

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin?****Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin? , on: 2009/10/27 2:45**

Some people believe that sin is a substance, not a choice. They believe that sin is a quality of matter, not a state of the will. I once asked a Calvinist "Is this body a sin?" They said, "Yes, our bodies are made of sin". I asked, "So you can put sin under a microscope and look at it?" He said, "sure".

Here are some points to consider in relation to the question "Is our flesh sinful" or "Is the body a sin?"

1. God is the author of our flesh (Exodus 4:11, Isaiah 44:2, Jer. 1:5).
2. Sinfulness is violation of God's law (1 Jn. 3:4). God's law tells us what type of choices we should and shouldn't make (Exo. 20:3-17), not what type of body or nature we should or shouldn't have.
3. Our flesh is just dirt (Gen. 2:7, Gen. 3:19).
4. Our flesh is the occasion of our sin, or the source of temptation (James 1:14), but sin itself is a choice (John 5:14, John 8:11, Rom. 6:12; Rom. 6:19 Eph. 4:26).
5. The body needs to be kept under subjection (1 Corinthians 9:27).
6. It is sinful to live after the flesh (Rom. 8:13), or to be living to gratify our flesh (Rom. 8:7).
7. But it is not sinful to have a flesh, because Jesus Christ had a flesh (Luke 24:39, John 1:14, 1 Tim. 3:16, 1 Jn. 4:3, 2 Jn. 1:7).
8. Jesus had the same type of flesh that we have (Heb. 2:14; Heb. 2:17).
9. Jesus made in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3) which means Jesus was made in the likeness of men (Philippians 2:7). The word "flesh" is sometimes used synonymous with men (Gen. 6:12, Matt. 16:17).
10. Jesus was morally perfect (2 Cor. 5:21) before He had a glorified or resurrected body.
11. The Gnostic's taught that the flesh was sinful in and of itself (1 Jn. 4:3, 2 Jn. 1:7).
12. Our flesh is an instrument or tool which we could use for sin or for righteousness (Rom. 6:13, Rom. 6:19).
13. Our flesh can be sanctified (Rom. 12:1, 1 Thes. 4:4, 1 Thes. 5:23, 1 Tim. 2:8).

GOOD QUOTES RELATED TO THIS TOPIC:**GOD IS THE CREATOR OF OUR FLESH OR NATURE WE ARE BORN WITH**

"If a man were created evil, he would not deserve punishment, since he was not evil of himself, being unable to do anything else than what he was made for." Justin Martyr (First Apology Chap. 43)

"Those who do not do it will receive the just judgment of God, because they had not work good when they had it in their power to do so. But if some had been made by nature bad, and others good, these latter would not be deserving of praise for being good, for they were created that way. Nor would the former be reprehensible, for that is how they were made. However, all men are of the same nature. They are all able to hold fast and to go what is good. On the other hand, they have the power to cast good from them and not to do it." Irenaeus (A Dictionary of Early Christian Beliefs by David Bercot, p. 287, published by Hendrickson Publishers)

"If man is in fault for his sinful nature, why not condemn man for having blue or black eyes? The fact is, sin never can consist in having a nature, nor in what nature is, but only and alone in the bad use which we make of our nature. This is

all. Our Maker will never find fault with us for what He has Himself done or made; certainly not. He will not condemn us, if we will only make a right use of our powers— of our intellect, our sensibilities, and our will. He never holds us responsible for our original nature... since there is no law against nature, nature cannot be a transgression... man's nature is not a proper subject for legislation, precept, and penalty, inasmuch as it lies entirely without the pale of voluntary action, or of any action of man at all." Charles Finney (Sermons on Gospel Themes, p. 78-79, published by Truth in Heart)

"To represent the constitution as sinful, is to present God, who is the author of the constitution, as the author of sin." Charles Finney (Finney's Systematic Theology, Bethany House, p. 261).

"... it is impious to say that sin is inherent in nature, because in this way the author of nature is being judged at fault." Unknown (The Letters of Pelagius and his Followers by B. R. Rees, p. 168, published by The Boydell Press).

"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." Winkie Pratney (Youth Aflame, Bethany House, pg. 78).

"The next dogma deserving attention is the position, that mankind derived from our first progenitor a corrupt nature, which renders obedience to the commands of God impossible, and disobedience necessary, and that for the mere existence of this nature, men 'deserve God's wrath and curse, not only in this world, but in that which is to come.' If the above dogma is true, it is demonstrably evident, that this corrupt nature comes into existence without knowledge, choice, or agency of the creature, who for its existence is pronounced deserving of, and 'bound over to the wrath of God.' Equally evident is it, that this corrupt nature exists as the result of the direct agency of God. He proclaims himself the maker of 'every soul of man.' As its Maker, He must have imparted to that soul the constitution or nature which it actually possesses. It does not help the matter at all, to say, that this nature is derived from our progenitor: for the laws of generation, by which this corrupt nature is derived from that progenitor, are sustained and continued by God himself... If, then, the above dogma is true, man in the first place, is held as deserving of eternal punishment for that which exists wholly independent of his knowledge, choice or agency, in any sense, direct or indirect, He is also held responsible for the result, not of his own agency, but for that which results from the agency of God." Asa Mahan (Doctrine of the Will, published by Truth in Heart, p. 115).

"Sin is never natural. It is horribly un-natural. Sin is never 'human'. It is horribly in-human. Sin creates remorse, guilt, and shame; every time a man feels these three witnesses in his soul, they tell him sin is not natural. Even the simple lie-detector can tell us this. The whole body reacts adversely when a man sins... God never planned sin for man. It is the most un-natural thing in the moral Universe... Do not dare say sin is 'natural'! God hates sin with perfect hatred; He loves humanity." Winkie Pratney (Youth Aflame, Bethany House, pg. 78).

THE DESIRES AND APPETITES OF OUR FLESH: GOOD OR EVIL? SIN OR TEMPTATION?

"Now temptation is not sin. Temptation is the proposition presented to the mind that you can satisfy a good appetite in a forbidden way. Temptation leads to sin... Sin is the decision of the will... sin is the decision to gratify a good appetite in a bad way." Paris Reidhead (Finding the Reality of God, pg 141-142)

"Don't mistake temptation for sin. Temptation is a suggestion to gratify a desire in an illegal way or amount. Temptation is not sin. Jesus was tempted." Winkie Pratney (Youth Aflame, Bethany House, pg. 83).

"God created us to exist in a constant state of desire and appetite... The infant cannot think of terms of duty, responsibility, or moral choice... The self-centeredness of infants has all the appearances of a vice. But they are acting on natural, God-given impulses to survive and seek their own pleasure... They do not have the intellectual and moral capacity to say 'No' to appetites and impulses. They cannot yet be held responsible. They begin life in innocent self-centeredness... But the growing child or adult who doesn't rise above self-indulging desires has fallen from God's intention and design. The root of all sin is founded in runaway indulgence of God-given desires... Drives which are not in themselves evil, nonetheless, form the seedbed on which sin will assuredly grow... When does this innocent, natural selfishness of a child become sin? In other words, when is a child to blame? Keep in mind that a child will not come under condemnation until his moral faculties are fully operative... When a child goes against his conscience, however limited and incomplete his understanding may be, he is then guilty. The degree to which his understanding has developed is the degree to which his actions can be called sin... As the body of flesh was the medium of Eve's sin and of Christ's temptation, so it is the implement of your child's development into selfishness—which, at maturity, will constitute sinfulness." Michael & Debi Pearl (To Train Up A Child, No Greater Joy, pg. 15-20)

“The bodily appetites and tendencies of body and mind, when strongly excited, become the occasions of sin. So it was with Adam. No one will say that Adam had a sinful nature. But he had, by his constitution, an appetite for food and a desire for knowledge. These were not sinful but were as God made them. They were necessary to fit him to live in this world as a subject of God’s moral government. But being strongly excited led to indulgence, and thus became the occasions of his sinning against God. These tendencies were innocent in themselves, but he yielded to them in a sinful manner, and that was his sin.” Charles Finney (You Can Be Holy, published by Whitaker House, p. 215).

"We have a nature that is capable of being perverted from legitimate to illegitimate, from the natural to the unnatural, from the pure to the polluted." Sin is to "pervert... natural, legitimate, human desires." F. Lagard Smith (Troubling Questions for Calvinists, page 134-135).

"Evil is making a bad use of a good thing." Augustine (Confessions and Enchiridion, trans. and ed. by Albert C. Outler, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, N. D., page 326-338, section 36).

“If these feelings are not suffered to influence the will... if such feelings are not cherished, and are not suffered to shake the integrity of the will; they are not sin. That is, the will does not consent to them, but the contrary. They are only temptations. If they are allowed to control the will, to break forth in words and actions, then there is sin; but the sin does not consist in the, but in the consent of the will, to gratify them.” Charles Finney (Systematic Theology pg. 191).

Re: Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin? - posted by murrcoir (), on: 2009/10/27 6:19

In order to understand the issues that arise from Charles Finney’s teachings, it is helpful to outline the basic ideas of Pelagius. The following are the key teachings of Pelagianism:

An insistence of the adequacy of created human nature, essentially unimpaired by Adam’s fall, to fulfill the will of God; the denial of original sin as either guilt or corruption transmitted from Adam to all mankind; the highest moral and spiritual expectations of the baptized Christian who must be capable of a life of perfect holiness, because God commands him thereto; and an understanding of the gifts of grace that excludes, or at best drastically minimizes, that enabling power without whose inner working we can do nothing acceptable to God.

Finney on Original Sin

An important issue in the Pelagian controversy that resurfaces in Finney is the manner in which Adam’s sin influences the Adamic race. Finney’s Calvinistic background, that apparently had little influence on his theology, held that Adam sinned on behalf of the human race, that original sin included a "sin nature," and that all are "by nature children of wrath" (Ephesians 2:3) Finney rejected that notion and taught that depravity is moral and not physical. He meant by this that the will, though strongly influenced by "sensibilities" and temptations, commits itself to selfish gratification. Since there is no physical depravity and "moral depravity can only be predicated of violations of moral law," sinfulness is an act of each individual’s will and not a "sin nature" that can be predicated of the whole Adamic race. Thus Adamic guilt and corruption of nature, the historical doctrine of original sin, is denied by Finney as it was by Pelagius.

Studying Finney’s Systematic Theology shows that this is not a caricature of his position. For example:

Moral depravity, as I use the term, does not consist in, nor imply a sinful nature, in the sense that the substance of the human soul is sinful in itself. It is not a constitutional sinfulness. It is not an involuntary sinfulness. Moral depravity, as I use the term, consists in selfishness; in a state of voluntary committal of the will to self-gratification.

The reason this is significant in relationship to Finney’s millennial teaching, is that it implies that if enough influence is exerted on the minds and hearts of humans, they could be persuaded to commit to a different principle. This principle, according to Finney, was to be "disinterested benevolence."

The Holy Spirit is necessary to convince the mind of the need to repent of selfishness and turn to the principle of divine love, but the human will is innately capable of choosing to obey God’s moral law. This would make a millennial kingdom without a bodily resurrection of the saints and the return of Christ seem feasible.

If the sin nature is non-existent and the human will capable of being persuaded, what stands in the way of reforming society? Finney’s answer was merely the lack of Christians getting on board his process of "new measures" revivalism.

Re: Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin? - posted by Leo_Grace, on: 2009/10/27 10:29

More false teaching from his holiness, truefaithsav, who is a disciple of Finney, not of Christ. He hopes to draw others with him down the slippery slope. Beware.

Re: Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin? , on: 2009/10/27 11:52

Quote:

----- Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin?

The body is made in the image of God, and in itself it is not 'a sin'.

But, flesh (that of which the body is made), which was originally at peace with God (the Eternal Spirit) and at peace with the human spirit through which it receives a quality of life other than that supported by physical food, is now struggling with 'the sin' Rom 5 and 6, Young's Literal Translation), which entered the world through Adam, through whom death passed to all men.

Unless that 'sin' - the sinful nature - is reckoned by us to be dead through the death of Christ on the cross, we will continue to find the flesh more sinful than we can control by willpower or good intentions, and even then, it can be brought into discipline only as we accept the help of the Holy Spirit, (Rom 8:13, 12, 11), to put to death (or starve, strangle, or stamp out) the evidences of that sin in our thought life and behaviour.

This is why 1 John 1:7 is so precious, imho... that we don't have to keep looking at 'the sin' and its possible out-working, and trying to control it; we are advised by the apostle John, and by the apostle Paul (2 Cor 3:18) to look steadily at Christ, and HE will change us, miraculously, and, will keep us in fellowship with Himself through the continuous cleansing of our souls by His blood.

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 12:10

This smacks of gnosticism.

Wolves come in among the sheep here from time to time. Sometimes subtle, sometimes very obvious...

Krispy

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/10/27 12:17

No serious, learned believer asserts that simply to have human flesh is a sin. The Bible teaches that it is our will that is in bondage to sinful desires unless we are given a new heart by God (Ezekiel 36). Your position requires no new heart given by God. Actually, God states that it is He who will **cause** us to walk in His statutes. Could you give us an account of why a new heart is needed, and why God causes us to walk in His ways?

Also, I still would like to see a serious exegetical discussion on Paul's phrase in Ephesians 2:3...

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

among whom also we all did walk once in the desires of our flesh, doing the wishes of the flesh and of the thoughts, and were by nature children of wrath -- as also the others, (YLT)

among whom we also all once lived in the lust of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and were by nature children of wrath, even as the rest:-- (ASV)

I see this passage as stating that we are inclined to sin, we are children of wrath by nature, and must be changed by God to be otherwise.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/27 12:17

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

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

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

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

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/27 12:21

Quote:

Your position requires no new heart given by God

This is the crux of Jesse's moral government theology. No new heart required, because man is not seen as having a wicked and corrupt nature to begin with. His doctrine destroys the notion of the necessity of the new birth.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/27 12:24

Quote:

Also, I still would like to see a serious exegetical discussion on Paul's phrase in Ephesians 2:3...

You'll never get serious exegetical discussion for Jesse. He doesn't exegete passages of Scripture, he simply cherry picks and proof texts. All of these years he's been reading his Bible, and he probably couldn't even tell you the basics of what Ephesians is about.

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/10/27 12:25

Quote:

Alive-to-God wrote:

But, flesh (that of which the body is made), which was originally at peace with God (the Eternal Spirit) and at peace with the human spirit through which it receives a quality of life other than that supported by physical food, is now struggling with 'the sin' (Rom 5 and 6, Young's Literal Translation), which entered the world through Adam, through whom death passed to all men.

The flesh was created week from the beginning, in the Garden. It was never meant to be used as strength for resisting sin. It is one of the very reasons that Adam fell; lust of the flesh...

Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God (1Corinth 15:50)
Do you imply that Flesh and blood could have inherited the kingdom of God?

Quote:

-----Unless that 'sin' - the sinful nature - is reckoned by us to be dead through the death of Christ on the cross, we will continue to find the flesh more sinful than we can control by willpower or good intentions...

The term "sinful flesh" is not "flesh which is able to sin", not that flesh is sinful in & of its self, that is a Gnostic belief.

lief.

The flesh is a tool, if you will. What matters is how we choose to use our flesh & what we choose to put our affections (desires) on.

The flesh will give pleasure because of the senses. The flesh is amoral; it takes pleasure in whatever & however, good or bad, morally or immorally for it has no mind to discern. This is unchangeable, it will remain the same even after we are saved; the flesh needs to be done away with. That will happen in the resurrection.

The flesh is not our so called "sin nature".

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 15:06

1. Gnosticism teaches that sin is a substance of the flesh, instead of a free will choice as all of the Early Church taught. Sin is violation of God's law and God's law only tells us what type of choices to make, not what type of body or nature to have.
2. Men are sinners, not because of the type of body that they inherit at birth (Gnosticism) but because of their own free will choices. A sinner's problem is not his body, though it is fallen, but his problem is his own heart, because it is wicked. The will of a sinner is at odds with the law of God. Men absolutely must be born again, not because they passively and involuntarily inherited some sinful substance, but because they have actively and deliberately chosen to break God's law.
3. That is why at regeneration we do not get a new body, we get a new heart. Jesus taught that sin comes out of the heart (Mark 7:21-23). Therefore if you are going to live a holy life, you need to get a new heart, not a new body.
4. Ephesians 2:3 in context is talking about those who choose to live for their flesh. The natural man is someone who doesn't live for God, but lives for the gratification of their flesh. When it says that they are, by nature children of wrath, it means that they are children of wrath because they choose to live for the gratification of their flesh (selfishness). They are under the wrath of God because they are living a natural life, a life seeking after the gratification of lust.
5. True conversion is when a person's heart changes. When their selfish heart is removed and a loving heart takes its place, a heart that loves God supremely and loves his neighbor equally. Even though a Christian still has a fallen or physically depraved body, which is subjected to disease and death, if he has a loving heart he is morally perfect because love is the fulfillment of the law.
6. If men are sinners because they passively and involuntarily inherit some sinful substance, they are victims and not criminals. As victims, they would DESERVE God's pity. But if men are sinners because of the choices they make, choices which violate God's law, then they are criminals who DESERVE punishment.
7. If men are sinners because they inherit a sinful body, then sinfulness is not their fault. If sinfulness is not their fault, they do not deserve punishment and therefore do not need Jesus Christ. The logical conclusion of having a "sinful body" is that you really don't need Jesus Christ. But if sin is their own free will choice, then sin is their own fault. If sin is their own fault, they deserve punishment. And if they deserve punishment, they need Jesus Christ. Therefore only if sin is their own free will choice do they need Jesus Christ.
8. If we inherit a sinful flesh, or a sinful body, then sin is not our fault but is God's fault. It would be God's fault because God is the one who actively and personally forms us in the womb. Therefore if we inherit a sinful flesh, or a sinful body, then God is the author of sin.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/10/27 15:46

Quote:

truefaithsav wrote:

4. Ephesians 2:3 in context is talking about those who choose to live for their flesh. The natural man is someone who doesn't live for God, but lives for the gratification of their flesh. When it says that they are, by nature children of wrath, it means that they are children of wrath because they choose to live for the gratification of their flesh (selfishness). They are under the wrath of God because they are living a natural life, a life seeking after the gratification of lust.

You're not grappling with the language of the text. Consider Paul's use of the same Greek word for "nature" as it occurs in Galatians:

"We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,"

In the same way that Jews are Jews "by nature" (it is part of their being from their birth), mankind is inclined towards wrath "by nature".

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 15:49

In the verse you quoted in Galatians, Paul was saying that they were Jews by custom or manner of life, and not sinners like the Gentiles. Nature meant custom or manner of life. Otherwise, if it meant birth, Paul was saying that Gentiles are born sinners but Jews are not!

"We who are Jews by nature (by custom or manner of life), and not sinners of the Gentiles (who are sinners by their custom or manner of life),"

It does not mean:

"We who are Jews by nature (by birth), and not sinners of the Gentiles (who are sinners by birth)," Paul was not saying that Gentiles were born sinners but Jews were not.

It doesn't make any sense, in your theology, for Paul to be saying, "We are born Jews, we are not born sinners like the Gentiles".

Ephesians 2:3 is using the word nature to describe a person's self chosen way of life, their manner of living. And Galatians 2:15 used the word nature to describe a person's way of life or their manner of living.

To be a "natural man", which Ephesians 2:3 is referring to, is the same as the carnal man. To be carnally minded is to mind the things of the flesh (Rom. 8:5). In the Greek this means to be fleshly purposed. A natural man, or a carnal man, is someone who lives for the gratification of their flesh. So to say that men are by nature under the wrath of God is to say that men are under God's wrath because they are living for their flesh.

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/10/27 16:11

Ver. 15. We who are Jews by nature,... I Paul, and you Peter and Barnabas, and the rest of the Jews at Antioch. Some are Jews by grace, in a spiritual sense, as all are that are Christ's, that are true believers in him, that are born again, and have internal principles of grace formed in their souls, of whatsoever nation they be; see Ro 2:28. Others become Jews by being proselytes to the Jewish religion: such were the Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven, that were dwelling at Jerusalem, when the Spirit was poured down on the apostles on the day of Pentecost, Ac 2:5, but these here spoken of were such as were Jews by birth; they were born so, were descended of Jewish parents, and from their infancy were brought up in the Jewish religion, and under the law of Moses, and in the observance of it:

and not sinners of the Gentiles: Mleih twmwa yevr, "the wicked of the nations of the world", as the {} Jews call them. Not but that the Jews also were sinners both by nature and practice, were involved in the guilt of sin, under the power of it, and defiled with it, as the apostle elsewhere most fully proves: nor is this said with regard to the vain opinion the Jews had of themselves, as very holy and righteous persons, who in their own apprehension needed neither repentance nor remission; and who looked upon the Gentiles as very unholy and unfit for conversation with them: but this more particularly respects that part of the character of the Heathens, that they were without the law, and were under no restraints, but lived in all manner of wickedness, without hope and God in the world, and so were notorious sinners, filled with all unrighteousness, profligate and abandoned to every evil work, and are therefore called emphatically "sinful men", Lu 24:7.

-- John Gill

You're doing serious violence to the text to twist it to read "we are under the wrath of God because we live as natural men" (which is true, just not what this particular text says). The text reads "we are by nature children of wrath". The clear re

ading of the text both in English and in Greek is that being a child of wrath is something tied so close to us that it is part of our very nature. Our hearts are "by nature" corrupt. We "by nature" flee from God and pursue wickedness. This can only be remedied by a supernatural intervention from God Himself (Ezek. 36).

Secondly, are people given a new heart before or after they come to Christ? If before, I assume you believe regeneration occurs prior to faith. If after, why do they even need a new heart if they could see Christ as more precious than the world and desire to obey Him rather than rebel against Him?

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2009/10/27 16:42

Brethren,

I believe the major difference is that Logic and truefaithsav believe that people can live sin free by just looking to Jesus as an example. They actually believe that it is possible to live sin free, because sin is only a choice, because Jesus did.

They only see Jesus as an example, instead of a necessity of his life being in them, to cause them to be saved and live holy.

Blessings to all!

Re: - posted by TrueWitness, on: 2009/10/27 16:56

I found this book review on Amazon.com and thought it was enlightening as to how some people not only have heretical views but actually glory in them. From Amazon.com:

Pelagius is my hero, July 28, 2008 By Jesse Morrell "Jesse Morrell" (USA) - See all my reviews (REAL NAME) I am just about finished with "Pelagius: Life & Letters". I personally did not care too much for the biography section of the book - the "life" section. But I really enjoy the actual writings of Pelagius. Pelagius is my hero. He represented Apostolic Christianity in a time when Gnosticism was taking over. I did wish that his letters were more theological. Pelagius was really a practical holiness teacher. But his theology of free will and human nature was touched upon in his letters. I really wish that his books on "Free Will" and "Nature" were not lost in history. This book was great. I also recommend "Presentation of Augustinianism and Pelagianism from Original Sources" by Dr. Wiggers, translated by Ralph Emerson. That covers the theology of Pelagianism very thoroughly.

Even if truefaithsav is not Jesse Morrell, you can read up on why Jesse is a heretic here:
<http://graceinthetriad.blogspot.com/2009/08/heretical-theology-of-jesse-morrell.html>

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/27 18:29

Quote:

4. Ephesians 2:3 in context is talking about those who choose to live for their flesh. The natural man is someone who doesn't live for God, but lives for the gratification of their flesh. When it says that they are, by nature children of wrath, it means that they are children of wrath because they choose to live for the gratification of their flesh (selfishness). They are under the wrath of God because they are living a natural life, a life seeking after the gratification of lust.

Jesse, this sounds like how you interpret every verse in the Bible. You clearly do not know how to do even the most basic inductive study of Scripture. If you don't mind, I'll show you how to do some basic "exegesis."

Reading Ephesians 2:3 in its immediate context. This is a very basic, very broad, and very quick interpretation of Ephesians 2:3, as placed in its immediate context within this Pauline epistle.

===

Ephesians is an epistle of the apostle Paul to the church in Ephesus. After a general introduction and salutations, Paul i

Immediately begins the task of combating some false ideas that had begun to make inroads into this church. To do this, he shows the overarching predetermined plan of God for all of history, and how that relates to Christ and how that relates to the Church. He shows how all things are ultimately summed up in Christ, and how we as believers fall into that ultimate summation in God's redemptive plan for history-- which has as its chief end the resurrection of the dead. Paul says that the downpayment and proof of this future plan that we can count on God bringing to pass is demonstrated by the gift of the Holy Spirit, who serves as a foretaste of the fullness that will eventually come.

Paul goes on to thank God for the church at Ephesus, and prays that their eyes might be enlightened so that they can have a personal revelation and insight into these precious truths. For if they do, it will revolutionize their lives. He then goes on to assert the greatness of Christ, and shows how Christ is above every order of every created thing, things in heaven and earth.

In chapter 2 Paul continues on this theme of the greatness of Christ, and shows how Christ rescued us while we were dead in our sins and the worldly and demonic forces and influences we were subjected to. Prior to this supernatural and divine rescue by the risen and exalted Lord, who is greater than all these forces, we walked as the rest of the children of wrath, who we were part of by nature. For apart from being rescued by the supreme and exalted Lord who sits above the forces that rule over and enslave mankind (the prince and the power of the air) to their wicked nature, we would still be in that state.

"But God" made a difference in this, and shined on us His great love and mercy, rescuing us not only from these cosmic forces, but also rescuing us while we were dead and in our sin. And when He rescued us and saved us from all this, He lifted us up out of the mire and clay, and has caused us to sit with Christ in heavenly places in order to demonstrate the riches of God in us in the ages to come. He did this apart from anything we did, He did it by grace working through faith. With that, all credit belongs to Him, and we have become His divine workmanship, so we could walk in the good works God has prepared for us.

====

That, Jesse, is a simple and sweeping exegesis of Ephesians 1 through 2:10. That is reading Ephesians 2:3 in "context."

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/10/27 18:51

The only reason that Pelagius is a heretic today is because Emperor Honorius was a target of his exhortations against the abuses of wealth and power.

Pelagius chastised the wealthy and powerful, including Emperor Honorius, for their abuses of property and privilege, exhorting them to the Christian virtues of mercy and charity.

Therefore Emperor Honorius willingly came to the assistance of the Augustinians.

In 415 Augustine sent Orosius to Jerome in Palestine with the mission of convicting Pelagius of heresy.

In June 415, a Synod was convened in Jerusalem with Orosius accusing Pelagius of heresy. Pelagius was present to defend himself and was acquitted.

A second council was called in December at Diospolis (Lydda) with two previously deposed Gallic Bishops bringing charges against Pelagius.

Again, he was present to defend himself and, again, he was acquitted.

In a dissatisfied reaction the Augustinians convened two of their own councils in 416 -- at Carthage and Milevum where they condemned both Pelagius and Celestius. Pelagius was not present to defend himself.

The Augustinians also appealed to Pope Innocent I who claimed universal authority for the Bishop of Rome by declaring that nothing done in the provinces could be regarded as finished until it had come to his knowledge. Innocent I, often referred to as "the first Pope", declared that the Pope's decisions affected "all the churches of the world" and reflects his attempt to exert control over the East as well as the West. The Augustinians successfully persuaded him to issue a conditional condemnation of Pelagius and Celestius on January 27, 417 which would be effective only if they did not

return to orthodoxy. However, Innocent I died on March 12 and was replaced by Pope Zosimus I on March 18.

Zosimus was an Eastern Christian who decided to re-examine the case, calling for a Synod at the Basilica of St. Clement in Rome. Pelagius was unable to attend but sent a Confession of Faith which was intended for Innocent I (Pelagius being unaware of the previous Pope's death). Zosimus was favorably impressed with Pelagius' defense and proclaimed that Pelagius was totally orthodox and catholic and that he was a man of unconditional faith. Zosimus went on to say that Pelagius had for many years been outstanding in good works and in service to God; he was theologically sound and never left the catholic faith.

Augustinians had been thoroughly defeated. They had been unable to successfully condemn Pelagius whenever he was present or when allowed to present his defense in writing. Three councils had declared him innocent of heresy. All they had to show for their efforts were Pelagius's condemnation by their own courts and their own chastisement by the Bishop of Rome. Undaunted and disobedient, they appealed to the Roman Emperor Honorius; the one who was being chastised by Pelagius for his abuses of wealth and power.

On April 30, 418 Emperor Honorius invoked the power of the state and issued an Imperial Rescript -- a civil document -- ordering action against Pelagius on the charge that public meetings and credulous adolescents affect the peace of Rome.

An ecclesiastical document written by Pope Zosimus followed. It condemned Pelagius as a heretic and banned him from Rome. The exact reasons why Zosimus reversed his position after the Imperial Rescript are unknown but it was done only after pressure from the Emperor. The text of Zosimus' condemnation is lost and the formal grounds for the condemnation are purely a matter of speculation.

Immediately upon Zosimus' death in 418 two different Bishops were consecrated Pope - Eulalius and Boniface I. Eulalius, like Zosimus, was a Greek. At the Synod of Gangra (Armenia) in 381, Eulalius was among the Bishops who passed Synodical canons in support of the equality of marriage and celibacy and condemned those who denied the legitimacy of the married priesthood.

Both positions were in opposition to the views of the Augustinians. In 419 Eulalius was replaced with the pro-Augustinian Boniface only through the intervention of the Emperor.

It is only a matter of time that when Pelagius dies and not able to defend himself that he would remain accused as a heretic.

The Church as been polluted with Augustine's Neo-platonic (Neoplatonism) Gnosticism/Manichean theology.

You all should listen to (<http://www.sermonindex.net/modules/mydownloads/visit.php?lid1973>) The Hidden Things of God - Part 1 by Paris Reidhead

It explains how the church got into Neo-Platonic Gnostic/Manichean theology through Augustine.

(Information is from Rev. Thomas J. Faulkenbury)

Evans, R. F.; Four Letters of Pelagius, London, 1968

Evans, R. F.; Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals, London, 1968

Ferguson, J.; Pelagius: A Historical and Theological Study, Cambridge, 1956

Nicholson, M. Forthomme; "Celtic Theology: Pelagius", An Introduction to Celtic Christianity, edited by James P. Mackey, Edinburgh, 1995

Rees, B. R.; Pelagius: A Reluctant Heretic, Suffolk, 1988

Re: - posted by TaylorOtwell (), on: 2009/10/27 19:38

Logic,

I think the pertinent point in this thread is not whether Pelagius was correctly or incorrectly labeled a heretic, but rather the meaning of Paul's teaching in Ephesians 2:3.

Re: - posted by murrcolr (), on: 2009/10/27 19:49

truefaithsav

David wrote in Psalm 51:5, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, And in sin my mother conceived me." (NASB). The NIV's translation is even clearer. "Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me."

In Psalm 58:3 David wrote, "Even from birth the wicked go astray; from the womb they are wayward and speak lies."

Then note Paul's statement in Eph. 2:1-3, "As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins, in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient. All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath." (NIV)

Note two important points here: First, speaking about his readers' former life (a statement which applies to all of us before salvation) he states they were dead in their transgressions and sins and as a result they followed the ways of the world. Following the sinful ways of the world and the typical lusts patterns of men is the product of spiritual death; the issue of root to fruit. Men sin because they are sinners.

Second, he shows this sinful condition and a further consequence, being under the wrath of God, is "by nature," a condition received by nature, i.e., inherited from our parents, just as David pointed out in Ps. 51:5.

This is further supported by Paul's statements in Romans 5. Though this passage is dealing with the imputation of Adam's sin as the federal head of the human race, it also shows us man is sinful because of his relation to Adam.

12 Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—13 for until the Law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come.

15 But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many. 16 And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification. 17 For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ. 18 So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men.

The point is, after Adam sinned, he and his descendants could only beget sinners, so all men are under the sentence of death, the penalty of sin (see Heb. 7:9-10 for the principle of imputation).

In essence then, all men are behind the eight ball or constituted sinners for three reasons:

Inherited Sin: They are sinners by nature; possessing an inherited sinful nature Ps. 51:5; 58:3 and see also Gen. 5:3

Imputed Sin: They are sinners by imputation Adam's sin is imputed to man's account Rom. 5:12 just as Christ's righteousness is imputed to us when we believe in Christ.

Individual Sin: They are personal sinners; all men sin as individuals since they possess a sinful nature. Even in a godly environment children naturally are selfish and tend to tell lies, etc. Rom. 3:23

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Is The Flesh Sinful? Is The Body A Sin?

Re: - posted by Logic, on: 2009/10/27 22:31

Quote:

TaylorOtwell wrote:
Logic,

I think the pertinent point in this thread is not whether Pelagius was correctly or incorrectly labeled a heretic, but rather the meaning of Paul's teaching in Ephesians 2:3.

I know, but TrueWitness was trying to find some "dirt" on truefaithsav.

When ever anyone can't refute the doctrine of someone, they always revert to mudslinging.

All I was doing is defending truefaithsav by proving that he was no heretic.

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 22:49

To murrcolr:

The tragedy is that truthfaithsave will not even answer what have posted, verse by verse. He will continue to repost what he always does. The result, his position on this issue does not have the support of the full counsel of God (i.e.-- the entire Bible, with all of it's many references to this same issue).

I would like to post your post again, and see where it goes:

Quote:

murrcolr wrote:

truefaithsav

David wrote in Psalm 51:5, "Behold, I was brought forth in iniquity, And in sin my mother conceived me." (NASB). The NIV's translation is even clearer. "Surely I was sinful at birth, sinful from the time my mother conceived me."

In Psalm 58:3 David wrote, "Even from birth the wicked go astray; from the womb they are wayward and speak lies."

Then note Paul's statement in Eph. 2:1-3, "As for you, you were dead in your transgressions and sins, in which you used to live when you followed the ways of this world and of the ruler of the kingdom of the air, the spirit who is now at work in those who are disobedient. All of us also lived among them at one time, gratifying the cravings of our sinful nature and following its desires and thoughts. Like the rest, we were by nature objects of wrath." (NIV)

Note two important points here: First, speaking about his readers' former life (a statement which applies to all of us before salvation) he states they were dead in their transgressions and sins and as a result they followed the ways of the world. Following the sinful ways of the world and the typical lusts patterns of men is the product of spiritual death; the issue of root to fruit. Men sin because they are sinners.

Second, he shows this sinful condition and a further consequence, being under the wrath of God, is "by nature," a condition received by nature, i.e., inherited from our parents, just as David pointed out in Ps. 51:5.

This is further supported by Paul's statements in Romans 5. Though this passage is dealing with the imputation of Adam's sin as the federal head of the human race, it also shows us man is sinful because of his relation to Adam.

12 Therefore, just as through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned—13 for until the Law sin was in the world; but sin is not imputed when there is no law. 14 Nevertheless death reigned from Adam until Moses, even over those who had not sinned in the likeness of the offense of Adam, who is a type of Him who was to come.

15 But the free gift is not like the transgression. For if by the transgression of the one the many died, much more did the grace of God and the gift by the grace of the one Man, Jesus Christ, abound to the many. 16 And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned; for on the one hand the judgment arose from one transgression resulting in condemnation, but on the other hand the free gift arose from many transgressions resulting in justification. 17 For if by the transgression of the one, death reigned through the one, much more those who receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness will reign in life through the One, Jesus Christ. 18 So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all

men.

The point is, after Adam sinned, he and his descendants could only beget sinners, so all men are under the sentence of death, the penalty of sin (see Heb. 7:9-10 for the principle of imputation).

In essence then, all men are behind the eight ball or constituted sinners for three reasons:

Inherited Sin: They are sinners by nature; possessing an inherited sinful nature Ps. 51:5; 58:3 and see also Gen. 5:3

Imputed Sin: They are sinners by imputation Adam's sin is imputed to man's account Rom. 5:12 just as Christ's righteousness is imputed to us when we believe in Christ.

Individual Sin: They are personal sinners; all men sin as individuals since they possess a sinful nature. Even in a godly environment children naturally are selfish and tend to tell lies, etc. Rom. 3:23

Best regards,

Walter

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 23:44

I can explain the proof texts you guys use for the notion of being "born sinful", but can you guys answer the explicit passages I have given which teach that our flesh is not sinful? I don't think so.

Here is my explanation of the common proof texts for the idea that you are born a sinner:

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

A. This scripture is talking about David and his mother. It is not referencing all of humanity. It says nothing about Adam.

B. The event spoke of is the conception of David, not the birth of David. He is not saying that he was born a sinner, he is saying that his mother was in sin when she conceived him. The conception is the beginning of the pregnancy, the birth is the end of the pregnancy. This passage is talking about the beginning of the pregnancy, the conception.

C. A strong case can be made that Ps. 51:5 is talking about the defilement of David's mother, because of a previous marriage to another man – a heathen.

(1.) David had two half-sisters named Zeruah and Abigail (1 Chron. 2:13-16).

(2.) The father of David's half sisters was not Jesse but Nahash (2 Sam. 17:25).

(3.) Nahash was an Ammonite king (1 Sam. 11:1; 1 Sam. 12:12).

(4.) David's father was Jesse, not Nahash. But the Father of David's half sisters were daughters of Nahash. This could explain why Nahash showed kindness towards David (2 Sam. 10:2).

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

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

(7.) This may explain why David was not called before Samuel the prophet amongst the other sons (1 Sam. 16:11).

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

D. The context of David's prayer of repentance is not consistent with David making an excuse for his adultery, "I was

born this way". In true repentance, an individual takes full responsible for their sin, offering no excuses for justification. David was not blaming his sin on his birth. David was simply stating that even the circumstances of his birth were surrounded by sexual sin.

E. David said that he was "wonderfully" and "marvelously" made by God in the womb (Ps. 139:13-14). Therefore, he could not have been sinfully made by his mother in the womb. It is not wonderful to be born sinful or marvelous to be created evil.

II. "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." Ps. 58:3:

A. This is a poetic book which verses can be taken figuratively or literally.

B. The context of this passage requires a figurative interpretation.

(1.) The entire chapter is figurative; the surrounding verses are all poetic. It talks of men being like serpents and deaf adders (vs. 4), of God breaking the teeth of the young lions (vs. 6), men melting away like running water (vs.7), God bending his bow to shoot arrows (vs. 7), men passing away as a snail which melts (vs. 8), and God destroying like a whirlwind (vs. 9).

(2.) It says that children speak lies from the womb.

(3.) Infants do not know how to speak as soon as they are born.

(4.) Therefore, this passage is poetic not realistic; it is figurative not literal.

C. The obvious meaning of this passage is that individuals choose to sin at a very early age, from the dawn of their moral agency, and the first sin which children usually commit is lying.

III. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jeremiah 13:23

A. This passage is talking about Israel during a certain period of time in their history. This passage is not talking about all sinners of all time. To apply this passage to all sinners of all time is to ignore the proper rules of hermeneutic interpretation, particularly context.

B. This passage is not talking about the way Israel was born. This passage is talking about the way Israel had become through their self-chosen habitual manner of life. The unchanging state of these people was a moral condition by choice, not a constitutional condition by birth.

C. Israel had resisted God for a long time. These men disobeyed God continually, after God had been reaching out to them time and time again. But despite all of the efforts of God, they were still wicked and evil. In fact, they were worse than when they started, because they had to continually harden their hearts as God was reaching out to them. They were well accustomed in doing evil.

D. They were so accustomed to do evil that their reformation would be comparable to a leopard changing his spots or an Ethiopian changing his skin. Through their habitual choice of disobedience, they made themselves reprobates. They resisted the influence of God to the point of no return. It was as likely to see an Ethiopian changing his skin, or a leopard changing his spots, as it would be to see these hardened reprobates changing their moral ways.

E. This passage was given to show Israel that they were without excuse, not with excuse. If they were born evil, or had no choice, they would have an excuse for being evil. God was revealing to them the justice of their punishment (Jer. 13:21-22). They rightly deserved punishment because of their continual disobedience, because of their voluntary and well established custom in doing evil.

III. "For as by one mans disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." Romans 5:19:

A. If we are going to apply the first section of the passage unconditionally and universally, we must also apply the second

d section of the passage unconditionally and universally, since the language for both is the same. If the first section means mankind is universally and unconditionally condemned in Adam, then the second section would mean that mankind is universally and unconditionally justified through Jesus.

B. By Adam's disobedience of eating from the tree, Adam provided all mankind with the opportunity of choosing to be sinners, since moral knowledge has been granted to all men. A sinner is an individual who voluntarily chooses contrary to their moral knowledge. The result of one man's disobedience (eating from the tree of knowledge) was that many were made sinners (men have chosen to be sinners).

C. By Christ's obedience of hanging on the tree, Christ has provided all mankind with the opportunity of choosing to be saved, since remission of sin has been offered to all men upon condition of their repentance and faith.

D. The word "made" used in these passages is not referring to a constitutional change, but referring to a conditional position which requires the consent of the will. Being a sinner is conditional upon choosing to sin. Likewise, being justified is conditional upon choosing to repent and believe.

E. This passage is not teaching that we contributed to Adam's sin, but that Adam contributed to our sin. It says by Adam's actions we have become sinners (We have chosen to sin).

V. "by nature children of wrath" Ephesians 2:3:

A. The word nature can describe a man's God given constitution: (Rom 1:26; 1:31; 2:14; 2:27; 2 Tim 3:3). But this is just dirt and it is created by God. Therefore it cannot be sinful in and of itself.

B. The word nature can describe a man's self chosen character, custom, habit, or manner of life: (Jer. 13:23; Acts 26:4; 1 Cor 2:14; Eph 2:2-3; Gal 2:14-15; 2 Tim 3:10; 2 Pet 1:4). This is voluntary and has to do with the heart. Therefore moral character, or sinfulness, can belong to this type of nature.

C. The context of this particular passage is talking about a former manner of life, addressing a previous lifestyle. "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world... among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind..." Eph. 2:2-3. The "natural man" is the same as the "carnally minded". It is someone who lives for the gratification of their flesh. To say that a person is by nature a child of wrath is the same as saying that they are under the wrath of God because they are living for the gratification of their flesh.

D. To say that they are "children of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2, 5:6) and "by nature children of wrath" is to say the same thing.

E. That which brings the "wrath" of God is voluntary moral character, not involuntary constitutions.

F. A sinful nature is moral not physical, it is a person's self chosen character and not his God given constitution. A man's heart (will) can be sinful, but a man's body can only be an occasion of temptation. Though continual choices of self-gratification, man has developed a habit of sin.

Now can you guys explain these passages??

- Quote:
- 1. God is the author of our flesh (Exodus 4:11, Isaiah 44:2, Jer. 1:5).
 2. Sinfulness is violation of God's law (1 Jn. 3:4). God's law tells us what type of choices we should and shouldn't make (Exo. 20:3-17), not what type of body or nature we should or shouldn't have.
 3. Our flesh is just dirt (Gen. 2:7, Gen. 3:19).
 4. Our flesh is the occasion of our sin, or the source of temptation (James 1:14), but sin itself is a choice (John 5:14, John 8:11, Rom. 6:12; Rom. 6:19 Eph. 4:26).
 5. The body needs to be kept under subjection (1 Corinthians 9:27).

6. It is sinful to live after the flesh (Rom. 8:13), or to be living to gratify our flesh (Rom. 8:7).
 7. But it is not sinful to have a flesh, because Jesus Christ had a flesh (Luke 24:39, John 1:14, 1 Tim. 3:16, 1 Jn. 4:3, 2 Jn. 1:7).
 8. Jesus had the same type of flesh that we have (Heb. 2:14; Heb. 2:17).
 9. Jesus made in the likeness of sinful flesh (Rom. 8:3) which means Jesus was made in the likeness of men (Philippians 2:7). The word "flesh" is sometimes used synonymous with men (Gen. 6:12, Matt. 16:17).
 10. Jesus was morally perfect (2 Cor. 5:21) before He had a glorified or resurrected body.
 11. The Gnostic's taught that the flesh was sinful in and of itself (1 Jn. 4:3, 2 Jn. 1:7).
 12. Our flesh is an instrument or tool which we could use for sin or for righteousness (Rom. 6:13, Rom. 6:19).
 13. Our flesh can be sanctified (Rom. 12:1, 1 Thes. 4:4, 1 Thes. 5:23, 1 Tim. 2:8).
-

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/27 23:51

If we are not born sinners, and sin is merely a choice, and not something in our nature, then why has all of mankind universally chosen to sin since Adam? Why have ALL SINNED and fallen short the glory of God?

Re: , on: 2009/10/27 23:56

This is my own personal study regarding the born sinner fallacy vs. The full counsel of God's Word:

1. Children do not inherit the guilt or sin of the parent: Deut. 24:16, 2 Kng. 14:6, 2 Chron. 25:4, Jer. 31:29-30, Eze. 18:2-4, Eze. 18:19-20.
2. Sinners are separated from God for their own sin: Isa. 59:2; Lk. 15:24; Rom. 5:12; Rom. 7:9, Col. 2:13.
3. Responsibility is limited to or exactly proportionate to ability: Deut. 6:5, Deut. 10:12, Deut. 30:6, Matt. 22:37, Mk. 12:30, Lk. 10:27, 1 Cor. 10:13.
4. Accountability is limited to or exactly proportionate to knowledge: Matt. 11:21-22, Lk. 12:47-48, Lk. 23:34, Jn. 9:41, Jn. 15:22, Rom. 4:15, Rom. 5:13, Jas. 4:17, Jn. 19:11, Matt. 23:14, Mk. 12:40, Lk. 20:47, Jas. 3:1, Matt. 10:15, Matt. 11:24, Mk. 6:11, Lk. 10:12, Lk. 10:14, Heb. 10:26, 2 Pet. 2:21.
5. Through Adams leading, influence, and example men choose to become sinners: Rom. 5:12, Rom. 5:19. Men choose to sin like Adam: Hos. 6:7. Adam has also opened up our eyes to good and evil (Gen. 3:22). With this knowledge we have all chosen to be sinners (Rom. 3:23), we have all chosen to do what we know to be wrong (Jas. 4:17).
6. Someone's leading, influence, or example can cause others to choose to sin: 1 Kng. 14:16; 15:26, 30, 34; 16:13, 26; 21:22; 22:52; 2 Kng. 3:3; 10:29, 31; 13:2; 14:24; 15:9, 18, 24, 28; 21:11, 16; 23:15, Neh. 13:26, Jer. 32:35, Isa. 3:12, Matt. 18:6; Mk. 9:42; Lk. 17:2, 1 Cor. 8:9, Heb. 4:11.
7. Each individual is personally accountable for their own personal sins only: Deut. 24:16, 2 Kng. 14:6, 2 Chron. 25:4, Eze. 18:2-4, Eze. 18:19-20, Matt. 16:27, 2 Cor. 5:10, 2 Cor. 11:15, 1 Pet. 1:17, Rev. 22:12.
8. Men are not born dead in sins, they become morally depraved and relationally separated from God when they voluntarily choose to sin: Isa. 59:2, Lk. 15:24; Rom. 5:12, Rom. 5:14, Rom. 7:9, Rom. 7:11, Col. 2:13.
9. All men have personally and voluntarily chosen to become sinners: Gen. 6:12, Ex. 32:7, Deut. 9:12, Deut. 32:5, Jdg. 2:19, Hos. 9:9, Ps. 14:2-3, Isa. 53:6, Ecc. 7:29, Rom. 3:23, Rom. 5:12
10. Each individual originates their own sin out of their own heart: Matt. 12:35, Lk. 6:45.
11. Infant children are morally innocent (2 Kng. 21:16; 24:4; Jer. 13:26-27; Ps. 106:37-38; Matt. 18:3) and have not yet "done anything" morally "good or evil" (Rom. 9:11) until the age of accountability, which is the age of reason, when they know right from wrong (Deut. 1:39; Isa. 7:15-16), and choose to do wrong (Jas. 4:17).

12. God forms us in the womb (Gen. 4:1; Ex. 4:11; Isa. 27:11; 43:7; 49:5; 64:8; Jer. 1:5; Ps. 139:13-14, 16; Ecc. 7:29; Job 10:9-11; 31:15; 35:10; Jn. 1:3).

13. God forms us in His image, so even after the fall of Adam man is made in the image of God (Gen. 1:26-27; 9:6; 1 Cor. 11:7; Jas 3:9).

14. Even after the fall of Adam, mankind continued to have free choice (Gen. 4:6-7; Deut. 30:11, 19; Josh. 24:15; Isa. 1:16-20; 55:6-7; Jer. 4:14; Hos. 10:12; Jer. 18:11; 21:8; 26:13; Eze. 18:30-32; 20:7-8; Acts 2:40; 17:30; Rom. 6:17; 2 Cor. 7:1; 2 Tim. 2:21; Jas. 4:7-10; 1 Pet. 1:22; Rev. 22:17). God calls all men everywhere to repent (Acts 17:30-31) and He rightly blames them if they do not repent (Matt. 11:20; 23:37; Mk. 6:6; Lk. 7:30; 13:34; 14:17-18; 19:14; 19:27; Jn. 5:40; Rev. 2:21). The only thing that keeps men back from God is their own unwillingness of heart, not any inability of their nature (Isa. 30:9; 30:15; 30:16; Jer. 8:5; Eze. 20:7-8; Matt. 11:20-21; 23:37, Mk. 6:6; 7:30; 13:34; 14:17-18; 19:14; 19:27; Lk. 14:16-24; Jn. 5:40; Acts 7:51; 17:27; Rev. 2:21).

Re: - posted by roaringlamb (), on: 2009/10/28 0:01

Quote:
-----III. "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? then may ye also do good, that are accustomed to do evil." Jeremiah 13:23

A. This passage is talking about Israel during a certain period of time in their history. This passage is not talking about all sinners of all time. To apply this passage to all sinners of all time is to ignore the proper rules of hermeneutic interpretation, particularly context.

Man you are a piece of work to say the least!

It amazes me how you will use this argument to hold your view, BUT then turn right around and quote from Ezekiel to try to prove your view?

If I am not mistaken, Ezekiel was speaking to God's covenant people for the most part, with the exceptions of the warnings and woes to Babylon, Egypt etc.

Come on man at least be consistent if you're you going to make us all wade through your pontifications on nothing.

And in reference to your defense of Pelagius, I suppose that Charles Tayes Russell was misunderstood too, and Mary Baker Eddy, and heck I'm sure that Arius was just misunderstood too. Poor folks, we should just accept everyone who says they believe the Bible I guess.

That's my ONE post for this topic, and it will remain ONE because you have no interest in dialogue if it doesn't allow you to cram your false beliefs down our throats.

Re: , on: 2009/10/28 0:12

Quote:
-----If we are not born sinners, and sin is merely a choice, and not something in our nature, then why has all of mankind universally chosen to sin since Adam? Why have ALL SINNED and fallen short the glory of God?

I could just say that it is the "mystery of iniquity" but I think it might be better to give a practical answer.

These are some answers I have compiled over the years:

1. From Charles Finney
2. From Gordon Olson
3. From Winkie Pratney
4. From Michael & Debi Pearl

FROM CHARLES FINNEY:

2. All moral depravity commences in substantially the same way.

Proof:

- (1.) The impulses of the sensibility are developed, and gradually commencing from the birth, and depending on physical development and birth.
- (2.) The first acts of will are in obedience to these.
- (3.) Self-gratification is the rule of action previous to the development of reason.
- (4.) No resistance is offered to the will's indulgence of appetite, until a habit of self-indulgence is formed.
- (5.) When reason affirms moral obligation, it finds the will in a state of habitual and constant committal to the impulses of the sensibility.
- (6.) The demands of the sensibility have become more and more despotic every hour of indulgence.
- (7.) In this state of things, unless the Holy Spirit interpose, the idea of moral obligation will be but dimly developed.
- (8.) The will of course rejects the bidding of reason, and cleaves to self-indulgence.
- (9.) This is the settling of a fundamental, question. It is deciding in favour of appetite, against the claims of conscience and of God.
- (10.) Light once rejected, can be afterwards more easily resisted, until it is nearly excluded altogether.
- (11.) Selfishness confirms, and strengthens, and perpetuates itself by a natural process. It grows with the sinner's growth, and strengthens with his strength; and will do so for ever, unless overcome by the Holy Spirit through the truth,

(Lectures on Systematic Theology, page 345-346)

FROM GORDON OLSON:

THE UNIVERSALITY OF SIN IN THE WORLD IS TO BE ACCOUNTED FOR AS FOLLOWS:

1. Hereditary physical tendencies tend toward softness and self-sympathy, beginning early in life....
2. Physical consciousness and experiences through the five senses are cultivated prior to the dawn of moral accountability.
3. Moral influences of our immediate and social environment lead us to choose similar habits of life by imitation and often persuasion (I Pe. 1:18).
4. At the dawn of moral accountability, as obligation to God and other beings is beginning to be perceived, moral enlightenment appears to make a dim impact because of our already established manner of living.
5. The will now determines to press on in this self-gratification against these new realizations, the habit of self-indulgence now becoming sinful and involves new concentrations in its pursuit (Is. 53:6; Ro. 3:23; I Pe. 2:25).

(The Truth Shall Set You Free, page 79-80)

FROM WINKIE PRATNEY:

WHY DO CHILDREN SIN?

How, then does a child sin! One does not have to teach a child to do wrong. The explanation becomes clear if we carefully consider the development of a man. A baby enters the world as the object of its parent's fondness, unceasing care, and concession by those who guard it. In these circumstances, the natural, inherited appetites are just developed; and the child's natural love of conscious freedom begins to express itself. The feelings develop long before the 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 the child's soul, so that later, when God opens up the spiritual understanding, the child will surrender to Him (1 Samuel 15:22; Proverbs 6:20-23; 10: 17; 13:18; 15:5;31-32; Ephesians 6: 1; Colossians 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 right or happiness of others.

This repeated bias grows, stronger each day before a knowledge of right or duty could possibly have entered the mind. Finally, the 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, is there any doubt that a child will not? The moment that child chooses selfishly, it sins. From this point on (and NOT before) God holds the child responsible for its 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.

(Youth Aflame, page 89-90)

FROM MICHAEL & DEBI PEARL

“God created us to exist in a constant state of desire and appetite... The infant cannot think of terms of duty, responsibility, or moral choice.... The self-centeredness of infants has all the appearances of a vice. But they are acting on natural, God-given impulses to survive and seek their own pleasure.... They do not have the intellectual and moral capacity to say “No” to appetites and impulses. They cannot yet be held responsible. They begin life in innocent self-centeredness.... But the growing child or adult who doesn't rise above self-indulging desires has fallen from God's intention and design. The root of all sin is founded in runaway indulgence of God-given desires... Drives which are not in themselves evil, nonetheless, form the seedbed on which sin will assuredly grow... When does this innocent, natural selfishness of a child become sin? In other words, when is a child to blame? Keep in mind that a child will not come under condemnation until his moral faculties are fully operative... When a child goes against his conscience, however limited and incomplete his understanding may be, he is then guilty. The degree to which his understanding has developed is the degree to which his actions can be called sin.... As the body of flesh was the medium of Eve's sin and of Christ's temptation, so it is the implement of your child's development into selfishness – which, at maturity, will constitute sinfulness.” Michael & Debi Pearl (To Train Up A Child, No Greater Joy, pg. 15-20)

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/28 0:14

Quote:

C. A strong case can be made that Ps. 51:5 is talking about the defilement of David's mother, because of a previous marriage to another man – a heathen.

Even if your conjecture is true, that David's mother was previously wed to an Ammonite king (which showing a direct link age is not possible, and it is more likely that the typical scenario of polygamy would be most likely), this would not be the contextual cause for David to make this statement he did in Psalm 51. Based off the immediate context of the Psalm, such a consideration is not a viable clue to rightly interpreting this passage. Almost everything we need to interpret this Psalm, as with most Psalms, is supplied right here within the Psalm itself.

The point David is trying to make in Psalm 51 is that his life has been one marked by the taint of sin from conception even to this very moment. His point is that he personally has a history with sin, and this history extends all the way back to the moment he was conceived. Contextually, he is talking about his own dealings with sin. He's not talking about whether or not his mother sinned in his conception. For he's not confessing his mother's sins. Whether, this Psalm is a psalm in which David is confessing his own sin. He's humbling himself before the Lord, and owning up to his sin, the sin which has plagued him since the womb, to which he pleads to the Lord for mercy and to be washed anew.

And his history with sin has taught him that this is a problem in a condition and nature, and a corrupt heart. Such is why he prays to the Lord, "Create in me a clean heart." He realizes that the Lord must ultimately deal with his heart if He is to deal with David's sin.

Thus, your dancing around in Psalm 51, which is a pretty straight forward and easy to read Psalm, is frankly, entirely unwarranted, and harmful to sound exegesis.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/28 0:22

Quote:

I could just say that it is the "mystery of iniquity" but I think it might be better to give a practical answer.

All of these answers tap dance around the heart of the issue, and don't really offer any real insight into why all mankind since Adam has universally chosen to sin without exception. We live in a world full of many exceptions. Very odd things out of the ordinary happen all of the time. Billions upon billions of people have populated this world at some point or another, some, who were even so blessed to have been born into the covenant made with Abraham and Israel, who had a goodly raising from very early on. Yet, without exception, ALL HAVE SINNED.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/28 0:40

Quote:

II. "The wicked are estranged from the womb: they go astray as soon as they are born, speaking lies." Ps. 58:3:

A. This is a poetic book which verses can be taken figuratively or literally.

B. The context of this passage requires a figurative interpretation.

(1.) The entire chapter is figurative; the surrounding verses are all poetic. It talks of men being like serpents and deaf adders (vs. 4), of God breaking the teeth of the young lions (vs. 6), men melting away like running water (vs.7), God bending his bow to shoot arrows (vs. 7), men passing away as a nail which melts (vs. 8), and God destroying like a whirlwind (vs. 9).

(2.) It says that children speak lies from the womb.

(3.) Infants do not know how to speak as soon as they are born.

(4.) Therefore, this passage is poetic not realistic; it is figurative not literal.

Again, you have no idea whatsoever of what you are talking about. Part of interpreting the Scriptures correctly is identifying literary devices when they are used, and rightly understanding what they are pointing to. For whatever figurative language they may employ, they are talking about a definite subject matter, and conveying truths that are quite literal. Psalm

m 58, like Psalm 51, is a pretty easy Psalm to interpret.

Psalm 58 simply accuses unrighteous judges of being wicked, and asks God for justice in regard to them. In verse 2, the Psalmist declares that these judges are corrupt in their hearts, and in verse 3: "The wicked are estranged from the womb; These who speak lies go astray from birth." By saying this, the Psalmist shows that these wicked judges have always been wicked. He shows, like in Psalm 51, that these wicked judges who are wicked from their heart have been wicked from the womb. Sin is simply a part of who they are, the Psalmist says.

In verse 4, the Psalmist compares them to venomous animals who poison and kill those they prey on. These men are like that the author says. In verses 6-9, the Psalmist prays for God's divine retribution and justice to fall on these men, for which he said, those who are righteous will rejoice over such justice when it finally falls.

So, you see, this Psalm is far from some sort of undiscernable confusing metaphors that you can simply dismiss because they are metaphors. It's a very simple and straight forward Psalm that just about anybody should be able to interpret. Don't be a coward. Engage the text, and let it bring forth its own interpretation.

But, you are not interested in doing that. Instead, you proof text random Scriptures that you've compiled through search engines, and make them say whatever you want them to say, instead of simply drawing out these things through careful, methodical and systematic exegesis.

Re: - posted by KingJimmy (), on: 2009/10/28 0:56

Quote:

V. "by nature children of wrath" Ephesians 2:3:

A. The word nature can describe a man's God given constitution: (Rom 1:26; 1:31; 2:14; 2:27; 2 Tim 3:3). But this is just dirt and it is created by God. Therefore it cannot be sinful in and of itself.

B. The word nature can describe a man's self chosen character, custom, habit, or manner of life: (Jer. 13:23; Acts 26:4; 1 Cor 2:14; Eph 2:2-3; Gal 2:14-15; 2 Tim 3:10; 2 Pet 1:4). This is voluntary and has to do with the heart. Therefore moral character, or sinfulness, can belong to this type of nature.

C. The context of this particular passage is talking about a former manner of life, addressing a previous lifestyle. "Wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world... among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind..." Eph. 2:2-3. The "natural man" is the same as the "carnally minded". It is someone who lives for the gratification of their flesh. To say that a person is by nature a child of wrath is the same as saying that they are under the wrath of God because they are living for the gratification of their flesh.

D. To say that they are "children of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2, 5:6) and "by nature children of wrath" is to say the same thing.

E. That which brings the "wrath" of God is voluntary moral character, not involuntary constitutions.

F. A sinful nature is moral not physical, it is a person's self chosen character and not his God given constitution. A man's heart (will) can be sinful, but a man's body can only be an occasion of temptation. Though continual choices of self-gratification, man has developed a habit of sin.

Again, you have shown no understanding of the context of Ephesians 2:3. Simply quoting in a sloppy fashion a random assortment of verses is not a sound contextual interpretation of Ephesians 2:3. Earlier, if you noticed, I went very quickly, yet carefully through the context of Ephesians 1-2:10... which you simply ignored. In Ephesians 2:3, not only is the Greek grammar pretty clear that Paul is talking about people who are children of wrath by constitution, it is contextually clear as well.

Such persons, Paul shows, live in a world submerged all the way through with sin. They not only sin, but they live in a world in which they are dominated by the prince of the power of the air, who rules over their mind and life. Such is why your petty gospel of self-salvation is nothing short of damning. For Paul makes it clear these children of wrath live in a world that is entirely lost and unable to save themselves. They have no hopes of ever turning in and of themselves from sin, for they are ruled by the devil himself, and unable to do so. Which is why we need Christ, Paul asserts, who stands far above and is more powerful than all these forces. From such a world, Christ saves men, and literally rescues them from something they are unable to rescue themselves from. He does this by showing them grace and mercy while they are yet sinners, making them alive, and causing them to sit above all these powers and influences.

This is the context of Ephesians.

I would address the other passages you cited, but, I don't have the time at the present. As it is, you clearly don't understand and those either. You never engage them in the slightest bit of exegesis. You always pull a "It doesn't really mean that, because my moral government theological grid of interpretation has no room for it to mean what you say it means."

If your gospel were somehow valid, it must stand the rigorous examination of careful historical-grammatical-contextual exegesis. Verses in the Bible are not isolated play things that you can string together as if you were making a necklace. Dogma must be the fruitful labor of closely examining a text, and reading what it says, not what you want it to say. If you read it for what it truly says, it'll challenge and revolutionize your life.

Re: - posted by ceedub, on: 2009/10/28 1:22

Trufaithsav...

Quote:
-----I once asked a Calvinist "Is this body a sin?" They said, "Yes, our bodies are made of sin". I asked, "So you can put sin under a microscope and look at it?" He said, "sure".

As an adherent to the doctrines of grace I found the above quote insulting. You don't need a microscope. It's right there in the pigments. At worst a small cereal-box magnifying glass will do. Please tell your Calvinist friend to test his source and info before spouting absurdity all over the net.