

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Original Sin? Adam or Me?

Original Sin? Adam or Me?, on: 2006/1/27 22:30

Me Or Adam?

By Winkie Pratney

GOD'S GREATEST PROBLEM

God's greatest problem is summed up in one little word: S-I-N. Heaven is at battle stations today because sin has invaded the human race and the moral Universe. It is high time the Church knew her enemy! Her first enemy is not the Devil, it is not death, it is not despair. Her enemy is SIN, and unless she learns to understand it, face it and deal with it, God can never grant us a visitation from on high to turn our nations back to Him.

John Wesley said - "Give me one hundred men who fear no one but God and hate nothing but sin and I will move the world." Do WE hate sin? Satan has successfully clouded the minds of thousands of church people on this dangerous issue. No man is a real Christian who does not hate the things God hates and love the things that God loves, as he sees them. And in all His holiness God hates sin. Sin cost Him His only-begotten Son. Sin cost the Lord Jesus His life. Sin plunged the world into a living Hell. It will yet plunge multitudes into an endless Hell. It is time we paid serious attention to the subject of sin. Our understanding of its guilt and awfulness will largely determine our view of the love and mercy of God, our presentation of the Gospel to sinners and our presentation of truth to the Body of Christ. What IS sin?

WHAT SIN IS NOT

(1) Sin is not NATURAL

A common answer when people are faced with sin is "Yes, I sin. Nobody is perfect - we're only human!" So - you sin because you are only a person? Does human equal sinful? Nothing could be further from the truth. Only by comparing ourselves with the perfect example of TRUE humanity - the Lord Jesus - can we see just how unnatural sin is. When God became man, He took on a true human body. Jesus was not God disguised as man, but God who became man. Although He was conceived supernaturally, He was born of a perfectly normal human girl. (Luke 1:31). He grew, learned, was hungry and thirsty. (Luke 2:52; 2:40; Matt. 4:2; Lk. 4:2; Jn. 19:8). As the Last Adam, His body (though arguably not subject to death or disease like ours is now) was just as special as when our first parents walked the earth; Scripture does not go out of its way to portray it as utterly unlike any other human body. (Heb. 10:5; Jn. 2:21; Lk. 24:3,23; 1 Jn. 1:1; 1 Jn. 4:3). He ate, drank, felt weary and rested; (Mk 2:16; Lk. 24:39) and declared His body to be flesh and bones (Jn. 20:20, 27). He was a human soul. (Is. 53:11,12; Ps. 16:10; Jn. 12:27; Acts 2:27; Matt. 26:38) John, Peter, Paul and Isaiah all called Him a man (Jn. 1:30; Acts 2:22; 1 Tim. 2:5; Is. 53:3) He called Himself a man (John 8:40). His favorite name for Himself when He walked this earth was "the Son of Man," used seventy-one times in Scripture.

Christ, was of course, always God. He was the only man without a beginning, because He was eternal in His origin. He knew that He had come from the Father, and after His earthly mission He would go back to the Father. His essential relationship with the Spirit and the Father was never removed. But while He walked this planet, to show that it was possible to resist temptation and defeat the Devil with only the power of the Holy Spirit, the guidance of His Father, and the Word of God, the Lord Jesus used none of His Godhead powers. He laid aside His rights and powers as God to tread this world (Phil. 2:5-8; Lk. 2:52; Heb. 5:7-9) although His essential nature as God remained unchanged. To be fully "tempted in all points such as we are", and yet be "without sin", the Lord Jesus had to become fully human. To make Him out to be unfairly more than this during His brief stay on Earth is to miss completely the whole purpose of His life; not only to offer His body as a perfect substitute for our sin, but to show us the way a child of God was to live in this world! (Heb. 2:14-15; 5:5-9) Understand - the Lord Jesus had nothing available to Him on Earth that any child of God does not have available; His Father even arranged for Him to have some disadvantages! (Luke 2:7; Jn. 1:46; Jn. 8:41) The Lord Jesus was our pattern of true human nature, yet He was "without sin" (Heb. 4:15) and He "did no sin". (1 Pet. 2:22) God made human nature; God did not make sin!

Sin is never natural. It is horribly unnatural. Sin is NEVER "human". It is horribly inhuman. Sin creates remorse, guilt and shame; any time we feel these three witnesses in our soul, they tell us sin is not natural. Even a simple lie-detector tells us this. The whole body reacts adversely if a man sins. Sin is in fact, a kind of insanity. (Ecc. 9:3). The insane treat their dream world as real, and the real world as a dream: so, practically, does the sinner. The insane try to do the naturally im

possible; so does the sinner, when he tries to squeeze lasting satisfaction from sin. The insane suspect and fear the one s who love them most; watch the sinner as he runs madly from the God who loves him, and rushes on to Hell as if it were Heaven! This is the worst kind of insanity; not of the head, but of the heart.

No-one ever sins because they love sin. Even the worst sinner does not like to be called a sinner; he resents the fact of his selfishness, even when he is selfish! And even the worst of sinners cannot help but admire right in another, whenever that other person is sufficiently far away from him not to convict him of his selfishness. (Is. 58:1-2; Ezek. 33:32; Rom. 7:22). Nobody sins merely for the sake of doing wrong. Sinning men and women hate themselves when they do wrong. A man sins only if he wants something for himself more strongly than he wants to do right. God never planned sin for man. It is the most unnatural thing in the moral Universe. To equate humanity with sinfulness is to make God the Author of His own worst enemy; to make God responsible for the thing that has brought Him unhappiness. Do not dare say sin is "natural"!

ARE WE REALLY UNABLE TO OBEY?

(2) Sin is not unavoidable

One of the favorite heresies of the past is rapidly becoming the favorite heresy of the present. It is the lie of Antinomianism - that men cannot do what God expressly requires them to do, and therefore they may live how they like and still enter the Kingdom of God. In the midst of the greatest moral landslide the world has ever seen, in the midst of the most flagrant disrespect for law and order and government of any century, it is unblushingly proclaimed as Gospel truth from pulpits across the nation that man cannot keep the law of God! In our wariness of the dangers of legalism, we have forgotten the perils of antinomianism; we have forgotten that "the law is a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ" (Gal. 3:24) and that "by the law is the knowledge of sin." (Rom. 3:20). Gone is the preaching of moral responsibility that streamed from men like William Booth, George Fox, John Wesley, and Charles Finney, that made men weep with conviction; gone is the heartbeat of the Psalmist for the honor of God when he cried "Horror has taken hold of me, because of the wicked that forsake Thy law!" (Ps. 119:56; Ps. 119:36).

Some sincere men say "God gave us good laws to keep" but in the next breath say "but He knew we couldn't keep them."! If this is really true, then how are God's laws good? No law is good that asks the impossible of its subjects. If God demands obedience to impossible laws, then God is not just, for even men do not require obedience to impossible laws. If even more, God demands such obedience under penalty of death, then God is not only unfair, but monstrous! What kind of Being would pass laws upon his subjects they are actually unable to keep, then condemn them to death for their failure to obey? This is a blasphemy on God's character. Which of God's laws are we actually unable to keep - if we love the Lawgiver? Do we have to relegate God to some other position than King of our lives and put something else in His place? Do we have to take His Name in vain? Must we steal? What man has ever been born that could not help but murder? Do we have no choice but to be sexually immoral, to lie, to covet, to dishonor parents and refuse to honor God on a special day of rest? God says "His commandments are not grievous." Do we say they are not only grievous, but impossible? The Lord Jesus said - "My yoke is easy and My burden is light." Do we say His yoke is not only heavy, but completely unbearable for any human being?

The Bible expressly declares that God has given good laws. All the laws of God are based on the one great Law of Love. Love is to govern the actions of all moral beings in God's Universe - that every moral creature should unselfishly choose the highest good of God and His Universe according to their real, relative values. As God's own being is greatest, He must be loved first of all; then all others in the order of their true value under God. The Ten Commandments are just a letter expression of that law, given when men began to ignore the original love law written on their hearts. They define man's obligations God-ward in the first three commandments, then those of his obligations to his fellow men in the last seven. The Lord Jesus summed these in His two commandments (Matt. 22:36-40; Mk. 12:28-34; Lk. 10:25-28) covering what Moses had already given. (Deut. 6:5; Lev. 19:18) Paul summed up the Law into the one basic word "love" (Rom. 13:8-10; Gal. 5:14; 1 Tim 1:5; Jas. 2:8-10). This Law, expressed in different ways, is given as the unchangeable condition of happiness and holiness. It defines human obligations and can never be changed or suspended in our present relationships. (Gal. 3:19; Ps. 19:7; Matt. 5:17; Rom. 7:12; 1 Tim 1:8)

No saint in Scripture thought they were "unable" to keep God's laws. Moses didn't (Ex. 24:3; Deut. 5:1, 6:24-25; 10:12-13). Neither did Joshua (22:5) Ezra (7:23-26) David (Ps. 19:7; 40:8) his psalmist friend (Ps. 119:165-168) or Daniel (9:9-11) or others! (2 Kings 17:13, 7-18, etc.). The Lord Jesus Himself told men to obey His Father's laws; this was the test of being a true disciple. (Matt. 5:17-20; 19:17; Jn. 14:15,21; 14:23-24; 15:10). The Apostle John stresses this obedience. (1 Jn. 2:3-6; 3:18-22). Obeying God's love law simply means living for Him with no selfish interest; to live up to all the light you have with all the effort of will, mind and feeling necessary for the task in hand. For the Christian, obeying God and keeping His commandments are a natural part of his new life. Only a sinner finds it hard to walk in God's ways;

when he tries to use law as a means to his own end, the ultimate gratification of his own selfishness. And he will fail.

IS SIN A "SOMETHING"?

(3) Sin is not physical

Many think they have explained the fact of sin in the human race by using a phrase we shall call "Doggie Logic". It goes essentially like this: "A dog is not a dog because he barks: he barks because he is a dog. Thus, man is not a sinner because he sins; he sins because he is a sinner." The assumption is, of course, that all sin flows from a preexistent sinful nature, and it is this nature that creates the sinful acts of the sinner. Just as the bark of a dog comes undeniably from the fact that he is a dog, so man's sin will flow inescapably from the fact that he is a sinner, and was born so. It sounds nice; is it true? There are unfortunately two things wrong with this logic. They are serious flaws, because once they are assumed, they actually destroy the basis of the very thing they seek to prove - that all men are guilty of, and responsible to God for their sin. These logic flaws are:

A MAN IS NOT A DOG. A dog's actions are right if he barks, because God created a dog to express itself naturally by barking. But God did not create men to sin! A dog's bark is natural; sin is not. The Bible everywhere represents sin as an alien invasion to a moral nature made in the image of God. Assuming that man sins because it is his normal nature to sin, also assumes that sin is natural. A dog barks because he is a dog. A man can also bark if he chooses to. Does this prove that he is a dog? No, it proves that he has chosen to do a thing he was never created to do naturally. If a man sins, it merely proves that he has chosen to sin, and his sin will certainly be treated as unnatural in the eyes and judgment of God.

Do we need a sinful nature to sin? Is it necessary to have an preexistent "implanted sinfulness" to enable man to do wrong? If one sinner can be found in Scripture who sinned without first having a sinful nature, the answer is no, and the case is closed. And of course, there are at least three moral beings who committed sin without sinful natures. Satan was the first. The first man Adam was the second, and then his wife Eve. The angels who were cast out of heaven were apparently first perfect. No moral being needs a sinful nature to sin. If he is given one that makes it really impossible for him not to do right, he is not guilty, but helpless.

Neither does sin reside, as some sincere men have speculated, in the blood. Scriptures associate mortality with blood, but never morality. It is a symbol of human life. As the key electrochemical and circulatory system of the body, it is both the "life of the flesh" and the "circuitry" of the soul. As a statement of outpoured life, it is certainly a precious symbol of Christ's atoning sacrifice. (Is. 53:10-12; Heb. 9:22-23; Matt. 26:28; Acts 20:28; Rom. 3:24-26; 5:9-11; Eph. 2:13; Heb. 10:10-14; 10:19-20; 1 Pet. 1:18-19; 1 Jn. 1:7). But blood in the Bible does not carry good or evil. If we can transmit morals through blood, then a blood transfusion from a saint will make a man more holy, and one from a sinner will make a saint less sanctified. It will follow then, that a prenatal blood transfusion on a "blue" baby will give it a totally different nature. Now, while it is true that the blood of any creature contains its life essence and the blood of Christ cleanses from sin, no Scripture assigns either sin or love to blood. Blood never holds morals in the Bible.

What is sin if it isn't a substance? As Christians we speak of sin as a power or a force and know it is something much more than just an isolated wrong decision. Somehow personal sin can keep record in our body, mind and emotions. All habits, both good and bad, are developed the same way: by repetitive choices, stored as patterns in our memory. Sinful patterns built around a life of supremely serving ourselves can be terrifyingly addictive and far stronger than any wishful intention to do better. We may see and approve what is good, but have no power in our own strength to escape the bondage.

In Romans 7:7-24, the Apostle Paul personifies sin to show its power over an enlightened, but unconverted mind. He calls it the law of sin and death. Any habit of wanting our own way clashes with the judgment of conscience and God's moral law. Any such developing death-style of evil habit (the "law" or "rule of action of sin") conflicts with the changeless reality of the true state of things, the law of God. A sinner may discipline his life to try to break some bad habits, but no-one ever escapes unaided the ultimate addiction of serving ourselves. Without the drawing power of the Holy Spirit, no sinner can free himself. Only Christ by the Gospel can truly deliver him. (Rom. 7:25; 8:1).

Paul illustrates the battle by speaking as if he is presently in it. That it is only an illustration and not a present personal problem is clear; the passage ends in true freedom. He speaks of the tug of this "law of sin" as if it is at home in his bodily members. "Flesh" is a phrase used to describe the concentration on emotional gratification through our five senses. We feel excited desires sparked into unnatural strength by habits of selfish gratification in our bodies. Jesus comes to break the cycle of death and bring deliverance.

Even here Paul does not really make a case for "physical" sin, and certainly is not seeking to prove it as his helpless inheritance. He is not concerned with how a man sins, but the fact of an internal battle raging that cannot be won alone. His point is to show us we have no hope of salvation in ourselves; the law of moral thermodynamics is against us. Who can help him get free? Only Jesus Christ, who faced all the temptations in His own body and did not give in at all; only Jesus, whose perfect character was sealed in death and whose resurrection demonstrates His power to face our worst and ugliest and win.

If sin is physical, in what form does it exist? Is it solid, liquid or gas? If sin is identifiably material, can it be isolated in a test-tube? Can it be injected into a saint to make him wrong? May we see the phenomena of a vial of sin concentrate? This is, of course, absurd. All efforts to trace actual sin to some biologic or materially organic connection with parents have failed of genetic, medical or physiological evidence. Attempts to trace actual wrong to some gene or chemical deficiency is the humanist's last shot at explaining morality, and still fails to deal with the universality of sin. At the most, all inherited traits from parents simply contribute influences for later selfish choices.

How then, can we account for the fact that all have sinned? It is customary to trace this universal sinfulness to some kind of organic connection with Adam. Out of the mass of historical theological opinion, we may reduce all views to two basically opposite ideas:

Augustine, began with the premise that souls, like bodies were transmitted to children. Thus man was unable to help sin, since he inherited a sinful soul. The logical conclusion of a premise like this is that man is not to blame for his sinful nature, and cannot properly be urged to repent of it, since true repentance involves self-condemnation by the sinner. It follows then, that man can do nothing in salvation; God makes all the choices, and man becomes a mere puppet in His hands. In such a system, man can be sub-Scripturally devalued; being human is equated with sinfulness. Doctrines of infant damnation, physical baptismal regeneration, unconditional eternal security; annihilation or Universalism, and forms of fatalism may logically follow. On the other hand, the Bible holds man fully responsible for sin; though he is indeed damaged, hurt and unable to save himself, he is not pictured as irresponsibly "helpless". He himself can choose to respond to God's Spirit drawing him to repent, believe Jesus and obey His Word.

Pelagius, held that a man was born innocent, free of contamination; if left to his own way, he would "naturally" choose God. Logically then, a man might actually save himself from sin by consistent right choices; he does not need a Savior at all! If this was true, why should God need to intervene in our lives? Given the right teaching and environment, we can carve out our own holiness and happiness without Christ! This leads to the unscriptural deification of man, and the dangerous errors of humanistic and rationalistic thought, which may lead on to religious atheism and the abandonment of God altogether. On the contrary, the Bible teaches that man is incapable of saving himself; that his plight cannot be corrected by education or environment, but only by the sovereign drawing power of God the Holy Spirit, who alone can lead a man into a "grace-by-faith" salvation not based on man's works. We all need God, even the holy angels who never sinned at all.

All other positions on human depravity place somewhere between these two extremes. Our own understanding of this subject will modify every facet of practical theology! This is no mere theoretical issue, but essential to our picture of the Gospel. If we excuse sin, we shall do so at the expense of God's love, and at the peril of our souls. If we dogmatise as sin what Scripture does not support, by calling temptations, influences and involuntary actions "sinfulness", we will be bound and falsely condemned by the Enemy of our souls, too busy fighting our own failures to turn the world upside down, while all Heaven mourns. We have seen what sin is not; to resolve these difficulties, let us see what sin is.

Re: Original Sin? Adam or Me?, on: 2006/1/27 22:31

What Sin Is

(1) Sin is universal

Nothing is clearer in Scripture or in daily life. World history is a chronicle of wickedness. Every man prior to conversion is a slave to his own selfishness. Every unsaved man knows that he is selfish. The Bible shows the unsaved to possess one common wicked heart or character: Gen. 6:5; 1 Kings 11:9-11; 15:3; 2 Chron. 12:14; Ps. 28:3; 66:18; 78:37; 95:10; Jer. 17:9-10; Ezek. 14:2-3; 18:30-32; Eccl. 9:3; Matt. 5:27-30; 9:4; 13:15; Mark 3:5; 7:18-23; 8:17; Lk. 21:34; Acts 8:21(18-24); Rom. 2:4-6; Rom. 8:7; Heb. 3:7-15. All men without God are totally selfish at heart. It is exceedingly humbling to admit that all of a man's pre-conversion actions are not in the least virtuous when examined in Eternity's light. Man has nothing to commend him to God, when he comes asking for forgiveness. He can never pass the final test at the bar of justice.

The Bible further reveals that from the beginning of our moral accountability (seeing spiritual responsibility to God and our fellow men) we have made a choice to live supremely for self. True virtue consists in right relationship to God. Without this surrender and trust, everything is tainted by self-seeking. No exceptions of true goodness, no pauses for really virtuous behavior, no alternating weeks of true holiness with sinning. Many factors influence the forms of this selfishness; there are many "good" clean-living, outwardly moral sinners, as well as those who are humanly despicable and degraded. Sinners choose the particular forms of selfishness that bring them the greatest pleasure, and this includes deeds and actions usually considered "good" by society, including prayer, religious activity, Bible-study and preaching! But all sinners, from those who have done "many wonderful works" to those God has had to "give up to vile affections", have one uniform morality - "there is none that doeth good, no, not one." This universal persistency in sin is also shown in: Gen. 8:21; Ps. 10:4; 14:13 (53:1,3); 28:3; Ps. 94:11; Eccl. 1:14; Is. 55:7-9; 64:6; Jer. 13:23; 17:9-10; Matt. 7:21-23; 12:34-35; Rom. 1:21; 3:10-12; 3:23; 6:16-17; 6:20; Eph. 2:1,3; 5:8; Tit. 1:15; 3:3; 1 Pet. 2:25.

YOU AND YOUR ORIGINAL SIN

(2) Sin is original

There is nothing clearer in the Bible; man is very original in his sin! Sin is not transmitted; it is re-created by any being misusing the elements of true morality - emotion, reason, choice, moral light and spiritual perception of God's law. (See "Man and The Origin of Evil" for a full discussion and documentation on this subject.) To see why man is accountable for his own "original sin" we must study the fall of our first parents.

At the dawn of Creation, God made His most wonderful work; out of the basic elements of the earth, a being "made in His image", beautiful and perfect in every respect. There was no sickness, pain, or death. Man was not made sinful. He was placed in an earthly Paradise, in the best possible circumstances. He was given the elements of morality, (made like God as a person) and subjected to a test of his obedience. Since "right" and "wrong" cannot be created in a being, morality is the result of any being's own response to that which they perceive as most valuable. If Adam were designed so he could not have sinned, he would not have even been "good;" a man unable either to do good or bad cannot be considered moral or responsible. For Adam, a tree was the test: provided he choose to draw his life and truth first from his loving Creator, he was righteous.

Adam's body and soul were perfect and unblemished. He served God, but without any real test of obedience, as nothing had yet entered Eden to tempt him to disobey. He was more innocent than holy, having no real pressures of temptation to test his faithfulness. No command of God crossed any of his natural inclinations; he was allowed to have his own way within the Garden God had given him. Finally, the great test came. The serpent suggested something that appealed to Adam and Eve's love of conscious freedom in opposition to the direct command of God. Tree of life or tree of knowledge; and they chose terribly. Tragedy struck; Eve, then Adam, surrendered to the desire to have their own way, and broke the clear command of God. In unspeakable sadness, God was forced to clamp down His Divinely-appointed penalties. These penalties were of a twofold nature:

Physical - Man began to physically die. His body felt the sting of the results of sin, and began to feel the curse of sickness, weakness and decay. This curse was essential, as a man who was allowed to continue forever in sin would become a second Devil, with every unrepentant year of his existence reinforcing his evil and increasing his wickedness. It spread to his family, society and his world.

Moral - Adam and Eve were cut off from God, in spiritual death. Their sin now separated them from their brokenhearted Creator, Who came saying "Adam, where are you?" Other terrible consequences followed. With sin also came guilt and remorse and shame. They were expelled from the Garden, losing their sense of place and belonging lest they become immortal in sin by taking of the Tree of Life. The ground itself, even the whole creation around them was cursed, so men would have to labor to live, having less time for self-pleasing and resultant deeper sin. Eve was placed under protective subjection to her husband, because she had been first deceived. Their first child murdered their second and became a fugitive.

WHAT HAPPENED TO ADAM?

It is vitally important to notice here how Adam fell, and the consequences of his fall. To understand present human depravity, we must first define the word "depravity". From the Latin *de*, very, and *pravus* crooked, depravity means the failure to meet an existing standard, a fall from a place of original perfection. Adam became depraved in two ways; his heart and soul first failed to obey God, then his body began to fail. The first depravity was thus moral, followed by the second, which was physical, caused by Adam's selfish choice in spite of the clear warning of the penalty of God. These two depravities caused two kinds of death; physical and spiritual. Although these are linked, they are not the same thing. Both dea

these are states of separation: spiritual death being a state of separation from God (essentially, to live sinfully is to be spiritually dead, (1 Tim. 5:6)) and physical death being finally a separation from the material world of Earth. And as a careful study of Romans 5 shows, it is physical death, not moral, that is transmitted to his race.

Every time in this difficult and disputed passage, (with the possible exception of v.17), where "death" is mentioned is manifestly temporal, or physical, and not spiritual death. This passage has nothing to do with proving that sin "descended from Adam". This interpretation was not found in the early church fathers; it was never given to the passage until the fourth century; was never adopted by the Greek church at all; and is wholly at variance with the design and scope of Paul's whole argument and presentation. Romans 5:12-14 shows that "death" was the penalty of disobeying God's law, but men died from Adam to Moses when there was no law. Thus, the transmitted death that all die is not spiritual, but physical. Because Adam sinned, all men die; they inherit not sin, but death. In verse 17, Paul catches on points of correspondence between Adam and Christ (cf. 1 Cor. 15:45-49). Here the work of Christ equals and even surpasses Adam's own failure; while Adam brought temporal death to his race, the Lord Jesus brought to man the gift of eternal life. Nothing is said, as would be expected in verse 20, about Adam's fall extending to his race. Paul knew the word for "impute" (*logazomai*) meaning to count, reckon, and used it for righteousness (Rom. 4:22) but a different word is used in Romans 5:13 (*ellogeo* - to bring into account). Verse 20 shows instead that the law came in as the occasion of universal sinfulness, implying that men sin now just as Adam did then; by intelligent transgression of known law of God.

Romans 5:19 is an exact parallelism. A key is the phrase translated "were made." What does it mean? Does it mean made so without choice or chance? If it should be translated "constituted" as some have said, then all men are or will be saved, (no choice or chance) because of what Christ did! This is obvious Universalism. However, this phrase occurs 21 times in the New Testament and in all other places where Paul uses it, it means "to ordain, appoint, put in place of". It is used of the ordination of elders, bishops, priests or judges, and properly means "to put, place, lay down" or "put in a position". To be put in a position is not genetic. Deacons and elders have conditions to meet for their place; they can also lose it. With this qualification, the passage is clear. Adam's sin put all men in the place of choosing sin. He fell first, damaged us all and set us up to follow his lead. But Jesus did not sin. His victory over sin and death put all men in the place of choosing righteously if they will respond to Him! As Adam's sin is the occasion (not cause) of a race's ruin, so Christ's obedience is the occasion, not cause of its redemption.

What then, did Adam pass on to his race? It is easier to sin than do right. People that sin keep sinning more. All, indeed, "have sinned". What happened in Adam that brings us now into a world with two strikes against us? The effects of sin are as profound as God's creation connections in our beings. Because of his organic link to us, Adam fathered physical depravity, reinforced by our ancestral parents' selfish choices to recur right down through history. This is the true "original sin", an inherited, accumulated damage that hurts us with a bias, or tendency towards self-gratification. Notice, it is not sin that is passed down, but degraded emotional patterns, a weakened or defiled physical body and over-hyped propensities that give sin its power and make all of us open to the tug of temptation. A parental addiction or greed may result in a child's inherited unnaturally strong appetite. While this is not in itself sin, the results of their sin are still transmitted, becoming in turn the occasions of further wrongdoing in future generations. Thus, a parent's sin is "visited on their children" although all such awakened desires or weakened bodies are the child's misfortune, not his crime. Such hereditary effects may last three or four generations, even when the child does not follow his parents' or grandparents' example. Apart from God's transforming work in salvation through Christ, the world's sin once begun can only multiply with each generation. (Ex. 20:5; Num. 14:18; Deut. 5:9)

The Bible testifies to our physical depravity by birth and circumstances. This makes it easier for the will to choose self-gratification, while not the cause of our wrong action. It is obvious that man is in a weakened and unbalanced condition: Ps. 103:15-16; Matt. 26:41; Rom. 6:19; Rom. 8:3,23; 2 Cor. 4:11; 5:2-4; 12:7; Gal. 4:13-14; Phil. 3:21; Jas. 4:14. This gives him a bias towards selfish action, the key among many influences for sin.

WHY DO CHILDREN SIN?

How, then does a child sin? You do not have to teach a child to do wrong. An explanation becomes clear as we carefully consider human development. A baby enters the world as the object of its parents' fondness, unceasing care, and concession by those who guard it. In these circumstances its natural, inherited appetites are first developed, and that child's natural desire for conscious freedom also begins to express itself. Feelings develop long before reason, and both are deeply entrenched before the spirit begins to awaken to the claims of God. Much depends at this point on the parents. If they are faithful in their duty to God, they must train their child to yield up its own way when that self-willed way will interfere with the happiness of others. The child will learn at first obedience to its parents only in a love/discipline relationship: it is here that the habit of response to authority must be ingrained in a child's soul, so that later, when God opens up their spiritual understanding, that child will surrender to Him. (1 Sam. 15:22; Prov. 6:20-23; Prov. 10:17; Prov. 13:18; Prov.

15:5,31-32; Eph. 6:1; Col. 3:20.)

Since the feelings develop before the reason and conscience, the will begins to form the habit of obeying desire, which deepens every day. The obvious consequence is that self-indulgence becomes the master principle in the soul of the child long before it can understand that this self-indulgence will interfere with the rights or happiness of others. This repeated bias, while not sin in itself, grows stronger each day, before knowledge of right or duty can possibly enter the mind. Finally, a moment of true moral responsibility arrives. The child is now old enough to understand wrong. (This will probably be earlier in a Christian home than in a non-Christian one.) Does the child approach this test in a perfectly neutral state? If Adam, in the maturity of his reason, with full consciousness of the morality of his actions, could give in to such temptation, how small is the hope that an unaided child will not? The Bible's sad record is, "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." The moment that child chooses selfishly, it sins. Paul put it like this: "I was alive without the law once; but then sin revived (sprang into life), and I died." Paul was Jewish. He grew up in a home surrounded by the law. How could he be alive without the law? It had to be as a child. The only time he was "without law" was when he didn't see or understand it. Spiritual death begins the day you first see, understand and disobey a known law of God. From this point on (and apparently not before) God holds the child responsible for his own actions and destiny. It is significant that all words of the Lord to sinners begin from their youth, and not from birth, as some have supposed.

It may be objected - does not the Bible teach that man is born sinful? Many who follow Augustine's assumptions think so. A number of verses are at times urged to support this idea, but they do not fairly stand up to alternative scholarship, and have only been used if no better explanation of the universal sinfulness of man is forwarded. We have to explain the universalness of sin somehow, and the inability of man to save himself. Yet to blame sin on another and to claim helplessness for our own evil is in itself an obvious evil. God is very plain; He does not hold the child in any kind of responsibility for its parents' sins. "What do you mean, you who use this proverb - the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live... you shall not have occasion to use this proverb in Israel. All souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine; the soul that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezek. 18:1-3,20, see also the whole chapter; Jer. 31:30; Deut. 24:16; 2 Chr. 25:4; Ps. 94:23.)

In speaking of the coming judgment, we are expressly told in the Bible that God shall judge every moral being for his own sins, no mention being made of the imputation of Adam's guilt. Ps. 9:7-8; 96:13; Ecc. 11:9; 12:14; Is. 3:10;11; Jer. 31:30; 32:17-19; Matt. 12:36-37; 16:27; Lk. 12:47-48; 20:46-47; Jn. 5:27-29; 12:48; Acts 17:30-31; Rom. 2:2-11,12,16; 14:10-12; Gal. 6:7-8; 1 Cor. 4:5; 2 Cor. 5:10; 1 Tim. 5:24-25; Heb. 9:27; 1 Pet. 1:17; Jude 14-15; Rev. 2:23. God has specifically stated He would not judge man for another's sin. Yet, all sin in Scripture without exception is under the judgment of God. Man cannot, therefore, inherit sin from his parents or Adam.

Some Scriptures used to try to support this "inherited sin" idea have been pressed right out of context. In examining these, it will be important to adhere to some universally accepted principles of Biblical interpretation. They are:

Interpret each verse or passage in the light of all other revealed Scripture;

Examine each verse in the context where it is placed, taking into account the design, purpose, authority and author of each passage;

Texts used to prove either of two theories prove neither;

Passages must be interpreted in a way (if they can be) by which they will not contradict each other.

It is with these principles in mind that we shall examine the so-called Scriptural objections:

Re: Original Sin? Adam or Me?, on: 2006/1/27 22:34

1) Psalm 51:5

"I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." Isn't it saying here we are born sinful? Here David speaks; he speaks from personal experience, and not for the whole world; and who is the subject of this sentence? Not David, but his mother! Pressed literally, this verse says that during his time of gestation and conception, his mother was a sinner; David is the object. There is a world of difference between being shapen in iniquity and iniquity shapen in him, just as there is a great difference between being born in New Zealand and New Zealand being born in me! So does this mean (as Augustine once believed) that any act of sexual procreation because of sexual feelings even in marriage is itself sinful? Surely not. God made sex. It is His idea. What He calls clean ought not to be called unclean. What then, does this passage teach? There are three different interpretations, none of which teach the dogma of transmitted or inherited sin;

That David's conception was considered illegitimate, as some Jews have always believed; not from his father's side (a bastard could not enter the temple of the Lord) but on his mother's. David's mother's name is not mentioned. David is not shown with the sons of Jesse when Samuel came to anoint them. David's brothers seem embarrassed and angry

in his presence. David apparently has a different mother than his brothers, Jesse's sons. His sister's dad is Nahash, not Jesse! (cf. I Chron. 2:13-16; I Sam. 17:25 and Ps. 27:10) If so, it explains many things about his life, his personal battles and abandonment to God, but nothing about Adam.

That David came from a lineage in which there had been family immorality, and remembered his "lineage" mother in comparison to his own sexual sin; David's mother calls herself a "handmaid" (concubine) who belongs to the Lord.

That David was simply deeply cut to the heart by his sin, and broke out in the extravagant language of poetry (cf. v3,4,7 and 8). Thinking back along his life, he broke out affirming that from the earliest moments of light he had been a sinner, and came from parents who were sinners, without in any way implying that this sin had been transmitted down to him by his mother. In no way does this passage teach "inherited" sin, no matter which way it is interpreted literally or figuratively.

(2) Psalm 58:3, Job 14:4, 15:4, and John 3:3

This first verse in Psalms 58:3 has been pressed into service along the same lines. Note that it is the wicked who are spoken of and that even they "go astray". If the text is forced to literal interpretation, it means that infants talk as well as lie from birth! Job 14:4 and 15:4 have been stretched to fit into this dogma. Both these two verses simply imply the universality of human sin and bodily frailty, without any reference to the means by which man sins. Both may be used to support the idea that man is physically depraved, and by these influences will certainly (not necessarily fixed) sin. John 3:3 can only at the limit state that that which is born of fleshly desire will tend to sin (when the will yields to its control) while that which results from the Holy Spirit's agency (in the sense that the will yields to Him) is holy. Nothing here about inherited sinfulness.

(3) Eph. 2:3

"by nature, the children of wrath" must be compared with Eph. 2:1 which plainly states man is dead through his own trespasses and sins. Man's wicked nature has come as the result of his wicked walk in the way of this world. As previously stated, the word "nature" does not mean the way we were born. God shows that a sinner goes against his nature in his sin (Rom. 1:31; 2 Tim. 3:3; James 3:6). His "nature of wrath" is the result of his sinful actions, forming in his life a character that makes God angry with him.

THE FINAL CONCLUSION - WHAT SIN REALLY MUST BE

(3) Sin is always moral

All gathered evidence points finally and irrevocably to this fact. Moreover, an extensive study of the root words for sin in the Bible show overwhelmingly that each man is held responsible for his own sin; none of these words give any hint of a physical or moral cause back of the will that produces sinful choices. All Bible words for sin overwhelmingly show its voluntary viciousness; all describe a deliberate choice.

1) Words with a root meaning to miss, err from the mark, or wander from the path of right prescribed by a loving Creator. The idea of a bad aim of an archer (Judges 20:16) or those who stumble or make a false step out of haste on their way to a goal (Prov. 19:2)

a) To sin (khaw-taw) Gen. 20:6,9; 39:9; Ex. 20:20; Num. 15:27(27-31); Deut. 20:18(16-18) (see 9:3-5); 1 Sam. 2:25; Job 5:24; Prov. 8:36(32-36); Ezek. 18:4,20,24.

b) Sin (khat-tawth) Gen. 18:20-21; 50:17; Ex. 32:30-34; Ps. 32:5; Prov. 14:34; Is. 6:7; Ezek. 32:30-34; Ps. 32:5; Prov. 14:34; Is. 6:7; Ezek. 3:20; 18:24; 33:14-16; Dan. 9:20-21; Zech. 13:1.

2) Words with a root meaning to bend, curve, twist, distort or make crooked.

a) To act perversely (aw-vaw) Act contrary, do wickedly or wrong: Ester 1:16; Dan. 9:5

b) Perversion (aw-vone) Crookedness, depravity, iniquity, perversion of Divine law; guilt contracted by sinning (Gen. 15:16; 32:5) It is the character of the action that is emphasized: (Ps. 32:5) Gen. 4:13; 44:16; Ex. 34:7,9; Num. 14:34; 1 Chron. 21:8; 32:5; 51:2,9; Is. 6:7; 53:6; Jer. 31:30,34; Ezek. 3:18-20; 18:17-20; 18:30; Hosea. 4:8; Mic. 7:18.

3) Words meaning break away from just authority, revolt, rebel (2 Kings 1:1; 3:5-7; 8:20,22)

a) Transgress (paw-shah) Is. 1:2-4; 46:8; 66:24; Jer. 2:29; 3:13(12-15); Ezek. 2:3; 18:31; 20:38 (35-38); Hosea. 7:13... "a breach with God, aspotacy - design and set purpose are always involved".

b) Transgression (peh-shah) Revolt, rebellion (conscious breach of duty, desertion-while 1(b) (khat-tawth) involves sins of negligence and weakness, 3(b) (peh-shah) always implies design, set purpose. Job 34:37 is a key - "he adds to his sin rebellion") Gen. 31:36; 50:17; 16:15-16; 16:21; Ps. 32:1; 51:1,3; Is. 43:25; 44:22; 53:8; 58:1; Ezk. 18:28; 18:30-31. Involves trespass and apostasy.

4) To be wicked (raw-shah) properly means to make a noise, or tumult. It denotes a state of impiety, making disturbance, confusion, trouble, with the idea of strong excitement. (Cf. Job. 3:17, Is. 57:20) If evil becomes the habitual feature of the disposition or action, it is raw-shah. 1 Kings 8:47(47-50); Job 3:17; Ps. 18:21; Is. 57:20; Daniel 9:15. Other words come from this.

5) Words with a root meaning covering up or over; treachery, falsehood or faithlessness:

- a) To act treacherously (maw-alâ') Deut. 32:51 (of Moses, 6(a) (maw-rawâ') used in Num. 27:14) Josh. 7:1; 1 Chron. 5:25; 10:13; 2 Chron. 12:2(1-3); Neh. 1:8.
- b) Treachery (mahâ'-al) Job 21:24.

6) Words with a primitive root meaning to be or make bitter; stroke or stripe; lash with a whip, strike, contend with both hands, repulse anyone; to strike anyone's mouth, i.e. refuse to hear his words, treat him with contempt; thus to be grievously perverse in resisting authority.

- a) To be rebellious (maw-rawâ') Num. 20:23-24 (Aaron's rebellion) 27:12-14 (of Moses; he uses the same word of Israel. Num. 20:10) Deut. 21:18-21; 1 Sam. 15:23; Ps. 5:10; Ps. 78:8.
- b) Rebellion (mer-eeâ') Num. 17:10; Deut. 31:27; 1 Sam. 15:23; Neh. 9:17; Pr. 17:11; Is. 30:9; Ezek. 2:3,5.

7) Words from a primitive root meaning to rebel, be rebellious, thus stubbornly disobedient:

- a) To rebel (maw-radâ') Josh. 22:15-16; 2 Kings 18:7(1,3,5-7); Job 24:13; Ezek. 2:3; Dan. 9:9.
- b) Rebellion (mer-adâ') Ezek. 4:19;
- c) (meh-red) Josh 22:22;
- d) Rebellious (maw-rawd) Ezek. 4:12,15
- 8) Iniquity or wickedness (vanity-awâ'ven) From a root meaning to pant, thus exert oneself in vain, come to nothingness. This emptiness idea is applied to:

Vanity, hence falsehood, wickedness;
 Lightness, ease;
 Living at ease, riches, wealth;
 Ability to do;
 Exhaustion.

- a) Emptiness or vanity (characterizing sin and false worship) Is. 41:29; Zech. 10:2; 1 Sam. 15:23 (of the vanity of idols) Is. 66:3 (of idols themselves) Hosea 4:15; 10:5.
- b) Vanity of words, falsehood, fraud; Ps. 36:4; Prov. 17:4

c) Wickedness, or iniquity: Num. 23:21; Job 34:8; Prov. 11:7; Is. 1:13.

9) Words with root meaning to spoil, with idea of break in pieces, or crushing with a loud noise or crash (Job 34:24; Ps. 22:9; Is. 24:19) Thus to make good for nothing, bad in any way.

- a) To be evil, to have an evil disposition (raw-ahâ') Ex. 5:23; Num. 20:15; Josh. 24:15; 1 Sam. Chron. 21:17; Ps. 22:16-17; 37:1,8-9; Prov. 24:18,19; Is. 1:16; 41:23; Jer. 13:23.
- b) Evil, bad, wicked (rah) of manner of thinking or acting: Gen. 2:9,17; 6:5; 8:21; 39:9; Deut. 17:2(2-5); 1 Sam. 12:17(16-19), 20(20-21); Ps. 7:9; Jer. 4:14,18; 7:24; 8:6; Ezek. 11:2.

NOT WEAKNESS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Who can look over these penetrating descriptions of sin in the Old Testament and say that sin is merely some kind of weakness, committed through inability of will? The New Testament goes on in the gallery of the portraits of selfishness:

1) Words with root meaning to miss the mark, the road, to fail to do what one intended to do, to err, do or go wrong, miss or wander from the path of uprightness and honor, thus to sin: (To "miss the mark" does not imply a target is too hard but

t the aim is too low.)

To sin (hamartano) Lk. 15:18-19; Luke 15:21; 17:34; Rom. 2:12; 3:23; 5:12; 6:14-15; I Cor. 15:34; Heb. 10:26; 1 Jn. 1:10; 2:1; 3:6,9; 5:18.

A sin (hamartema) An evil deed, an error, an offense: Mark 3:28; Rom. 3:25.

Sin (hamartia) A failing to hit the mark, error, mistake, failing to accomplish what was intended, or what was good and useful, misdirection of our faculties: Matt. 1:21; Lk. 24:46-47; Jn. 1:29; 8:21,24,34,36,46; 16:8-9; Acts 13:38-39; Rom. 3:9; 6:1,2,6; 6:11,20; 1 Tim. 5:24; Heb. 3:13; 11:25; 12:1,4; Jas. 1:15; 4:17; 5:20; 1 Jn. 1:7-9; 2:2; 3:4-5; I Jn. 5:17.

A sinner (hamartolos) Devoted to sin: Matt. 9:13; 11:19; Lk. 18:13; Rom. 5:8; 1 Tim. 1:15; James 5:20; 1 Peter 4:18.

2) Words carrying the idea of falling away, fall beside or near, stumbling, false step, a blunder (derived from para, beside, and pipto, to fall, fall down)

To fall away (parapipto) To deviate from the right path, turn aside (climactic action) Heb. 6:6

A trespass (paraptoma) A falling away from right, truth, duty, lapse or deviation from truth and uprightness, an error, sin, misdeed or fault arising from ignorance or inadvertence: Matt. 6:14-15; 18:35; Rom. 4:25; Gal. 6:1; Eph. 1:7; 2:1; Col. 2:13; James 5:16.

3) Words conveying the more serious idea of stepping beside, going past without touching; from para, beside, and basin o, to step out, walk, go. The words are all active and positive:

To transgress (parabaino) To morally violate, overstep: Mt. 15:2-3; Acts 1:25; 2 Jn. 9.

Transgression (parabasis) Deviation, extravagance, digression; hence violation of God's law, deliberate departure from truth: Rom. 2:23-25; 4:15; 5:14; Gal. 3:19; 1 Tim. 2:14; Heb. 2:2(1-4)

A transgressor (parabates) A breaker or violator of the law: Rom. 2:25-27; James 2:9,11.

4) Words involving law with a prefixed negative; thus the condition of one without law (either ignorant of it, or violating it)

Lawlessness (anomos) Destitute of law (1 Cor. 9:21) Generally used in the sense of departing from the law, a violation of the law, lawless, wicked; Lk. 22:37; Acts 2:23; 2 Thess. 2:8; 2 Pet. 2:8

Lawlessness (anomia) Want of conformity to the law, contempt, violation of it, iniquity and wickedness; Matt. 7:23(21-23); 13:41(37-42); 23:28(27-28); 24:12; Rom. 4:7; 6:19; 2 Cor. 6:14; 2 Thess. 2:7; Tit. 2:14; Heb. 1:9; Heb. 8:12(10-12); Heb. 10:17(16-17); 1 Jn. 3:4.

5) Words involving the word just or righteous with a negative; refusal to do what is right.

To do wrong (adekeo) To be just unrighteous, to wrong someone, to hurt, act unjustly or wickedly; Matt. 20:13; Acts 7:24-27; Col. 3:25; Rev. 22:11.

Unjust (adikos) Unrighteous, one who violates justice or has violated it; Matt. 5:45; Lk. 16:10-11; Acts 24:15; I Cor. 6:9; I Pet. 3:18; 2 Pet. 2:9.

Unrighteous (adikia) Injustice, wrong; Lk. 13:27(24-27); Jn. 7:18; Acts 1:18; 8:23(20-24); Rom. 1:18, 29; 2:8; 2:6-11; 6:13; I Cor. 13:6; 2 Thess. 2:10-12; 2 Tim. 2:19; 1 Jn. 1:9; 5:17.

6) Words involving godly, pious, worship with a negative; to be irreverent:

To be ungodly (asebeo) To act impiously, to be destitute of reverential awe towards God: Peter 2:6(4-9); Jude 15 (14-15).

Ungodly (asebees) Impious, despising God. Rom. 4:5; 5:6; 1 Tim. 1:9; 1 Pt. 4:18; 2 Peter 2:5; 2 Pet. 3:7; Jude 4, 15.

Ungodliness (asebia) Want of reverence. Rom. 1:18; 11:26; 2 Tim. 2:16; Tit. 2:12; Jude 15,18.

7) Words denoting evil, bad, of a bad nature or condition.

Evil (poneros) Bad, wicked in an ethical sense; also used of labors, hardships, peril, toil:

Evil in general: Matt. 5:11; 7:17-18; 9:4; 15:19; Mk. 7:22,23; Jn. 3:19; 7:7; Rom. 12:9; Col. 1:21; 2 Thess. 5:22; Hebrews 3:12; Heb. 10:22; 2 Jn. 11.

Evil persons: Mat 5:45; 12:34-35,39,45; 13:49; 25:26; Lk. 6:35; Gal 1:4; 2 Thess. 3:2; 2 Tim. 3:13

(3) Satan and the evil angels: Matt. 13:19,38; Lk. 7:21; Eph. 6:16; 1 Jn. 2:13-14; 3:12; 5:18-19.

Wickedness (poneria) Depravity, iniquity, badness, evil disposition of mind: Matt. 22:18; Mark 7:22; Lk. 11:39; Acts 3:20; Rom. 1:29; 1 Cor. 5:8; Eph. 6:12.

A Final Word

From the study of Bible words describing sin, we look in vain for evidence that sin is anything else than ultimately a wrong choice. There is always the idea of movement, voluntary action, never a static or inactive something behind the will, received by heredity, that causes the will to act in sin. The Word of God protects itself from theological speculation like this; sin is a selfish, lawbreaking choice.

Without God, man does have a sinful nature, but this nature is not physical. He inherits no absolute causation from his parents or anyone else. Man is held responsible for his own actions. His sinful nature consists in the habit patterns of a life lived for self instead of God. They flow from a wrong heart, or ultimate choice in life. They need not be all premeditated to be sin. A man who has unyielded rights and resentment in his heart that has been allowed to build for some time does not have to coldly calculate to fly into a rage. A man says an unkind thing. He tries to cover it by saying, "Oh, I didn't mean that!" Scripture flatly contradicts him by stating "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks". He may not have meant it to be revealed in all its ugliness. But it was in his heart, and the unconscious action followed. Nature does not mean natural, as compared to ordinary, but that which is common, that which man does as a rule. If we say man has a sinful nature, we are not talking about some solid "thing" causing sin, but that as a rule of life, as a habit of actions the sinner always behaves sinfully. His own heart is set on pleasing himself; out of this primary choice or idolatrous preference flows all his thoughts, actions and lesser choices.

Scripture reveals that no sinner seeks God. His selfishness has made him run from the call of God just like Adam did long ago: Gen. 6:5; 2 Chr. 12:14; Ps. 10:4; 53:2; 119:115; Ecc. 8:11; Is. 9:13; 31:1; 59:4; 64:7; 65:1; Matt. 23:37; Jn. 5:40; 6:26; Rom. 2:4; 3:11. For this reason, he cannot be saved unless God invests great efforts in him to turn him back to righteousness. Man is able to repent when faced with the love of God and the enormity of his sin, and must do so as a first condition of God's restoration to His family. This is directly asserted in both the Old and New Testaments. (Is. 1:16-18; 55:6-7; Hosea. 10:12; Matt. 3:2; Lk. 13:3,5; Acts 17:30-31) Because repentance involves a facing of, and turning from sin, sin is ultimately a moral act.

It is precisely this emphasis that needs to be restored to the Church today! The dogma that men are made to sin and are blamed for sin primarily because of Adam is taught neither by revelation, reason, or the record of the Early Church for the first three hundred glorious years of its ministry. It is unbiblical, inadequate and unreasonable, a hindrance to the deep and powerful convicting work of the Spirit of God, and has been the foundation of more subtle heresies and misrepresentations of the Gospel than almost any other falsehood. It detracts terribly from the loving, just character of the great Godhead. Its misuse and misapplication in practical living turns the actual idea of God's grace into an ugly travesty of justice, makes repentance unreasonable and holiness unattainable. It has historically been the chief foundation of Universalism and the key reason for the rational rejection of the truth of future punishment. Through its mesh "the goodness of God" which leads men to repentance loses much of its meaning. No wonder some churches practically do not give themselves to missions and evangelism while theoretically believing it, and little wonder that sinner's hearts are not broken by much of our preaching today! All through history, when God has found men and women who dared preach personal responsibility for sin and the necessity and practicality of a holy life through faith in Jesus, lasting revivals resulted. Let us then throw away all excuses for our failure to obey the Lord of Hosts; let us admit it is not just the fault of Adam or our ancestors, but we who are to blame; and let us repent deeply, that God may grant us true conversions and revival

Re: - posted by Greenquality, on: 2006/1/27 23:13

Hi laz great subject, but it's hard to read the first three lines, when you are wrong! about who is the subject, and what is the object! show me the verb LOL, if you can't follow the subject, in psalm 51.5, this will throw you off. go throw the bible and check your self again make sure you are on the level. a (Old saying measure twice and cut once)

Re:, on: 2006/1/28 0:10

I don't understand what you are saying. All I did was post Winkies article in three sections.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 8:54

Quote:

-----Moreover, an extensive study of the root words for sin in the Bible show overwhelmingly that each man is held responsible for his own sin; none of these words give any hint of a physical or moral cause back of the will that produces sinful choices.

I see no benefit in telling anyone that they sin because they "willed" it (if we also imply that they can will not to sin). Life patterns are deeply engrained, and a great deal of one's choices are the result of learned habits, and a need for significance and security. People choose what they do or believe, not necessarily for pleasure, (as Morrel suggests), but for survival. The pleasure (gratification) that results from choice has a tendency to reinforce the sinful pattern. When sinful choices make one feel "righteous", then they are reinforced ex: religious loyalty could be a sin that results when one has placed his trust in man.

Sin is simply: missing the mark, not necessarily a bad action.

A newborn's survival depends on screaming when it is hungry or needy - esp if it has a parent who is negligent. At some point this "screaming" is viewed as sin. That would be when the child has been taught a better way to express his need. Unfortunately children aren't always taught better ways to deal with self-centeredness, and before they are even aware of what's going on, they have developed sinful ways of thinking and reacting to life which are almost impossible to recognize or change.

I prefer to say this: While we are not responsible for the fact that we are sinners, we ARE responsible for the way we deal with it. We are responsible to CHOOSE God's solution when that solution is presented to us - by the Spirit, when the blindness is removed.

Diane

Re: Original Sin? Adam or Me? - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/28 11:26

In response to...

Original Sin by Lazarus1719 on 2006/1/28 3:30:42

Me Or Adam?

By Winkie PratneyOriginal Sin, Is there any such thing?No.

"I object to the doctrine of constitutional sinfulness, that it makes all sin, original and actual, a mere calamity, and not a crime. For those who hold that sin is an essential part of our nature, to call it a crime, is to talk nonsense."

Charles Finney: Lectures on Systematic Theology: Lec 24 Moral Depravity

Yes.

"Sin may be summarised as threefold:

An act, the violation of, or want of obedience to the revealed will of God;

a state, absence of righteousness;

a nature, enmity toward God." C I Scofield

Yes.

"Notwithstanding the depravity of man's soul by original sin, there is yet left a basis whereon divine grace can work for its recovery by spiritual regeneration.

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

Tertullian 197-220 AD was one of the ante-Nicene fathers.

No.

"Paul goes on (Rom 5:12) to picture death as spreading to all men, because all men sinned. Neither the spreading of the sin nor the parallel spreading of salvation through Jesus is automatic - both involve the choice of the individuals." Roger Forster: Faith and Reason p 234

Yes!

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

John Wesley; Sermon 44 Original Sin.

No.

YWAM espouses the moral government doctrine of the atonement and as part of that teaching and as regards sin teaches...

"1. Our moral character is shaped merely by our individual acts of sin.

2. If an individual unknowingly commits a sin, it is not a sin to that person and they will not be held to account for it by God.

3. The sin of Adam is not transmitted to us, and it would be unjust for God to pronounce us guilty because of his sin.

4. If God condemns us all because of Adam's sin, God must also save everyone because of what Christ did (Rom. 5:19). This is universalism, and therefore both parts of the argument must be wrong.

5. Our moral depravity is shaped solely by wrong and sinful choices we make."

No.

"A sinful nature is developed in our lives through habitual self-indulgence and subsequently begins to affect everything we do. . . . Thus we concur that a law or sinful nature is present but we must also see that it originated by choice. A good example of this is a junkie bound by an addiction to heroin. He cannot help but crave drugs; but its origin was in his choices."

George Otis: The God they never knew. (YWAM key spokesman)

Pay your money and take your choice? or can we get clearer than this? While I'm not quite prepared to go as far as Wesley to infer that Charles Finney, Winkie Pratney, Roger Forster, George Otis are "but heathens still" :-? , I am strongly convinced in the existence of what I prefer to call 'congenital sin'.

If you want to read Wesley's sermon you can find it here: (<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/wesley/sermons.v.xliv.html>) Original Sin.

Re: roadsign, on: 2006/1/28 12:12

You said "I see no benefit in telling anyone that they sin because they "willed" it.

Really?

How can you repent of sin if you are not truly responsible for it?

In my case, I needed to realize this fact so I could repent.

Re: Proper understanding of sin leads us to Christ - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 12:56

Quote:

-----How can you repent of sin if you are not truly responsible for it?

How can I be responsible for being born a sinner!!! If I had a choice, surely I would have preferred to be born sinless. Did I make the choice in the womb? Why do I have to believe that I chose to be a sinner before I can choose to receive Christ's atonement?

It's like having cancer. How helpful would it be to believe that I caused it to myself by eating the wrong foods, or whatever? (did I cause all the pollution and put bad chemicals in my food)

Would that be a prerequisite before I would go to the doctor and accepted his cure. I doubt it. In fact, I believe the opposite. One who thinks they did it to themselves may be more inclined also to believe that they deserve punishment - and may do things to harm themselves in order to absolve their guilt. In fact, I know too many people like this. (substance abuse, self-abuse, self-condemnation, abuse others etc)

I recently engaged in conversation with a member of Alcoholics Anonymous. He mentioned that a gene had been found that explains why we see the typical generational pattern of alcoholism. I have always objected to that notion, viewing it as an excuse. So I pointed this out. His response surprised me. He said, "Guilt is a bad motivator for cure. It tends to keep

p the sinner in his bondage. Once alcoholics are told about the genetic predisposition, a lot of their shame, guilt, and hopelessness is lifted, and they move on towards healing from the disease.

I am in no position to prove or disprove his point. I know that many would strongly object, because of the implication that we are excusing sin, and thus preventing the sinner from seeking God.

But AA does not allow for any excuse, and instead holds each person responsible for their own choices.

I like Philologos explanation: 'Congenital' sin. It does not absolve anyone of personal responsibility, but also does not lay a crime for which the sinner is not responsible. I am not to be punished for Adam's sin.

There is also the notion that we learn early in life: Since it's my fault, I must also fix it. While that is true, if carried too far, it leads away from Christ: ie: If I don't fix it (absolve my own wrong), then I will be condemned by those I trust. And surely God will condemn me too. So I must earn my way to God.

I like Scofield's explanation of sin best, even though I am not a Scofield fan.

Diane

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 13:15

The only problem with this person's long diatribe is that it is totally unscriptural. It denies the whole revelation of the New Testament. It takes verses out of context and sets aside Christ's redemption and work on the Cross.

It gives us Law, denies original sin and nullifies the redemption of Christ, i.e. "if righteousness is by the Law, then Christ died in vain.

As in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive.

This person takes Paul's words in Romans 7 completely out of context and twists them to say exactly the opposite of what Paul says. That Paul confesses that in him, that is in his flesh dwells no good thing and his attempts at keeping the law are always frustrated by the law of sin in his flesh and the only salvation from this situation is the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus who fulfills the just requirement of the law in us who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.

As regarding Original sin Paul says:

Romans 5:12 Therefore just as through one man sin entered into the world and through sin, death,; and thus death passed on to all men because all sinned... But death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned after the likeness of Adam's transgression, who is a type of Him who was to come.

18 "So then as it was through one offense unto condemnation to all men, so also it was through one righteous act unto justification of life to all men."

19 "For just as through the disobedience of one man the many were constituted sinners, so also through the obedience of the One (Christ) the many will be constituted righteous."

The fact this person completely ignores and sets aside the New Testament revelation shows its false basis and false promise.

Sorry to sound harsh. But Paul said of those who sought to bring the believers under the bondage of the Law, "would that they would cut themselves (mutilate) themselves off (referring to circumcision). A very strong word. He called them dogs

His strongest words were to those who preached Law and not Christ as Grace and righteousness to everyone who believes.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 13:23

Quote:
-----How can you repent of sin if you are not truly responsible for it?

Repentance is not for sinful acts as such and committing to keeping the law. This is not repentance.

Repentance is from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to the Tree of Life which is Christ.

Repentance is from independance from God and unbelief to God to recieve from Him the abundance of Grace and the gift of righteousness.

Repentance is from self righteousness to Christ who is made unto us both wisdom from God, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

Repentance is from a life of Self dependence, Self realization, Self righteousness, and Self expression to dependance up on God who is our righteousness in Christ.

Repentance brings us to God to recieve from Him the abundance of Grace and the gift of righteousness. It brings us out of Adam into Christ and brings into us all Christ is and All Christ has accomplished.

Repentance brings us independant self rightouse rebels to the end of ourselves to cry out to God and recieve the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, to regenerate us and to make us sons of God with His life and Nature.

Repentance brings into us the Faith of Christ and Eternal Life. It brings us into Christ who died to the Law on the Cross having fulfilled its requirements and brings into us His resurrection Life which manifests itself in holy living which expressed Christ who is within us as the Spirit.

Graftedbranch

Repentance - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 13:28

Quote:
-----Repentance is not for sinful acts as such and committing to keeping the law. This is not repentance.

Repentance is from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to the Tree of Life which is Christ.

Repentance is from independance from God and unbelief to God to recieve from Him the abundance of Grace and the gift of righteousness.

Repentance is from self righteousness to Christ who is made unto us both wisdom from God, righteousness, sanctification and redemption.

Repentance is from a life of Self dependence, Self realization, Self righteousness, and Self expression to dependance upon God who is our righteousness in Christ.

Repentance brings us to God to recieve from Him the abundance of Grace and the gift of righteousness. It brings us out of Adam into Christ and brings into us all Christ is and All Christ has accomplished.

Repentance brings us independant self rightouse rebels to the end of ourselves to cry out to God and recieve the redemption which is in Christ Jesus, to regenerate us and to make us sons of God with His life and Nature.

These are words of life and hope.
Diane

Re: questionable logic - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 13:35

Quote:
-----That David's conception was considered illegitimate, ...on his mother's. David's mother's name is not mentioned. David is not shown with the sons of Jesse when Samuel came to anoint them. David's brothers seem embarrassed and angry in his presence.

Is this not an unbiblical way of explaining David's words in Psalm 51 "surely I was sinful at birth, from the time my mother conceived me?????"

I am trying to summarize the philosophy of Jesse Morrell, and am wondering how that would affect the ministry of this 20 yo energetic street preacher. Any thoughts?

Diane

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 13:38

Amen Diane,

It is evidence that this one must twist the plain revelation of the Bible to promote his legalistic religion.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 14:17

Quote:
-----God's greatest problem is summed up in one little word: S-I-N. Heaven is at battle stations today because sin has invaded the human race and the moral Universe. It is high time the Church knew her enemy! Her first enemy is not the Devil, it is not death, it is not despair. Her enemy is SIN, and unless she learns to understand it, face it and deal with it, God can never grant us a visitation from on high to turn our nations back to Him.

There are several fallacies in this opening statement. It is said that God's battle is with sin, and that "heaven's battle is to turn the nations back to Him."

The nations were never under Him but under the prince of this world.

But the first point is that God's battle is with sin which has invaded the "moral universe".

But as we read the record of Genesis, what we see is that God created man in His image and likeness and placed him before the Tree of Life that he might 'freely eat.' A study of this and comparison with Revelation 21-22 shows that the Tree of Life represents God's Eternal Life. God intended man to eat of this tree to receive the Eternal Life of God into Himself. God created man to be a vessel and container of God to be His expression on the earth.

What was man's sin? It was eating of the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil to "become as God knowing good and evil".

The significance of "original sin" was a choice to be an independent, self-realized being knowing good and evil. That is not just evil but good and evil.

Man's original sin is to choose not a life of dependence upon God by partaking of God and receiving God, but a self-realized independent life apart from the Life of God.

This is the "original sin". This brought the whole race into an independent fallen condition. One which seeks to be both "good and evil" in independence from God.

What is repentance? It is repentance from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil to the Tree of Life. It is turning from self-realization, self-exaltation, self-righteousness and independent living.

Christ died on the Cross to redeem us from sin. His redemption is judicial meeting the requirements of God's Holiness, God's righteousness, And God's glory.

And in resurrection Christ is to us the Tree of Life regenerating us on the basis of His judicial redemption and bringing the Life of God into us.

The gospel is not repent of breaking the law and return to keeping the law. The gospel is repentance from an independent Life apart from God. It is repentance from our own self righteousness.

According to Galatians, God gave the Law to reveal to us our inability to keep it. The Law shows us that we have no capacity to be holy and righteous in our selves. It turns us to Christ to be redeemed, forgiven, restored, regenerated, and receivers of Eternal Life which is in Christ.

It brings the Holy One, Christ into us to be our righteousness, our holiness, and our everything. It brings us to a place Adam never enjoyed, He never ate of the Tree of Life and after the fall was banned and barred from it. Adam never had the Life of God. But we, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus have not only the forgiveness of sins but also regeneration and the indwelling Life of God to make us not just redeemed creatures but children of God with His Life and nature to be His many sons conformed to the image of the First Born Son of God.

This writer would have us to turn from evil to good. To turn from sin to self righteousness. Both are fruits from the same tree. He would have us turn from one branch to another. From the branch of evil to good. From immorality to morality.

But God's way is to turn us from Self to Christ. From both evil and good to God. To receive the Life of God to be the expression of God in Christ.

This person in his quote of Romans 7 ignores the preceding verses which say:

"You have died to the law through the body of Christ that you might be joined to Another, even to Him who was raised from the dead that you might bear fruit unto God."

Graftedbranch

Re: a practical note on being born sinners - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 14:53

Are we born sinners?

Do children have to be taught to lie? No.

Do children have to be taught to be selfish? No.

Do children obey out of their natural disposition? no.

Children must be taught not to lie but tell the truth.

Children must be taught to share and not be selfish.

Children must be disciplined to obey.

Why is this? Because they are by nature sinners and rebels. If left to themselves will they grow up into godly men loving God and obeying the law of God? No.

A flower which has the life and nature of a flower if given water and air and sunshine will grow up and blossom into a beautiful flower because it has the life and nature of a flower.

But if left to ourselves we will never grow up into godly law keeping rightouse people.

Only by "partaking of the Divine Nature" in Christ by the Spirit do we grow up to express the Life and nature of God.

Are men holy by nature? No. We are unholy. Do we love righteousness by nature? No. we love sin. Cna we by the exercise of our will become holy and rightouse? No. We do not have holiness in us. We don't have righteousness in us. And even if we desrie to be such, we have no capacity.

Apart from Christ and the law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus we have no way, We have no ability, we have no sollution to our situation. We are slaves of sin and death.

"If a law had been given that could give life, then righteousness would be by the Law."

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/28 15:01

graftedbranch's (just parts)

Quote:

-----Repentance is not for sinful acts as such and committing to keeping the law. This is not repentance.

Repentance is from a life of Self dependence, Self realization, Self righteousness, and Self expression to dependance upon God who is our righteousness in Christ.

I think this is too sweeping a statement. I think you are right in what you affirm but mistaken in what you deny ie.I agree with what you say 'repentance' is, but not what you say it is not. ;-)

The issue that is at the heart of this is 'original sin' which in the traditional understanding of this teaching is a 'disposition' rather than an occasion. Jesse, quoting Winkie Pratney is concentrating on the individual's responsibility for his own sin and for the effect of his own sin on his character and destiny. This is a necessary emphasis but it doesn't really answer the question about 'original sin'

Repentance too is both an occasion and a disposition. Repentance is most certainly required for "sinful acts".Â“Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.Â” (Acts 8:22, KJVS) This response of Peter to Simon the Sorcerer is a single example but the scriptures constantly reveal that people were to repent of 'sinful acts'. This aspect of 'repentance' is part of 'confessing' our sin. The Greek word translated 'confess' in 1 John 1:9 means to 'acknowledge', literally to 'say the same word'. This is a man agreeing with his 'accuser' and his 'accuser' is the Spirit of God. This recognition of culpability is the basis of 'conviction' and 'repentance'. We see it very plainly in the 'confession' of a prodigal king and of a prodigal son.Â“Against thee, thee only, have I sinned,Â” (Psa. 51:4a, KJVS)

Â“And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.Â” (Luke 15:21, KJVS)The concept 'I have sinned... against thee' is the vital ingredient of Biblical repentance. "I have sinned' is a personal 'acknowledgment' of culpability ie blame-worthiness.

This is not a man saying 'I am a sinner' that is a further step. This next step is where a man, and only by divine revelation, begins to see what is 'in' him, not just his actions but his disposition. Although there are several examples of 'congenital sin' in the OT the doctrine of 'congenital sin' only comes clearly into focus in the NT. This is a mercy of God. If the diagnosis were given before the remedy were available it could surely only result in despair.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 15:19

You are right brother. Sin is defined as many things in the Bible. It is disobedience to the law, it is unbelief (whatsoever does not proceed from faith is sin, etc.)

But what I outlined is the essence of sin. We must deal with sin daily as believers confessing them and appropriating the Blood of Christ.

But Christ came to deal with more than our sins but sin itself in its essence and it's essence is Self and independance from God. All sin finds it's roots here. In our fallen human sinfull life which loves sin.

But the root of sin is self. And self is the product of Satan's infusion of his corruption in our nature through the tree of the knowlege of good and evil.

The Blood of Christ deals with our sins but the Cross of Christ deals with the sinner terminating the Old man who is a sinner on the cross and in resurrection He brought into being a New creation.

Graftedbranch

Re: Tree of Good and - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 16:15

Quote:
-----The signifigance of "original sin" was a choice to be an independant, self realized being knowing good and evil. That is not just evil but good and evil.

GB, do you mind expounding on this thought. I've never understood it. Does it say that we wish to know and do good (not only evil), only APART from dependency on God.

I have to admit that I know atheists who do a lot of good, they are quite altruistic, and can be more consciensious and loving than those who claim to know God.
It seems rediculous to tell them that their benevolent gesture is totally evil, and contains NO good. How would that help them see their need for God? It would only make us appear like followers of a crazy religion.

Quote:
-----Repentance is not for sinful acts as such and committing to keeping the law.

Would this sentence not be more accurate if it had the word MERELY inserted in it. ie Repentance is not MERELY for sinful acts.... (at least that is how I assumed it to mean)
Diane

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/28 16:30

Quote:
-----I have to admit that I know atheists who do a lot of good, they are quite altruistic, and can be more consciensious and loving than those who claim to know God.

Lev. 2:2 Then he shall bring it to Aaron's sons the priests, and he shall take from it his handful of its fine flour and of its oil with all its frankincense. And the priest shall burn it as its memorial portion on the altar, an offering by fire, a satisfying fragrance to Jehovah.

2:11 No meal offering that you present to Jehovah shall be made with leaven, for you shall not burn any leaven or any honey as an offering by fire to Jehovah.

2:12 And every offering of your meal offering you shall season with salt and you shall not omit the salt of the covenant

of your God from your meal offering" with all your offerings you shall present salt."

Sister, I believe you have hit on a very good point. There are in fact many unbelievers who rival believers in their "good deeds". They do many good things and have "good intentions" and are very altruistic and self sacrificing.

We take a wrong position in trying to convince them that what they are doing is not good but evil. It is not evil. It is good. But it is good from the wrong source.

God does not look at the deed but the source from which it comes. It is a fruit of the Spirit? Is it the product of faith? Is it of the New Creation?

Both human good and evil flow from the same source. The Tree of the knowledge of Good and Evil. It is easy for us Christians to deny evil, but what about our good things? What about our natural affection and our natural disposition to help and do good deeds?

These things need to be resisted as well. We are called to live by Christ, to eat Christ, to feed on Christ and to deny our soul life whether good or bad.

We need the Spirit's enlightenment to see our natural goodness is just the Honey which God said was not to be in the meal offering. The Meal offering is to be of Olive Oil (the Spirit) the fine flour (Christ's humanity) frankincense (the fragrance of His resurrection) and Salt (The Cross). But honey as well as leaven is excluded.

Honey is our natural goodness. Leaven is sin. Both are to be excluded in the meal offering which is acceptable to God.

God wants neither our natural goodness nor our evil sinfulness. He wants Christ.

Graftedbranch

Re: What is natural goodness? - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 19:05

There are many people in churches who are full of natural goodness. They are involved in everything. They have a natural capacity for organization. They do all the right things. They are always at weddings and funerals, they write the appropriate cards and letters. They give the right gifts. They counsel with others. They are the cream of the crop. But is this Christ? No. It is just their own natural disposition.

And churches encourage this sort of thing. They heap praises on those who do so much and are always doing the appropriate thing.

But this has nothing to do with Christ, the Spirit or the Christian Life. It is just natural goodness.

But let them go unnoticed. Let them be slighted. Let them be overlooked when the praises are being handed out and you will see what they are made of. When Self is slighted they are deeply offended. When they are overlooked they are hurt. When their natural talents are not appreciated they feel unresolved and are downcast.

But they may not show it. They may "take the humble position". Or they may have a natural humility and defer all praise saying "no, I am not so wonderful". But this too is natural. It is not Christ. It is not the Spirit. It is just natural disposition.

And unfortunately most of Christianity is built up with people's natural goodness. Natural gifts, Natural talents, natural schemes for evangelism, for church growth, for everything. There is no cross and little of Christ.

This is honey. This is unacceptable fire on God's altar. It is wood, hay and stubble. Not the Gold of the divine nature, the Silver of Christ's redemption and the precious stones of the Spirit's work within them.

Not the Oil of the Spirit of God, the fine flour of Christ, the Salt of the cross and the fragrance of frankincense which is resurrection Life.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 19:37

Quote:
-----And unfortunately most of Christianity is built up with people's natural goodness. Natural gifts, Natural talents, natural schemes for evangelism, for church growth, for everything. There is no cross and little of Christ.

Somehow it has to be evident that this is all built on a faulty foundation. Before that becomes evident, I see no way of "evangelizing" the deluded - ie, rescuing them - whether they be atheists or hypocrites.
Diane

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 19:53

Quote:
-----Somehow it has to be evident that this is all built on a faulty foundation.

Actually, the problem is it is built on the right foundation, which is Christ.

Paul in 1 Corinthians when speaking of God's building and the judgement seat of Christ speaks of the One foundation which is laid and our need to be careful how we build on it. With wood, hay and stubble or with Gold, Silver and precious stones.

Most churches are built on the right foundation which is Christ. But few build with Gold, Silver and precious stones.

Graftedbranch

THE NATURE OF SIN., on: 2006/1/28 20:11

THE NATURE OF SIN.

God created the human race so He could share His life and love with them, so that He could have a relationship with them, and love and bless them. We were created for union with God and He made us in His image and in His likeness, uniquely fitted to interact with Him in love. This is the meaning of our existence, to live by the life of God enjoying the privilege of being His children. We are unique in our creation; we were created with the ability to commune with God in our in a body of flesh made from the dust of the earth. We were created to live in and respond to God in love.

God created human beings with a free will because He desired to share His love with free beings that could partake of His life and join Him in His unspeakable joy. He did not create us out of a some need within Himself for company. He is the infinitely fulfilled One. He created us because He wanted to share His love with us. He loves you because He loved you in to existence.

God created every one of us as moral beings, with a free will, the ability to choose Him or reject Him. Love must exist by choice alone. Love cannot be forced or legislated. Robots can not love! God created mankind, with no necessity within Himself and no pressure from without to bring about another creature with free will. He freely chose to create us with free will. All of us have the God given ability to say yes or no to Him.

Man was not designed to live independent of God. God's intent was to rule in the heart of man, for man's good, and for His own enjoyment. Man needs God, and was to live in (and enjoy!) total submission to Him. God is no 'tyrant', His demand for our submission is for our good.

In order for mankind to make the deliberate choice to believe God, to love Him and walk in His love, He made a tree called, the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and He placed it into the Garden. Remember, without the choice of at least two things, love, obedience, holiness and sin cannot exist.

"And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, "Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die." (Genesis 2:16,17)

The response of the Adam and Eve to the tree would either be one of obedience, which would develop into trust and love toward God. Or they would make the choice of disobedience; unbelief that rejected God and His love and the result of such a declaration of independence from God would be death. Adam and Eve lived in fellowship with God until they chose to rebel by eating the forbidden fruit. God had designed them so they would rely and trust Him for all wisdom and knowledge.

Adam and Eve had everything they could possibly need. God provided them with everything as a free gift. Since they were created, every breath they took they were reminded that they were not God but dependent on Him. The meaning of their life was to be submitted to their Creator. It was at that point that the devil came to tempt them. He tempted Eve with the lie that she could like God. The heart of sin is the desire to be king and ruler of one's own life. To be independent of God and to dethrone Him and take His place. Sin in its ultimate desire wills to remove God, kill him if it could and crown oneself in God's place.

Satan began tempting Eve by portraying God as a liar that could not be trusted. He inferred that God did not really love her because He did not have her best interests in mind. Satan made it look like God was withholding something good from her. He then told Eve that in eating from the tree she could declare her independence from God and she could like God. He assured her that God had lied; eating from the tree would not bring death but was instead the doorway to her total self-directed freedom.

"Then the serpent said to the woman, "You will not surely die. For God knows that in the day you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil. Eve saw that the fruit was good for food, pleasing to the eye and desirable for gaining wisdom, so she took it and ate it. She gave some to Adam and then he also ate it" (Genesis 3:4,6)

Instead of trusting and having her confidence in God, Eve believed the serpent and made the choice to disobey and declare her independence from God. In this act of defiance towards God, she severed herself from God, who was the only source of her life and the meaning of her existence. This was not just a slip or fall but an act of total rebellion! Both Adam and Eve rebelled in an act of disobedience that declared independence from Him. By rebelling they disconnected themselves from God who was the only true source of life and plunged themselves into death.

They were created to say yes to God and choose to trust His love. Instead they have said no to God and yes to the lie of Satan and in so doing become the enemies of God. They have denied the meaning of their existence as creatures and rejected their God given glory of submission and obedience to the Creator. They have said no to the covenant union with Him, for whom they were created, exchanging it for the dead end street of independence that results in death.

When God said "In the day you eat of it you shall surely die" this was not just a punishment, but the announcement of a fact. You are dependent upon God for your life, you are created to live in His love and if you walk away from Him, a law will be triggered that cannot be reversed - you will certainly and unquestionably die.

Adam and Eve died in the moment they ate of the tree. God is Life and the source and upholder of all life, no life exists outside of Him, and nothing is independent of Him. When Adam and Eve ate this fruit they turned away from God's rulership. The life-sustaining relationship with God was broken. They cut themselves off from God and His wisdom, blessings, life, power, love and light. They decided to live for self, and for the purpose of self-gratification, rather than for fellowship with, and in obedience to, God. They kicked God out of His rightful place on the throne of the heart and replaced Him with self.

All of us have sinned in the same way. Each of us have turned away from God and to our self. We have placed ourselves above God and our fellow man. In doing so, we become the voluntary but real slave of lust, appetite and desires. We freely choose it and that is why we are totally responsible for it and why God can justly send us to hell.

Re: THE NATURE OF SIN. - posted by roadsign (), on: 2006/1/28 22:38

Quote:

-----We freely choose it and that is why we are totally responsible for it and why God can justly send us to hell.

What did Jesus mean when he said he came to set the captive free? Free from what? Was it the bondage of the will?

What does Isaiah 6:9 mean, "... make their ears dull and close their eyes..." Does it not mean that they cannot understand the way, or find the way.... because it takes divine revelation.

There is one big difference between Adam and us: Adam was not born in sin, separated from God like we are. Prior to regeneration, we have NEVER known fellowship with God. We never knew the light. Well- at least, I didn't. So, how can I volitionally turn away from something I don't even know exists.

If the definition of sin is, to miss the mark, why should it be necessary to define sin according to a volitional, conscious choice. I can certainly be missing the mark without making any choices at all.

I once heard a pastor say, "To fail to choose at all is really making a choice to reject God." In other words, though we might not make a choice to reject him, simply by failing to choose him, we have rejected him .

Diane

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/28 22:57

Amen Sister,

Graftedbranch

Sin is a wrong moral choice., on: 2006/1/29 5:43

There is no proof in the Bible that sin is anything else than a wrong moral choice. The meaning of the original Greek and Hebrew words used in the Scriptures to describe sin are:

1. To act perversely, to twist and distort.
2. To be stubbornly disobedient.
3. To refuse to serve God.
4. To act treacherously and disobey.
5. To be rebellious and refuse to do right.
6. To be lawless and to refuse to reform.
7. To be obstinate or noncompliant.
8. To deviate from the right.
9. To be ungodly and to be unjust.

The following passages show that all sin is disobedience and that this disobedience is a free choice.

Romans 6:16 "Know ye not, that to whom you yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants you are to whom you obey ; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness."

James 5:17 "Therefore to him that knows to do good, and does it not, to him it is sin."

Romans 14:21 "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin."

Isaiah 65:2 "I have spread out my hands all the day unto a rebellious people, which walks in a way that was not good, after their own thoughts."

Isaiah 1:19-20 "If you be willing and obedient, you shall eat the good of the land: But if you refuse and rebel, you shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord has spoken."

Psalms 81:11 "But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would have none of me."

Isaiah 42:24b "For they would not walk in His ways, neither were they obedient unto His law."

Ezekiel 20:21a "They rebelled against me: they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgements to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them."

Matt. 23:24b "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and you would not!"

These verses point out the sinner's rebellion and refusal to obey God. The sinner's real problem is pure rebellion. He cannot obey God but instead he defiantly and boldly refuses to even listen to God.

What is sin?, on: 2006/1/29 5:50

What is sin?

Sin is the result of a free moral choice to rebel and disobey God. In both of the above cases, Adam and Lucifer freely chose to knowingly rebel and totally disobey God. Instead of letting God rule and reign, they chose to take control of their own lives. Sin is the throwing God out of His rightful place and then taking His place in one's life. Sin is more than just a simple act of defiance. It is a preferred state of the heart. The sinners' only real aim and purpose in life is to bring himself pleasure that totally disregards his own intelligence and God's right to rule.

Sin also is the wrong use of the abilities and resources that God created us with. God did not make any mistake in the creation of Lucifer or Adam. Both of these took what they had been created with and used it in the wrong way and for the wrong reason.

Miss the mark?, on: 2006/1/29 5:53

the Bible teaches that sin is a wrong moral choice.

Have you even been exposed to this teaching about sin? The Preacher draws a bull's-eye target and then draws arrows all around it. Most of these arrows fall way short of the target completely. He may draw one or two hitting the target but missing the bull's-eye. He then explains that sin is missing the mark and falling short of God's glory. He then says that no matter how hard we try we will always miss the mark.

This is a total distortion of God's truth! The sinner misses the mark because he is purposely aiming in the opposite direction of the true target!! It is not that he tries to hit the bulls-eye and misses but it is that he knowingly and rebelliously shoots his arrows in the total opposite direction of the true target.

True sin is the aim and intent of the heart to totally disregard God and His love. It is the aim and the intent of the heart that determines if a person is holy or not. The sinner can always come to Christ for salvation.

It is not a criminal act to aim at a target and miss. People do not go to hell for simply missing. A sinner goes to hell because he is a criminal. The reason why the sinner is a criminal is because he has the ability to aim at the right target but he purposely aims in the opposite direction. He deliberately and defiantly has aimed his heart in total opposition to God. He is so stubborn and rebellious that even though he can turn around (repent) and aim in the right direction, he never will without the grace of God. This stubborn refusal is what sends the sinner to hell.

Every sinner has committed two evils. These are, forsaking God and building a system that tries to quench their spiritual thirst and desire. The sinner has not only refused God's right to rule over him but he has replaced the only true God with a false god.

Jer. 2:13 "For my people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water."

1 John 3:4 "Sin is lawlessness" i.e., breaking the law, a WILLFUL act.

Sin is a CHOICE to disregard God and go one's own way.

Isa. 53:6a "All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way."

God would never command or require repentance if man was truly unable to obey.

Acts 17:30 "And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commands all men every where to repent."

The sinner's REAL problem is his REFUSAL to come to God when He attempts to draw him near.

Matthew 23:37 "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that kills the prophets, and stones them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathers her chickens under her wings, and you would not!"

Every person has received light from Jesus Christ and no one has ANY EXCUSE for rejecting God.

John 1:9 "That was the true Light, which gives light to every man that comes into the world."

Romans 1:20 "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse:"

The Word of God does not describe sin as a simple miss or weakness but as rebellion. When you look at the entire Bible you will see a history of many stubborn, rebellious, defiant, prideful, arrogant and disobedient people. None of these people were born this way. They had the ability to follow God and do things pleasing in His sight, but they freely chose to spit in God's face.

Re: Miss the mark?, on: 2006/1/29 12:33

I haven't read the whole thread, but, I have BIG problem with bringing morals into any definition of sin - because, the only morality we know is based entirely on God's definition of Himself - there is no other definition. And, to KNOW HIM is LIFE and HEALTH..... We can prove that by tasting it, but it is harder to prove that not to know Him is death and destruction.

I like this verse, which I didn't see listed in the last few posts, because it takes the ground away from everyone's feet, no matter how they stick to the morality of the culture in which they were raised - even a 'christian' culture - and most especially if they deny God Himself.

John 16:9

Of sin, because they believe not on me;

Re: Miss the mark? - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/29 14:39

Quote:

-----the Bible teaches that sin is a wrong moral choice.

All of these definitions of sin are correct. But the issue here is not what sin is but why we sin. Some here would argue that we sin because we choose to sin. But why do we choose to sin? We choose to sin because we love sin. Why do we love it? Because it is our fallen nature to love sin.

The Bible teaches that we sin because of what we are. God did not create us sinners but created the whole human race in Adam. And Adam sinned bringing the whole human race which was in his loins into the slavery of sin, corruption, and death.

We have a dual problem. We have sins which we commit and we have sin which is the bent of our fallen nature. That is we have a sinful nature that we inherit from Adam.

The Point of Romans 5 is that death is penal and through Adam sin entered into the world and death by sin so that death

h spread to all men... even to those who did not sin in the likeness of Adam's transgression.

The fact is death is penal and we all die. Even babies die.

Paul argues that sin is not imputed when there is no law, nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, signifying that death was reigning even before the Law was given. Though there was no law to condemn us for our behavior, yet we were already under condemnation.

We sin because we are sinners. We have no capacity to do otherwise. We cannot make ourselves righteous and we act according to our nature. And the Law was given to us to expose this condition. The more we try to keep it, the more sin rises up in us and takes us captive. The more we resolve not to get angry and lose our temper, the more it rises up.

Even under the Old covenant, No one could keep the Law. That is why the Levitical System was in place. The Offerings, the atonement, the sacrifices.

We may be able to control our behavior to a certain extent but we cannot control the well springs of our heart. You cannot make yourself love someone whom naturally you just can't stand. It is not in us to do so. We are sinners.

And the whole point is that as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. We come under condemnation through Adam's sin and we are justified in Life by Christ's redemption.

The Blood of Christ deals with our sins and the Cross of Christ deals with us as sinners. The Blood justifies us and on the Cross He terminated the Old Man, the Old Creation. We died in Christ on the Cross. And through the Blood our sins are forgiven and through the Cross we are delivered from our fallen humanity.

And by the application of the Spirit within us we are set free from our fallen human nature and we are enabled to live by the Law of the Spirit of Life in Christ Jesus. And as we deny our own fallen life, we live by the indwelling Life of Christ and manifest the fruit of the Spirit which is Love, Joy, peace, patience, goodness, self control. These are fruits of the Spirit, not our self efforts at being holy and righteous.

Grafted branch

Re: Sanctus - posted by Compton (), on: 2006/1/29 14:59

Quote:

-----It is the aim and the intent of the heart that determines if a person is holy or not.

There certainly is clarity in this statement. I would be interested in hearing some feedback from a few others on this measurement. Personally I like how it allows room for justification by faith even as it requires obedience.

This is an area that has given me much food for thought since joining in this forum. Growing up in fundamentalist baptist circles, we were never afraid of moral absolutes, biblical obedience or even good old-fashioned legalism...but we wouldn't have imagined using the word "holy" to describe ourselves. I believe this reluctance was not because of a lack of desire to live purely...quite the opposite. I think the Calvinist DNA in many denominations, which frames God's holiness as something inutterable and absolute, makes many people understandably reluctant to think of themselves as truly "holy." God alone is described by the awestruck angels, "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus." In this setting for the word "holy", the more pious a Christian strives to be, the more painfully aware they might become of their own need for God's grace.

I'm not sure how this relates to the main direction of this thread, but I felt it might be helpful for people with different church backgrounds to appreciate this. When I first visited SI, I was frankly amazed to hear that people would refer to themselves as "holy"...it took a little time to see that my controversy with the description was not all based on differences in sanctification doctrines...some of it was simply a different practical application of the word "holy".

Blessings,

MC

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/1/29 15:25

Quote:
-----There certainly is clarity in this statement. I would be interested in hearing some feedback from a few others on this measurement. Personally I like how it allows room for justification by faith even as it requires obedience.

Holiness is Christ Himself. Only God is holy. And we become holy only by "partaking of the Divine Nature" as Peter says

It is only as we learn to feed on Christ and assimilate Him as our daily food, do we have His holiness wrought into us by the Spirit.

We can never look at ourselves and say, "I am holy" But we can rejoice in the reality that this One who indwells us is the Holy One. And as we contact Him and live by Him we manifest His holiness.

Paul said in Gal. 2:20, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live, yet not I but Christ lives in me and the life I now live in the flesh, I live by faith, the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me."

When we stop trying to make ourselves holy and begin to thank the Lord that He is within us as our holiness, righteousness, and everything, then we will begin to experience Christ as our holiness.

What we need is revelation to see what God has already done. He has redeemed us, justified us, regenerated us and put us into Christ and Christ into us. And only when our eyes are opened to see these divine facts, do we begin to act in faith trusting the indwelling Spirit to make them real in our experience.

As we daily feed on Him we will find that we no longer desire the impure things. They become repugnant to us. We find a Life within us working. We no longer have a desire to hang out with our worldly buddies. We will no longer be attracted to impure things and when we find ourselves attracted, we will call on the Lord and find His life immediately setting us free

IN this way we become constituted with Christ and we begin to Live Christ and speak Christ and are full of life and full of Light.

This is practical holiness.

"As you have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so also walk in Him".

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/1/30 8:55

Hi Graftedbranch,

Quote:
----- The Blood of Christ deals with our sins but the Cross of Christ deals with the sinner terminating the Old man who is a sinner on the cross and in resurrection He brought into being a New creation

Is the Old Man in this model an individual or the corporate body of unbelievers under Adam?

But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity

ity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: (Ephesians 2: 13-16)

It seems evident in this passage that "IN Christ" we are members of the "One New Man" and are in "One Body".

There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; (Ephesians 4:4)

But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love. (Ephesians 4:15, 16)

Clearly we have revelation of the mystery of the Body of Christ, which as many members are fitly joined together and are under His headship (if you will). This is the same "One New Man" that was spoken of in Ephesians 2.

Now, we will gain insight into the "Old Man".

This I say therefore, and testify in the Lord, that ye henceforth walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind,

We are told in Philippians 2 to "Let THIS mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus... who became OBEDIENT unto death- even the death of the cross." Gentiles walk in the vanity of their mind, we are to have the MIND of Christ.

Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart: Who being past feeling have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness; But ye have not so learned Christ; If so be that ye have heard him, and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus: That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;

Taken in context we seem to have a long teaching here on the contrast between the corporate "New Man" (which is in Christ) and the corporate "Old Man" which is described in great detail.

As I understand these and linked passages in Romans, 1 John 2, John 8, and others one is a member of the New Man by virtue of being in Christ and is a "New Creation." One is only a new creation that is IN Christ. And if they are IN Christ, they are members of the one New Man. And vice versa if they are yet in Adam and members of what is to those who have been born again the "Old Man".

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: THE NATURE OF SIN. - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/1/30 11:42

This is taking a step backwards in the discussion but I have been away from my computer for some days.

freecd's

Quote:

-----Remember, without the choice of at least two things, love, obedience, holiness and sin cannot exist.

That would depend on your definition of 'sin'. Are you referring to the 'state' or the 'occasion'.

Quote:

-----Adam and Eve died in the moment they ate of the tree.

Indeed they did but what kind of 'death' are we referring to. Hebrew has a way of intensifying* a word by repeating it, so we have 'perfect peace' for those whose mind is 'stayed upon Jehovah', or as the Hebrew has it 'peace, peace'. 'holy of holies', song of songs, are all examples of this idiom. In Hebrew the warning given to Adam is "and of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou dost not eat of it, for in the day of thine eating of it—dying thou dost die."

(Gen. 2:17, YNG) It would not do it justice but it is the equivalent of saying 'you will really die'. This was not referring to physical death as is clear in that 'in the day of his eating' Adam did not die physically. This is spiritual death, real death.

In Rom 5:12 says that "because of this, even as through one man the sin did enter into the world, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death did pass through, for that all did sin;"

(Rom. 5:12, YNG) I have opted for Young again here for a couple of reasons. From this point forward into the next chapters of Romans the Greek nearly always refers to 'the sin' and 'the death'. It personifies them. We sometime personify a word by beginning it with a capital 'come in said Love'. Paul is not referring to the act of sin here but what we might legitimately call 'Sin, with a capital S'. This is not sin the act but Sin the person.

Paul reveals that it was 'through one man' that Sin entered the world. 'through' here is 'dia', the route that Sin took to enter the world was through 'one man'. Paul repeats the revelation later in the same chapter "But, not as the offence so also the free gift; for if by the offence of the one the many did die, much more did the grace of God, and the free gift in grace of the one man Jesus Christ, abound to the many;"

(Rom. 5:15, YNG) 'by one offence of one man many died' and remember we are not talking about physical death but 'real death'. Here too Paul constantly refers to 'the Death' (Death with a capital D). According to Paul Sin entered the world through Adam's 'one offence' and Death entered 'through Sin'. Eve's disobedience was earlier than Adam's but whereas Adam's disobedience opened the world to Sin and Death, Eve's disobedience does not seem to have any ongoing consequence. In spite of C S Lewis' pretty language, we are all 'sons of Adam' even the ladies. There are no 'daughters of Eve'. Adam's single act of disobedience opened the door of the world's sheepfold to Sin and Death.

Paul's Rom 5:12 goes on to reveal that there is a succession of single events here. Young's translation shows the impact of the Aorist tenses used... "because of this, even as through one man the sin did enter into the world, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death did pass through, for that all did sin;"

(Rom. 5:12, YNG)...by his use of the English 'did enter' 'did pass through' 'did sin'.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/1/31 9:49

Quote:
-----Taken in context we seem to have a long teaching here on the contrast between the corporate "New Man" (which is in Christ) and the corporate "Old Man" which is described in great detail.

Brother,

I believe you have an excellent grasp on this whole matter.

The Old Man is Adam. And we as his descendants are "in Adam". We are of Adam, in Adam and participate in all he is and all he did.

And the New Man is Christ in resurrection. He is the First Born of the New Creation. He is the Second Man. As the last Adam he terminated on the Cross the Old Creation, the Old Man and all he stood for and all that was in him. As the Second Man in resurrection, He brought into being the New Man of the New Creation. The One New Man of whom we are all members corporately in Christ. The one New Man in whom there can be no Jew or Greek, Slave or Free, barbarian, Sythian, etc. But Christ is all and in all.

I like this paragraph in, "The Complete Salvation of God in Romans":

"In Adam we inherited the nature of Satan as sin, constituting us sinners in essence and element. We also inherited death, which on the one hand, made us passive, weak, and impotent with respect to the things of God, and on the other hand, reigned first in our spirit, then through our soul, and eventually over our body. Furthermore, in sin and death, we became subject to the condemnation of the righteous law of God. As believers, we have been baptized into Christ and also in

to His death, a death that took us out of Adam. In addition, we were regenerated at the time of Christ's resurrection (1 Peter 1:3), and in that rebirth, through His resurrection, we were transferred into Christ."

Graftedbranch

From 'Make it Simple' - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/1 16:35

RobertW's

Quote:

'the speed at which our Old Man (the old man) is refreshing itself in its blatant wickedness is progressing.'

I'm not sure I see the 'Old Man' like this. The 'Old Man' is steady state, it is in the individual that that 'refreshing' takes place rather than in society.

This will high-jack the thread. If you want to pursue the 'Old Man' line we could move to the Original Sin? Adam or Me? thread.

This is a carry over from the 'make it simple' thread. I underlined the part I hope to discuss.

Ron's quote:

I'm not sure I see the 'Old Man' like this. The 'Old Man' is steady state, it is in the individual that that 'refreshing' takes place rather than in society

My current line of thought on this (which seems to stay in a continual state of flux) is that our Old Man as the corporate body of Adam, ruled by the spirit of disobedience, would seem to be slipping deeper into wickedness or 'deteriorating' from the Image of God day by day on a corporate level. The whole of the human race under Adam seems to be decaying and the rate of that decay seems to be accelerating.

Now maybe I can split the horns of what I am saying to see if it jibes with Ron's understanding. Could it be that our Old Man is in a constant state (steady state) of rebellion, but yet the preventative judgments kept that steady state from being able to fully express itself. I.e. *'God made man upright, but he hath sought out many inventions, etc.* Technology has not in fact increased the 'refresh rate' of our old man, it has merely made provision for those who are in Adam to more readily fulfill their lusts. And also because of the ease with which the flesh (oops) is made provision for, men's hearts are increasingly fully setting in them to do evil and their imaginations are increasingly evil continually. They are not there yet, but they are getting there (or should I say, "back there" (Genesis 6). I just see a connection between the individual and the corporate. Each person is making a contribution.

God Bless,

-Robert

Re: From 'Make it Simple' - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/2 9:04

I wish to look at another aspect of the Old Man and that is the relationship between the Law and The Old Man.

For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: (Ephesians 2:14-17).

It seems that this passage required the abolishment of the law of commandments contained in ordinances in order that the new man could be 'made.' This takes me to Romans 7:1.

Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth

It is interesting that the analogy of marriage is used in this passage to describe the relationship between man and Sin and man and Christ. What I have never heard brought out is a comparison of what is described in Ephesians as the conduct becoming of a wife and our conduct when we were yet 'married' to Sin. I had a friend mention the other day that when he conducts weddings some have refused to have the stipulation of obedience required for the wife as part of the vows. Instead of "to have, hold, and obey" they want "to have and to hold" (only). I noticed this once when I watched *Shadowlands* (the story of C.S. Lewis) and how the word 'obey' was there in Lewis' vows and I cannot recall it being a part of any wedding I have ever attended.

There is difference also between a wife and a virgin. The unmarried woman careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and in spirit: but she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband. (I Corinthians 7:34)

Not only did our Lord die to Sin, but He also abolished the Law of commandments contained in ordinances. There is a tendency to want to please our master as human beings. It seems to me that the Law was used learn new ways to 'please' Sin by inverting the commandments. As we read on in Romans 7 & 8 it seems to indicate that the Law actually excited the unbeliever to commit sins as it gives Sin something to rebel against. What I am trying to understand is, are we loosed from Sin because we are dead to the Law (in Christ)?

This is important to me because under this model Sin did not 'die', but rather, in Christ WE died to Sin and there is a difference. And when we 'died' to Sin we were loosed from the Law of Sin. If we follow this out logically we will see that what keeps us dead to Sin is that we are likewise dead to the Law in Christ. In the event that we were to come 'alive' (for lack of better terms) to the Law, Christ is made of none effect in our lives.

So the question becomes, why can we not come under the Law if it is spiritual and we, the Born Again, are likewise spiritual? It seems to me that to come under the Law is to somehow resurrect Sin again and that to maintain our liberty from Sin in this life we must remain in Christ, dead to the Law, and filled with the Spirit. The Law is powerless to finish off what was begun in the Spirit. Why is that?

Re: From 'Make it Simple' - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/2 10:00

Robert W's

Quote:

-----My current line of thought on this (which seems to stay in a continual state of flux) is that our Old Man as the corporate body of Adam, ruled by the spirit of disobedience, would seem to be slipping deeper into wickedness or 'deteriorating' from the Image of God day by day on a corporate level. The whole of the human race under Adam seems to be decaying and the rate of that decay seems to be accelerating.

I know we have talked about this at length and I think you are probably getting the 'refreshment' metaphor from Â“That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;Â” (Eph. 4:22, KJVS)

Â“that ye put away, as concerning your former manner of life, the old man, that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit;Â” (Eph. 4:22, ASV)

Â“that you put off, concerning your former conduct, the old man which grows corrupt according to the deceitful lusts,Â” (Eph. 4:22, NKJV) I have quoted this in the ASV and the NKJV so that we can see how the translators are trying to give a sense of the continuing progress of corruption which is associated with the Old Man. The verb 'corrupt' is in a present participle and is in the passive voice. We might translate it "the Old Man, the one being constantly defiled".

Although I do believe that the 'Old Man' is the biblical expression of the human race's solidarity in Adam, I don't really think it functions as a 'corporate' entity in society. That concept, I think, would be that expressed in the terms 'the world'. Paul's reference is a reminder to his readers of what they had been taught. This is not really an imperative; an order. It is a reminder that they were 'taught... to put off, concerning the former way of life, the Old Man'. Paul then further describes this 'Old Man' as 'the one being constantly defiled, as regards the lusts of the flesh'. I think this is a reference to the continual defilement caused by the Old Man upon an individual. (and an unregenerate individual at that, but that is another topic.) The nature of a man or woman in that old union with the Old Man can never 'improve'. It is constantly subject to a process of defilement. There is an OT passage which exactly describes how I see this process at work.Â“But the wicked are like the troubled sea; for it cannot rest, and its waters cast up mire and dirt.Â” (Is. 57:20, ASV) This is an aspect of 'total depravity' not that it implies that every act of man is 100% evil but that every act is 'defiled'; the depravity is al

Embracing, no part has escaped its influence. Just when you think its all calmed down the troubled sea spews up another load of 'mire and dirt'.

The Old Man cannot be improved. I don't think he can get any worse either.:-) This is what I meant by 'steady state'. We may think we observe improvement but short of regeneration the returning tide will regurgitate all the old depravity.

As regards whether or not things in the world are getting worse, or whether things have never been this bad is a different discussion. But even if they are I don't think it is because the 'Old Man' is worsening. It may, as I think you suggested, be that God is loosening the restraints.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/2 12:01

Quote:
-----Although I do believe that the 'Old Man' is the biblical expression of the human race's solidarity in Adam, I don't really think it functions as a 'corporate' entity in society. That concept, I think, would be that expressed in the terms 'the world'.

I was going to ask you if maybe I was improperly mixing two things up; the world and the old man.

Quote:
-----I think this is a reference to the continual defilement caused by the Old Man upon an individual. (and an unregenerate individual at that, but that is another topic.)

I am underlining 'and' here to try and understand if you feel that the old man still has some sort of influence on the regenerate? I have been wondering if there could be some clues in these discussions as to mystery of 'the flesh'. It would answer a lot of questions as to why a Christian needs to 'mortify' the deeds of the body or not 'fulfil the lusts of the flesh'. I suppose the short question is, "where is the 'power struggle' coming from?"

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/2 13:19

Romans 6:6 "Knowing this, our old man has been crucified with Him in order that the body of sin might be annulled, that we should no longer serve sin as slaves;"

I like this footnote in the RcV:

Old man - "Referring to the natural life in our soul. The old man is our very being, which was created by God but became fallen through sin, and it is the same as the "I" in Gal. 2:20. It is not the soul itself but the life of the soul, which has been counted by God as hopeless and has been put on the cross and crucified with Christ. Formerly, our soul acted as an independent person, with the old man as its life and personality; now, since the old man has been crucified, our soul should act only as an organ of Christ and should be under the control of our spirit, having Christ as its life."

Body of sin - "The body indwelt, occupied, corrupted, possessed, utilized, and enslaved by sin, so that it does sinful things. This body of sin is very active and full of strength to commit sins; it differs from "the body of this death" mentioned in 7:24, which is weak and powerless in the things of God. The body of sin is not the sinning person but the sinning instrument utilized by the old man to express himself by committing sins, thereby causing the body of sin to become the flesh. Hence, the body of sin in this verse and the flesh of sin in 8:3 refer to the same thing."

Annulled - "Or, unemployed, jobless, inactive. Because the old man has been crucified with Christ, the body that had been utilized by him as the instrument for sinning now has nothing to do; it is unemployed, jobless. Thus, we have been freed from sin and no longer need to be under the bondage of sin to serve sin as slaves."

My summation - Sin still dwells in our flesh. It has not changed. But we have changed. We have been crucified with Christ and we are no longer slaves to sin in our flesh. We are not under obligation to it. We have been freed from it in Christ. The nature of the flesh has not changed but our relationship to it has changed. The Old man was a slave to sin in the flesh but having been baptised into His death, we are freed from the slavery to sin in our flesh. We are free to live by Christ in our spirit.

The Old man is the "man of old" The man who was a slave to sin. He has been crucified with Christ. We are no longer slaves of sin but we can now by the mercies of God present our members to God as slaves of righteousness.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/2 13:59

Hi Graftedbranch,

Quote:
-----Old man - "Referring to the natural life in our soul. The old man is our very being, which was created by God but became fallen through sin, and it is the same as the "I" in Gal. 2:20. It is not the soul itself but the life of the soul, which has been counted by God as hopeless and has been put on the cross and crucified with Christ. Formerly, our soul acted as an independent person, with the old man as its life and personality; now, since the old man has been crucified, our soul should act only as an organ of Christ and should be under the control of our spirit, having Christ as its life."

I believe this is the common understanding of the term 'Old man', but passages such as in Ephesians 2 and 4 as well as Romans 6 seem to indicate that our Old Man is that which rules those who are in Adam (corporately). If you are in Adam, you are under the old man, etc.

This becomes more difficult though when it comes to understanding the "Body of Sin." I have to believe that is individual, but am unsure.

Quote:
-----The body of sin is not the sinning person but the sinning instrument utilized by the old man to express himself by committing sins, thereby causing the body of sin to become the flesh. Hence, the body of sin in this verse and the flesh of sin in 8:3 refer to the same thing."

So is it the material body that is somehow sinful and if so, how can that be and how does that differ from dualism? If the body is sinful simply as a human 'body' then Christ's body would have been shot through also with Sin. This opens the door to a discussion of the transmission of Sin- is it physical, metaphysical, or something else?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/2 14:48

Graftedbranch's

Quote:
-----Old man - "Referring to the natural life in our soul. The old man is our very being, which was created by God but became fallen through sin, and it is the same as the "I" in Gal. 2:20. It is not the soul itself but the life of the soul, which has been counted by God as hopeless and has been put on the cross and crucified with Christ. Formerly, our soul acted as an independent person, with the old man as its life and personality; now, since the old man has been crucified, our soul should act only as an organ of Christ and should be under the control of our spirit, having Christ as its life."

I think this is very complicated and as far as I can understand it I disagree with it. I don't think the 'Old Man' is at all the same thing as Paul's 'I'. I have often pointed out in these threads on similar subjects that in... "knowing this, that our old man has been crucified with, that the body of sin might be annulled, that we should no longer serve sin." (Rom. 6:6, DRBY)... we have the phenomena of a plural possessive pronoun (our) and a singular noun 'man'. We do not have a personal, separate 'old man'; that is to say they are not lots of 'old men' but just ONE old man.

This is a direct reference back to Rom 5:12ff where Paul refers constantly to 'one man' "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned: (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 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. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.) Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover

the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound: That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord.Â” (Rom. 5:12-21, KJVS) I have put the 'one man' into bold font where it refers to Christ. In this passage there are just TWO men in view. One 'old man'; the Greek is the Ancient Man (ie Adam), and one 'new man' Christ. All men are in either of these two 'one man'. In the passage God's remedy for our condition is the crucifixion of the 'old man' at the point of Christ's death and the beginning of a 'new creation' in the 'new man'. The 'old man' is a Satanic counterfeit of the 'indwelling Christ'. But just as there are not many 'Christ's' but just one Christ in many saints, so there was only ever one 'old man' in all of us.

Quote:
-----Body of sin - "The body indwelt, occupied, corrupted, possessed, utilized, and enslaved by sin, so that it does sinful things. This body of sin is very active and full of strength to commit sins; it differs from "the body of this death" mentioned in 7:24, which is weak and powerless in the things of God. The body of sin is not the sinning person but the sinning instrument utilized by the old man to express himself by committing sins, thereby causing the body of sin to become the flesh. Hence, the body of sin in this verse and the flesh of sin in 8:3 refer to the same thing."

Nor would I see the 'body of sin' in this context as the individual body of the saint. I see it rather as the Satanic counterfeit of the Church, the body of Christ. This is humanity under the wrong head. Later when Paul wants to refer to the individual's body he uses the phrase 'mortal body'.

I think we can best understand the 'new man' by contrast with the 'old man'. These two 'one man' individuals cannot co-exist in a single person. We are either indwelt by the old 'one' and are 'in Adam' or we are indwelt by the 'new one' and are 'in Christ'.

Just my thoughts... :-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/2 15:23

Quote:
-----So is it the material body that is somehow sinful and if so, how can that be and how does that differ from dualism? If the body is sinful simply as a human 'body' then Christ's body would have been shot through also with Sin. This opens the door to a discussion of the transmission of Sin- is it physical, metaphysical, or something else?

The Body of sin or 'the flesh' as created by God was not sinful. It became corrupted and fallen through the eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Paul in Roman's 7:17,18 says, "Now then it is no longer I that work it out but sin that dwells in me. For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, nothing good dwells".

H. C. G. Moule in his Greek commentary, "Studies in Romans" says regarding 6:6:

"The body of sin - i.e. the body regarded as a special seat and stronghold of sin."

The footnote in the RSV on Romans 7:18 says:

"The flesh here is the fallen and corrupted human body with all its lusts. This flesh was not created by God but is a mixture of God's creature and sin, which is the life of Satan, the evil one. God created man's body a pure vessel, but this vessel was corrupted and transmuted into the flesh by Satan's injecting himself into it at the time of the fall. Now Satan as sin personified is in man's flesh, making his home there and ruling as an illegal master, overruling man and forcing him to do things that he dislikes. It is this indwelling sin which is the unchangeable evil nature, that constitutes all men sinners."

Christ came in the "likeness of the flesh of sin" but without its corruption. Just as in John 3, the Brazen Serpent held up by Moses was the likeness of the Serpent but not the Serpent, Jesus said, 'Even so must the Son of Man be lifted up...

And in God's complete salvation in Christ, our spirit is first regenerated. Then day by day our soul is being renewed by the indwelling Spirit through the washing of the Word in the Word. And eventually at the Lord's coming these bodies will be transfigured into His glorious image by the Same indwelling Spirit (or in resurrection regarding those who have died in Christ).

But till the Lord comes, our bodies are still the "seat of sin" and are under the sentence of death. But the Lord's redemption

on is full and complete. Even our bodies of this death will be transfigured and glorified. And in these bodeis today we gro an, awaiting our full sonship, the redemption of our bodies.

I can testify, I have been a believer for 30 years and have enjoyed some genuine transformation and growth in Life, but my flesh today has not changed. It is still the same.

If I were to leave off prayer and contacting the Lord daily and leave off spending time in the Word and in the fellowship of the Saints, I would find my flesh asserting itself and the same desires and worldly lusts would gain in me. But thank God this is not necessary.

If we sow to the flesh, we shall from the flesh reap corruption, but if we sow to the spirit, we shall from the Spirit reap Life which is eternal.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/2 15:42

Quote:
-----Now Satan as sin personified is in man's flesh, making his home there and ruling as an illegal master, overruling man and forcing hi m to do things that he dislikes. It is this indwelling sin which is the unchangeable evil nature, that constitutes all men sinners."

I think I would say something similar only I would reverse the order of "Now Satan as sin personified is in man's flesh, m aking his home there and ruling as an illegal master," and say now Sin is personified in man's flesh ruling as an illegal m aster...

I know this all sounds like hair splitting, but for the longest time on these forums we have been discussing these issues tr ying to come to terms with just where Sin could be resident in a body or 'in the flesh' and if during regeneration one is tot ally cleansed of this contamination that, under this model, is in an individual.

I don't know that I am any closer to understanding the topic or not as I keep unearthing more and more questions as we dig into the subject. Ultimately our doctrine has to jibe with the Incarnation and cannot allow for death to be the final Savi or.

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/2 16:02

Quote:
-----I know this all sounds like hair splitting, but for the longest time on these forums we have been discussing these issues trying to co me to terms with just where Sin could be resident in a body or 'in the flesh' and if during regeneration one is totally cleansed of this contamination that, under this model, is in an individual.

This is where most treatments of this subject go wrong. Regeneration does not cleanse our flesh. Regeneration regerate s our spirit. And the Spirit from within our spirit renews, sanctifies and transforms our soul.

But Paul's whole treatment of this in Romans 6,7, and 8 show us the flesh is still present with us, It is still the same, It ha s not been "clensed" by regeneration. On the contrary Romans's 6 shows us we have changed. We have died in Christ t o sin and the flesh is rendered powerless or "without authority".

Before we were saved, we could only live by the flesh. It was our master. But today we are in Christ and no longer under it's authority.

But till the end, "The flesh lusts against the Spirit and the Spirit against the flesh" and we must "put to death the deeds of the body".

If we beleive our flesh is changed we are wrong. It has not. But we are not to live according to the flesh "for the mind set

on the flesh is death" but "the mind set on the spirit is Life and peace."

This is consistent throughout the New Testament. It is the same in Romans and in Galatians. Until the Lord comes we will need to abide in Christ. We will need to keep ourselves minding the spirit. We will need to feed on Christ and be transformed by Him. We will need to be in the fellowship of the Body of Christ to receive the rich supply of the Spirit of Jesus Christ. We will need to be strengthened by His Spirit into our inner man that Christ may dwell in our hearts through faith...

And we should never be surprised by anything we find in ourselves. If we believe that our flesh has been cleansed, then when sin rises up in us we will be shaken. We will say, 'What is this, I must not be saved... How could someone be saved this way or want such a thing...' But if we know our flesh it will not surprise us, we will simply turn to the Lord and confess. "Thank you Lord for your precious blood and for your indwelling Life. "Lord save Me from myself." And thus we will experience His Saving Life within us.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/2 16:34

Hi Graftedbranch,

Thanks for the reply. I would say that I agreed with that view and argued viciously for it until the last few years. Today, after a more in depth study and also a look at the topic from some different angles has me wondering if we are free-er (for lack of a better word) than we think. I have some pretty well written arguments here on SI in the articles section that were taken from these forums on the side you mention. However, I have reconsidered *much* of it in light of many teachings I have since read and heard. Some are Ron's and others like Finney and Wesley. One of which I would particularly recommend is Paris Reidhead's (<http://64.34.176.235/sermons/SID0114.mp3>) The Tragedy of Third Generation Religion.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/2 18:08

Graftedbranch's

Quote:

-----But Paul's whole treatment of this in Romans 6,7, and 8 show us the flesh is still present with us,

What is your definition of 'the flesh' and how do you interpret "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death." (Rom. 7:5, KJVS)

"So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. 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." (Rom. 8:8-9, KJVS)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/2/2 21:06

Quote:

-----So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit,

I like this footnote on 8:8,9

"Verses 8 and 9 emphasise the word in, showing that the stress here is on condition and experience more than on the source and position".

That is to say "to be in the flesh" in this context is not just a matter of our position but of our experience. To be in Adam or in Christ as in Romans 5 and 6 is positional. But to be "in the flesh or in the spirit is a matter of our condition and experience.

On the one hand, an unbeliever is one "in the flesh". The flesh is his sphere of living. He is a person wholly in the flesh.

On the other hand a believer is one "in the spirit" that is the Spirit is his sphere of living.

While it is possible to be a believer and in experience be "in the flesh", the flesh is not his sphere. He is a person in the Spirit "if so be that the Spirit of God dwells in you". But it is impossible for an unbeliever to be "in the spirit" because his spirit is dead and he "does not have the Spirit of Christ".

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/2/2 21:14

Quote:
-----However, I have reconsidered much of it in light of many teachings I have since read and heard. Some are Ron's and others like Finney and Wesley.

With all due respect to Wesley and Finney, (and I have spent much time especially studying Wesley's views on sanctification), while they are very good to a point, in the end the Word of God is our source of truth. Frankly, they are not so clear.

I have found the views of Penn Lewis, Andrew Murray, H. C. G. Moule, Watchman Nee, and others in the same stream to be more scriptural, more cohesive, more true to experience, and have found the "Amen" in my spirit.

The views of Wesley and Finney while sounding good, are just not what the scriptures teach.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/3 4:32

Quote:
-----That is to say "to be in the flesh" in this context is not just a matter of our position but of our experience. To be in Adam or in Christ as in Romans 5 and 6 is positional. But to be "in the flesh or in the spirit" is a matter of our condition and experience.

Witness Lee's Recovery Version is taking the Watchman Nee line here of a separation between 'standing and state'. This notion of standing versus state, as you rightly recognize, was quite unknown to Wesley. It is a 'Brethren' tweak which is highly speculative. Penn Lewis' writings of course are almost entirely speculative.

I have a copy of the Recovery Version but I have not been particularly impressed with it. It shows the signs of a single translator in its narrowness and interdependence of concept. The footnotes seem to be largely Witness Lee's explanation and justification of his own line of teaching.

Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2006/2/3 8:56

Ron's passages:

“For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death.” (Romans 7:5, KJVS)

“So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God. 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.” (Romans 8:8-9, KJVS)

It seems to me that one is either 'in the flesh' or are 'in' the Holy Spirit, but not both at the same time. Perhaps my best definition of 'the Flesh' is an equation:

'Man' - the Holy Spirit = 'in the Flesh'.

'Man' + the Holy Spirit = 'in the Spirit'

In this model the flesh is the man under the influence of the spirit of disobedience. A person who is 'in the Spirit' is FULL of the Holy Ghost- which expels the influence of Sin. This is why more and more I am coming to the conclusion that we may not fully appreciate the command 'but be ye filled with the Spirit.' When a person is not FULL then (however it happens) they become vulnerable to temptation.

I believe in part it is because when a person is 'in the Spirit', FULL of the Holy Ghost they have different appetites and 'fed' in a different pasture (if you will). They have no appetite for things that are going to feed their NATURAL (non-sinful and good) desires until they become *unnatural lusts*. On the contrary when one does not seek the Lord in prayer and to be continually filled, they begin to set their *mind* on the things of this earth. This is progressive. The influences of the world are too powerful to ignore the mandate to be filled with the Spirit and stay filled. Is it not through the fullness of the Spirit that we have the mind of Christ?

So often Ron points out that we need to know who a letter (epistle) is addressed to. I have to believe that the letters are written (especially Romans and Galatians) to those who had received the Holy Spirit (by the hearing of faith) or also as Paul says, "having begun in the Spirit..." and were *expected* to be being filled with the Spirit. If you were NOT being filled with the Spirit- the letter would not make sense to you. You had not gone through the experience he was referring to and so it could never make any sense.

More evidence of the true nature of Sin and the flesh is found when the Lord rebuked Peter (Satan through Peter):

and he having turned, said to Peter, 'Get thee behind me, adversary! thou art a stumbling-block to me, for thou dost not mind the things of God, but the things of men.(Matthew 16:23

This is a tremendous revelation as to the 'mindset' of Satan and hence his children; for thou dost not mind the things of God. Is their minds void of thought? Is their minds empty now that God is not on their mind? Romans 1 and 2 comes to mind, where folk did not like to retain God in their minds. So when God is not on the mind, what is? Answer: but the things of men.

The Born Again person starts resisting the Holy Ghost and minding the things of men; feeding their lusts, until they believe they are captive to 'the flesh' and wonder what is wrong with them. The *problem* is that they are not staying FULL of the Holy Ghost. This is where I think the struggle for 'control' really is. If a person is serious about yielding up their will they will seek God to be continually 'filled' with the Spirit. If they want to run their own life- they will ignore this precept and haphazardly seek the Lord for fullness. The enemy comes along and then points the finger- "its the flesh!"... "its the flesh!" and the lie is believed. The truth is, they are resisting and quenching the Holy Spirit as He prompts them to pray and seek the Lord for fullness. Its all about fullness. ;-)

Re: - posted by Graftedbranch, on: 2006/2/3 23:58

Quote:
----- This notion of standing versus state, as you rightly recognize, was quite unknown to Wesley. It is a 'Brethren' tweak which is highly speculative. Penn Lewis' writings of course are almost entirely speculative.

To refer to this distinction as a "tweak" is quite an understatement. One might as well say, 'Justification by faith was Luther's "tweak" to the Roman Catholic system of sacramental salvation.

As to speculative, a better word is "exposition of the text".

To recognize the difference between standing and state is no small matter. And to see judicial justification as the basis for or dispositional sanctification is simply to follow the lines of revelation in the Word.

And one may say many things, but speculative cannot be a word used to describe any matter of the teaching of either Watchman Nee or Jessie Penn Lewis. In principle both refused to teach anything that they had not proven in experience. And this is what makes their ministries rich in Life and not merely speculative.

Graftedbranch

Re: Original Sin? Adam or Me? - posted by Quickend (), on: 2006/2/4 5:57

Quote:Winkie Pratney
(by way ofLazarus1719)

Sin is never natural. It is horribly unnatural. Sin is NEVER "human".

would anyone like the opportunity to show mercy on a lazy reader and condense this original thead into a digestable summary?

I thought it was commonly excepted among believers that men were born with a sinful nature.

Re: sinful nature, on: 2006/2/4 6:04

This article may help you

<https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/articles/index.php?view=article&aid=10416>

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/4 12:46

Quote:

-----I thought it was commonly excepted among believers that men were born with a sinful nature.

It has been, generally speaking, but there have been notable exceptions; Robert Barclay (speaking for George Fox), Charles Finney, (speaking for himself!) and those who align themselves with his teaching. Winkie Pratney, Paris Reidhead, and freedd.

'commonly accepted' of course, doesn't mean the majority is right that's why we are having this 'discussion' rather than having a 'vote'. :-D

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2006/2/4 12:52

Graftedbranch's

Quote:
-----To recognize the difference between standing and state is no small matter. And to see judicial justification as the basis for dispositional sanctification is simply to follow the lines of revelation in the Word.

Justification by faith having been rediscovered by Luther became the common treasure of the whole church. State and standing have remained the speciality of the Brethren and those associated with them in various ways.

Quote:
-----And one may say many things, but speculative cannot be a word used to describe any matter of the teaching of either Watchman Nee or Jessie Penn Lewis.

I am not questioning the spirituality of these two but the teaching of Mrs Penn Lewis, embraced as it was by T Austin Sparks consequently Watchman Nee of the inter-operation of soul and spirit is not derived from scripture but from their observation of 'cases'. This is a dangerous foundation for doctrine.

Re: - posted by Christinyou (), on: 2006/2/5 0:12

"I am not questioning the spirituality of these two but the teaching of Mrs Penn Lewis, embraced as it was by T Austin Sparks consequently Watchman Nee of the inter-operation of soul and spirit is not derived from scripture but from their observation of 'cases'. This is a dangerous foundation for doctrine."

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.

The Spirit of Christ is in those that are born again, they are born of Spirit.

Act 16:18 And this did she many days. But Paul, being grieved, turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the

name of Jesus Christ to come out of her. And he came out the same hour.

When the spirit came out of her spirit, the soul remained or she would be deaf mute with no mind, will or intellect. We must separate the Soul From the Spirit or The Spirit of Christ that is birthed in every believer would make each one of us exact copies of Jesus Christ, with His Mind Will and Intellect. We are told to renew our mind, which is the soul, mind, will and intellect. This is conformation that the soul and spirit are separate but operate as one. Do we separate the Body from the Spirit at death? Yes or the glorified body that God gives us would be no different. Paul separates the body, soul and spirit and deals with them as separate parts but making up the whole or the Spirit of Christ could not dwell in us with a corruptible soul and body. Hbr 4:12 For the word of God quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. Dividing asunder the soul mind from the spirit, which is Christ and the body. In dividing the Word is the discernor of thoughts and intents of the heart. The Spirit of Christ in you the Hope of Glory, The Holy Spirit Comforter Teacher of the soul mind, the didaskw paraklhtoV, the Teacher Comforter. The glorious body like His.

Who is the Discerner? Jesus Christ Himself, "The Word" John 1:1-4 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men.

Even Mary separated the two in their capacity to magnify and rejoice. Luke 1:46-47 And Mary said, My soul (psuche) magnified the Lord, And my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Intellect praising God.

Luke 1:47 And my spirit (pneuma) hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. Spirit of Christ in us is our rejoicing that Satan is out and Christ is in.

Even to quickening of The Body of Mary to contain the Spirit, Soul and Body of Christ. This is what happens when we are born again, The Body is quickened to contain the Spirit of Christ the Seed of the Father that the soul might learn and renew the mind and the Spirit is now contained in Flesh. Rom 8:11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He (Holy Spirit) that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by His Spirit (Christ) that dwelleth in you. This is a separate work by the Holy Spirit of quickening these mortal bodies to be able to contain the Spirit of Christ in Flesh. Then the Holy Spirit can complete the work He was sent to do. Jhn 14:26 But the Comforter, the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in My name, He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.

1Jo 2:27 But the anointing which ye have received of Him (Holy Spirit) abideth in you, and ye need not that any man teach you: but as the same anointing teacheth you of all things, and is truth, and is no lie, and even as it hath taught you, ye shall abide in Him. (Christ)

We are saved in Spirit, we are being saved in soul, and we will be saved in body. 2Cr 1:10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver; "delivered", saved, (in spirit) "doth deliver", is delivering (soul mind). "will yet deliver", will deliver us in body, which will be like His. The Spirit of Christ has saved us, New Birth in Spirit. The Holy Spirit is saving us in our Soul Mind. The Body will be changed in the twinkling of an eye to His Glorious Body and we will ever be with the Lord.

Derived from Scripture.

In Christ: Phillip

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/6 6:27

Quote:
-----Justification by faith having been rediscovered by Luther became the common treasure of the whole church. State and standing have remained the speciality of the Brethren and those associated with them in various ways.

While the brethren saw this distinction clearly, It has become quite a common way to understand the process of sanctification.

But more than this, It is scriptural. For instance, in 1 Corinthians Paul addresses them as "the Church of God which is in Corinth, to those who have been 'sanctified' in Christ Jesus, the called saints, with those who call upon the name of the Lord in every place, who is thiers and ours..."

Paul regarded them as the church, they were in Christ Jesus and had been (past tense) sanctified (set apart) in Christ Jesus.

This was their standing. They are the church, They are in Christ Jesus, they are called saints, and they have been sanctified in Christ Jesus.

Yet, as we read on they were anything but saintly. They were living and acting "as mere men". They were babes in Christ, they were carnal and even "fleshy". A very strong word. There was even fornication among them.

Yet, despite all this, they were the "called saints."

In position, they were in Christ, they were a genuine church, were regenerated with the Divine Life, and they had all the gifts of the Spirit, etc. But their condition was anything but reflective of this.

Judicial redemption is the base upon which God regenerates us. It is the base upon which God can regenerate fallen sinners and make them children of God. And it is also the base upon which God does all His work in us. We are regenerated on this basis, and we grow in Life on this same basis. God accounts us righteous, He has given us Christ to be our righteousness. He has put the Father's robe on us.

And based on Christ's redemption, the Spirit sanctifies us imparting Christ into us and God deals with us on this basis to conform us to the image of Christ.

Redemption is dispensational, regeneration is dispositional, Our standing is in Christ, our experience fluctuates. Our experience has to be brought up to the standard of our standing. This is a day by day process. And eventually all God's redeemed will be fully conformed to the image of the First Born Son of God. (Romans 8:29)

When the Children of Israel applied the Blood to their doorposts, they were intrinsically no more holy than those who did not, But God passed over them. The Blood was for God to see.

But they also ate the Lamb. This brought the Lamb inside of them. And this was their strength to leave Egypt. The Blood is the basis for their redemption, but the eating of the lamb was their strength to leave. Both aspects are seen here, both standing and condition. But eating the lamb was only the beginning, After leaving Egypt, they had to eat Christ as the Manna every day to become reconstituted with the "heavenly food" And we also must eat Christ every day to become reconstituted with Him.

Our standing as believers is in Christ. We are redeemed judicially and regenerated dispositionally. And we are sanctified dispositionally in Christ and by the Spirit's daily work within us we are being conformed to His Image. Our state is being brought up to match our standing. This is the Christian Life.

Graftedbranch

Re: - posted by Graftedbranc, on: 2006/2/7 12:25

Quote:
-----Justification by faith having been rediscovered by Luther became the common treasure of the whole church. State and standing have remained the speciality of the Brethren and those associated with them in various ways.

Justification by faith became the common treasure of the whole church because justification by faith is the base of the Church. Apart from justification by faith there is no church at all. And whatever organization of men which calls itself the church but denies justification by faith is not the church because there is only one foundation laid.

But the understanding of sanctification is built upon this one foundation. You may have the foundation but not have the understanding of state vs. standing.

If the whole church does not embrace a certain teaching or understanding, it is not because it is false, but because it just has not seen it.

But the scriptures are clear regarding the distinction between our standing in Christ as believers and our experience of Christ which is based on our standing. It is not obscure. It is clearly laid out in scripture not here or there in obscure passages, but it is the common thread and base of all the epistles.

John Wesley's view of a "second blessing" which eradicates sin from us and make us perfect and sinless has no basis in scripture. And in reading his defense of it he must resort to redefining sin to accommodate the obvious failures of those who report to be such "sinless saints".

There is indeed a genuine experience of Christ as our indwelling overcoming life and as we mature in Him this becomes the daily reality of our experience, but this must be maintained by constant fellowship with Christ in His Word and constant abiding in Him. Otherwise our sinful fallen flesh will reassert itself as all saints can testify to in experience.

Those who are most filled with Christ and are most spiritual are the ones who live close to the Lord and are constantly saying, "Lord forgive me, Lord cleanse me, Lord revive me, Lord gain me."

And one who believes he has become sinless is blind and has no consciousness of what sin genuinely is. He must excuse his self assertion, his self seeking, his self exalting, and all such "little sins". He may cease to drink, smoke and chew and run around with girls who do, but does he love the brethren with a selfless love. Does he never lose his temper? Does he always treat his wife with the Love of Christ? Does he receive correction from others? And if he does, what is he corrected from if he is sinless?

Is he always faithful in prayer? Does he never give in to laziness and fail to have his time with the Lord? Does he never fail to call on the Lord and pray about every matter? Does he always obey the leading and prompting of the Spirit within him?

Sinless perfection is the possession of only one Person and that is the Lord Jesus Christ. And only to the degree we are constituted with Him do we enjoy His sinless life.

A person who believes he has had some experience which eradicated sin from his flesh is deceived. As John says, "if we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, but if we confess our sins, God is just and faithful to forgive us our sins and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."

Was Peter not privy to this experience when he withdrew from eating with the gentiles in hypocrisy and Paul had to rebuke him to his face?

Was Paul not privy to this experience when he said harsh words to the High priest saying, "God shall smite thee thou white washed sepulchre", and had to repent?

A reading of both Wesley's and George Whitefield's journals reveals a John Wesley which was anything from sinlessly perfect. He was strongly opinionated. He ignored and set aside clear revelation in scripture. He broke promises. He was oft

en contradictory. He even made many critical decisions such as his theological view by casting lots. He had many faults and did many things which he ignored and refused to acknowledge. Why? Most likely to admit fault is to deny his sinless state which he imagined.

Until our bodies are redeemed at our Lord's coming, it will remain true that "he who sows to his flesh shall from the flesh reap corruption, but he who sows to the spirit shall from the Spirit reap life which is eternal."

Graftedbranch