptures will make perfect sense to him if he will just remember to keep them in their proper context'.

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/4 19:20

If I were born a poor man and wanted to find out what the explanation for this was because in my poverty I suffered, not only in my own body but I could see that my sons and daughters were suffering also, I could take a look at the genealogical record and no doubt I would find an explanation. What then if in looking at the record I discovered that my forefather from the beginning of the record had been a truly wealthy man? The moment I caught sight of this I would be more troubled than if I had not looked at all. Perhaps in seeking for a further explanation I were to discover that although my forefather had been wealthy, his wealth had in fact been given to him freely, and not only the wealth he possessed, but even that which is beyond all possible measure, was set before him also. By this point I would be groaning with incomprehensible groans realising that in my forefather I had even lost eternal life itself.

We don't have to imagine this story because this is a true account of our forefather Adam.

If anyone cannot comprehend easily what it is that was lost in our father Adam, it is because they have not yet comprehended what they have gained in another man, the Last Adam, the second man. Rather than pressing our forefather, and the loss we have suffered in him, why don't we press that which we have gained in another man? Even Christ! If we comprehend Christ we will comprehend all else.

And in the darkness of the night there was a Light
 In sudden moment of despair, comprehending all
 I cried out, Father, Father. And in an instant, saved 
In great mercy He laid hold of me. And bore me up 
All at once was I giddy, rising high upon his train
 I laughed and shouted His name to the heavens 
And He did with all Joy carry me to His fold 
My feet He set upon the Rock and understanding gave
 He bore the wounds to tell of it, and I wept of Him 

Forgive me Lord I asked, forgiveness all He spake

Brethren it is not in looking back that we will comprehend our condition. It is in looking ahead to Christ that we will comprehend our condition in the light of His similarity. A true man, the last man, the second Adam, yet without sin. Sin cannot be comprehended by looking to its form, it can only be comprehended by the one Whose form was without sin, yet became sin for our sakes. I don't say that there is no profit in seeking to understand the flesh of men. We are to reckon with it, however not to analyse it. If there had been no difficulty with this body of sin in which we are presently clothed, then Christ would of necessity have done this great thing for us by dying for our sins. If when we were born of our mothers according to the flesh, we had an adequate and reasonable body, sufficient for God's purposes that would have been the end of the matter for each man and women. Yet the scripture tells us because One died for all, all have died. This is that we might be clothed in Him through death and resurrection in a new man. If the old man had been of any use at all, or if there had been any possibility that it was capable of bearing fruit unto righteousness, then Christ would have died for our sin and that would have been an end of sin. If this had been it then there would have been no necessity of our own inclusion in His death also. Yet Christ did put off His body by death of the Cross and this because He became sin for our sake. "By His doing we are in Christ Jesus Who became to us both the wisdom of God, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption". This is the measure of it and it was the Father's doing in Christ Jesus.

If we must look back then let it be according to the light of Christ and not according to our own sinful flesh. The natural mind cannot fathom anything unless it is first comprehended in the spirit. There is no discouragement intended at all.

Re: - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/4 20:22

Hey there brothers,

I think the present participants have pretty much exhausted this topic and I think it would be good to sign off in peace. Really appreciate all your contributions. One thing is for sure, we don't have all of the truth. Only Jesus does, so keep looking unto Him. I am going to.

I would love to participate in a thread on how to walk the gospel out.

God bless all of you.

Pilgrim

Re: For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning... - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/5 9:00

amrkelly wrote ///Verse eleven brother settles who this letter is addressed to very well.///

I look at chapter 1 to Paul's introduction in the letter to see of whom the letter was addressed to : "to the saints which are at Ephesus, ((and)) to the faithful in Christ Jesus"

I researched from what the background of the saints in Ephesus was: Acts 19:17
"And this was known to all the (Jews) and (Greeks) also dwelling at Ephesus..."

amrkelly wrote ///No need to argue the point really. If you do decide to read the passage again it might be worthwhile considering the context, not from an imaginary historical one, as through a telescope, but through a mind of comprehension, as by reason of grammar.///

I agree that there is no need to argue, but I am not convinced of your interpretation!

But regardless the point that I was making is not negated by your 'grammatical comprehension'.

Even if the "you" of verse one is strictly referring to "you the Gentiles" and if Paul is making some coded antisemitic statement in verse 2 by his usage of the word "children of disobedience" (which seems a little more like Luther and a little less like Paul!)

It would seem that all of this is but a redundancy, because even with your interpretation of whom the "you" (Gentiles) of verse one is and the "children of disobedience" (Only referring to the Jews) of verse two is, they all are connected by verse 1 and 2 to encompass the entire human race.

Re: Entire New Testament for the Church - posted by pilgrim777, on: 2013/5/5 10:58

Amrkelly,

Good day to you. Unfortunately, I think you stand completely alone on believing Ephesians was only written to the Jews at Ephesus. When I first came to Christ and started reading the Scriptures the Holy Spirit impressed on my spirit that the whole Bible was for anyone that had ears to hear and especially for the Church.

I don't even think murr or any moderator would agree with you.

I know some people in the "Hebrew Roots" movement, that would agree with you.

Re: Is there a sin nature?, on: 2013/5/5 13:28

porudpappa

Strangely enough brother your drawing attention to the verse from Acts nineteen actually makes the case for what I am saying about the passage from Ephesians.

“And he entered into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, reasoning and persuading as to the things concerning the kingdom of God. But when some were hardened and disobedient, speaking evil of the Way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, reasoning daily in the school of Tyrannus.” Tyrannus was a Greek.

Here you have the sons of disobedience which Paul speaks about to the church in Ephesus. Verse nine from Acts nineteen says it plainly. So when we read “wherein ye once walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the powers of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience” we see that Paul is making reference

rence to specific men of the Synagogue of Ephesus where he taught and preached the gospel for three months.

The same could be said for the whole of Asia where Paul preached for two full years. The same could be said for Israel itself, and the same could be said for any place in which place the Apostles preached Christ and were rejected by the Jews in the Synagogues of those places. Wherever the gospel was rejected it was rejected disobediently to the gospel itself which is the power of God unto salvation. This is not anti-Semitic it is a sad reality. Yet this is to miss the real fuller meaning of chapter two of the Ephesian letter. There is neither Jew nor Gentile in Christ Jesus. This is the real fuller purpose of the entire chapter as far as the flesh is concerned.

You may think that I have a point to make here in continuing to defend what I have said. You would be right, but it has nothing to do with Jew or Gentile. I have said all of this already plainly, perhaps you should go back and read the posts very carefully. The reason for continuing, has to do with another claim altogether. This is that men are cartons (empty vessels) waiting for a compass of influence and either Satan or else the Lord, to provide direction. I said previously that this will give rise to a heresy, and I say it again. You have stood in agreement with the brother who has said it and I stand against it. Its a simple as that. The limitation of posting on a public forum and the need to submit to the moderators and the purpose of the site prevents me from stating it more plainly. So of course I won't.

This saying "children of the devil" has been used in this thread to justify the claim that men are simply cartons and that they choose to either serve Satan or Christ. This is untrue. It is a failure to comprehend what it means to reject Christ on the one hand, and what those men are like who truly do reject Christ in the visibility of the power of God, on the other. We ought not to call ordinary men and women children of the devil. They are not. It is offensive. And by it we have offended many such men and women who have not yet believed and do cause them to stumble by it. It is madness. Do we love those who are perishing or do we despise them?

If someone had simply stated what is in simplicity of truth a reality, that all unbelievers are influenced by the prince of the power of the air because their own nature as sinners lends itself to his influence, then this would have been sound. But there was and is an intention to "prove" something which if it is received, will give rise to an inevitable conclusion. "Men cannot be accountable before God because they are driven by Satan from the moment they first sinned". Brethren I have to tell you even little children sin. This doctrine is more Augustinian than not and therefore lends itself to the same heresy of Universalism. Which thing I spoke plainly before hand.

Here is the problem brethren. Even believers can serve Satan. If they walk according to the lusts of the flesh their actions will in the end prove to have served Satan. Yet they cannot at that instance of walking in the flesh have become Satan's children. It is simply a complete falsehood to speak in such terms. When I shared this previously I was greeted with "according to you Amrkelly, the temple is defiled regardless if the Spirit of God is in you". Well it is of little account but this is the way of it. The temple is sanctified because of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. It is defiled despite the indwelling of the Holy Spirit if we walk after the flesh. This is what it means to grieve the Holy Spirit. It is why we repent some time afterwards when we have so walked as to defile this temple of our bodies. The fact that we are still able to stumble is evidence that we have not yet been perfected in our understanding so as to know how to walk. It is not evidence that we are Satan's children.

Re: , on: 2013/5/5 13:32

Quote:

-----Amrkelly,

Good day to you. Unfortunately, I think you stand completely alone on believing Ephesians was only written to the Jews at Ephesus. When I first came to Christ and started reading the Scriptures the Holy Spirit impressed on my spirit that the whole Bible was for anyone that had ears to hear and especially for the Church pilgrim777

Brother I care not whether I stand alone any more than I care who stands with me. I am not seeking a division. I am stating my understanding.

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/5 14:49

amrkelly wrote ///This is not anti-Semitic it is a sad reality///

If you are interpataing Ephesians ch 2 verse 1 as speaking of the Gentiles and chapter 2 verse 2 "the spirit that now wor keth in the children of disobedience" as only speaking of the Jews.

Than it does not get any more anti-Semitic than that!

For you would be saying along with Luther that : "The Devil has possessed these people with all his angles;..." more so t han just the general blindness of all whom are lost.

Where as Pilgrim is saying that their is a dual kingdom instead of a dual nature as Catholic Augustine taught.

and if you are not serving the King of Heaven than you automaticaly are serving the King of this world.

This seems to me, much more of Pauls point in Ephesians ch 2, instead of an askewed seemingly anti-Semitic interpata ion.

amrkelly wrote ///We ought not to call ordinary men and women children of the devil.///

But amrkelly If I am understanding your interpataion on Ephesians ch 2 correctly, Than how is that not what you are impl ying of all Jewish peoples ?

I interput Pilgrims view as what scripture testifies of all none believers: "In whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not..."

in Comparison to the state of a believer "... ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls."

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2013/5/5 15:12

Quote: I don't even think murr or any moderator would agree with you.

1 Cor 3:1-4 And I, brethren, could not speak to you as to spiritual people but as to carnal, as to babes in Christ. I fed you with milk and not with solid food; for until now you were not able to receive it, and even now you are still not able; for you are still carnal. For where there are envy, strife, and divisions among you, are you not carnal and behaving like mere me n? For when one says, "I am of Paul," and another, "I am of Apollos," are you not carnal?

Proud papa men are born with a sinful carnal nature we are born prone to sin.. Once we belive in Christ we still struggle with the 'sinful carnal nature' it is this nature in Christian's that cause sects and division in the church.

It is that nature that causes you to make a comment like you did, it is also that nature that makes you stand against Aug ustine so strongly.

I pray that one day that God will open your eyes to your true condition..

Edit:-Spelling

Re: - posted by PaulWest (), on: 2013/5/5 15:47

Brethren, I think this conversation has drawn to a close. From here on out it will only get more accusing and personal. This topic is one of those "Gordian Knots" that will never be resolved on earth as long as theologians exist. Original sin, like other volatile topics, can be a blessing to study and discuss when one group is not trying to cause another to surrender. The longer we struggle against flesh and blood, the less power we have to wrestle wicked spirits and tear down strongholds. We step right into the trap.

There is a certain vanity in debating "original sin" while we're yet defeated by sin. The fact that it is "original" or not really has no bearing. Our current enslavement is the only reality; our deliverance should be the only topic of relevance. Everything else is skirting the real issue.

I am closing this and putting it to rest.

Brother Paul

Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2013/5/5 15:59

///... it is also that nature that makes you stand against Augustine so strongly.///

murrclor again what was the great heresy of the donatists ?

Do you agree with Augustine that such heretics as the donatists, should be lovingly brought back to the fold by useage of force with a sword and put to death if they refuse ?

Or what about Luther,

Do you agree with him when he says:

"The Anabaptist set up a ministry and congregation of their own, which is also contrary to the command of God. From all this it becomes clear that the secular authorities are bound...to inflict corporal punishment on the offenders...Also when it is a case of only upholding some spiritual tenet, such as infant baptism, original sin, and unnecessary seperation, then... we conclude that... the stubborn sectarians must be put to death"- Martin Luther

murrclor wrote ///I pray that one day that God will open your eyes to your true condition///

murrclor, why are you so adamant about this doctrine ?

The reason that I am so adamantly opposed to this Augustinian doctrine, is because I was a slave of disgusting, embarrassing habitual sin, with no power within myself to overcome it, and I deceived myself into believing that my struggle was similar to what Paul was speaking of in Romans 7 (Augustine's view of the normal Christian life.) and that it was just my old sinful nature taking control.

When I had these doctrines challenged, and realized that I no longer was able to justify my sin as the normal Christian struggle, at that point my eyes were open to my true condition.

murrclor, it may be a good debate tactic to suggest that you come to your conclusion based on special spiritual insight, but let's make sure that that is what it is and not just traditional indoctrination.