



## Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin

### the first sin - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/4 19:54

originally our father of dust the first adam committed sin against god ,and as we christians are now part of the body of christ who is the second adam ,we were part of the body of adam , in whoms loins we all were

in the same way we now partake of the divine nature through being born again , we all partook of image of the man of dust ,a corrupted nature ,,that which is born of flesh is flesh ,in a wider context speaks about us being born spiritual dead

when adam originally sinned all those in the body of adam died the spiritual death ,and we remained dead in adam ,till we were made alive in christ ,,bless god

romans ;5:18 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

tho as the sons of adam willfully sin and hold down and suppress the revealed common truths of conscience and gods attributes

romans teaches it was through adams first sin , that resulted in us being condemned and found guilty ,contrary to popular teachings

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

not only did the sons of adam suffer condemnation because of adams sin ,,we in adam were all made sinners as mentioned before

we bore the image of the man of dust as paul said

this happened while in the loins of adam ,,

made sinners refers to us being created sinners , this happened in one scene before the foundation of the world ,and was experienced at conception or creation of our bodies

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

we from this verse see that death came to all those that sinned

and the fact remains that as babies and children experience death ,,this proves that death can come upon them because they were in adam when he sinned ,, when adam sinned and died spiritual all who are in his body sinned and died spiritual ,,and the reflection of is the physical death that can be experienced any time in the natural mans life

we in christ inherit death ,through christ's death along with resurrection life ,,bless god

we who are in or were in adam inherit sin and death with out resurrection life , through adams sin and his spiritual death in contrast

the gift of righteousness is imputed to us through christ and his righteousness

romans 5:18 and through one mans offence (adam), judgment came to all men resulting in condemnation

the curse of sin was imputed, because of Adam's disobedience

in the same way the elect were created to partake in the divine nature, through death and resurrection  
Romans 6:5 says we were united with him in his death

humans were united to partake in the corruption of Adam through his spiritual death, and inherit the opposite of the divine nature

that God might show what it means to express grace and mercy, in all these definitions

without the fall, there would be no mercy or justification and full expressions of grace

God works all things for good to those who are called according to His purpose

amen

**Re: the first sin - posted by stevet83, on: 2012/11/4 20:22**

Amen...

Under Adam:

We're born in sin and inherit condemnation.

Under Christ:

We're born again in righteousness and inherit eternal life

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/4 21:19**

just for the record brother, I've never ever read a commentary from any reformer or even been a member of a reformed church, or heard a sermon on original sin, though I do believe some of what is called reformed doctrine

I just think the Bible teaches original sin and other doctrines that are taught in reformed circles

blessings

**Re: the first sin - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/4 22:53**

p1118 Niv Student Bible 1 John commentary Zondervan 1992

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

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

..

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

Live as you please

To Gnostics all matter was evil. Only the Spirit was pure, and Gnostics sought to rise to a higher more spiritual plane. This teaching produced a side effect: people who strove to rise above matter didn't care about personal ethics. Their pure spirit could not be tainted by "earthly" sin. Thus, they could act any way they wanted.//

If the physical body is intrinsically evil Than what about the flesh of Jesus ??

Was Jesus Christ our Lord, not made of the seed of David according to the flesh ??

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/4 23:13**

Great article Gary. Thought you read reformed doctrine for breakfast! Good to see some clarity coming into your writing. Nice to be clear headed what! In a post some months ago the Sarx (Flesh) thing was discussed and I recall GinnyRose making an amazing statement right at the end of that post. Something to the effect that Jesus didn't actually have Joseph's DNA. She didn't put it exactly that way, but that's what it meant. I recall being somewhat taken aback, yet at the same time realised that it was actually true. Of the line of David by matrimony not DNA. In the likeness of sinful flesh. Not sinful flesh. Mmmm. Anyway whilst it is true that our father Adam according to the flesh made a decision which has affected us all, what we ought to be asking is what that decision really was. This would give much more practical help to the reality of sin in our lives. If we understood what Adam's sin really was, we would understand something of what resisting sin really was. Then we wouldn't have to spend our days researching doctrines at all.

See the last post in this thread! Wild.

[https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic\\_id=45968&forum=36&start=0&viewmode=flat&order=0](https://www.sermonindex.net/modules/newbb/viewtopic.php?mode=viewtopic&topic_id=45968&forum=36&start=0&viewmode=flat&order=0)

No I haven't started on drugs. Just having a Californian Moment. Its 4 am in the UK. Bless you Gary and Brenda also.

**Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/4 23:28**

Hi amrkelly, the last post in that thread which by the way I will say was written by a dear sister, but that does not mean that I am in agreement with Augustines position I see very little evidence for it other than the Fact that Jesus was begotten Of God and not Joseph. (a large conclusion to form just from that fact)

amrkelly can you show any evidence of such a position being held by the early church fathers before Augustine??

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/4 23:28**

all matter is not evil, only a gnostic would suggest that

but as James said, the spirit that dwells in man lusts to do evil, matter is good a corruptive influence did enter into the spirit or the heart of man, leading to do evil

the bible talks about those who are born again are not born of corruptible seed John chapter 1

the corruption is inbred into the seed of Adam, not only that we also see this corruption in animals and plants, which was subject to futility but not willingly Paul said that, it groans in this corruption, till the revealing of the sons of God

this is not gnosticism, because it is the opposite

matter is good, but the spirit is evil is what total depravity is, that was the result of the original sin

they say matter is evil and spirit is good

it's utterly a satanic doctrine

men being given over to the evil prince, the spirit of the prince and power of the air, which is the spirit that works in the children of disobedience

in which we all walked before the new birth

paul taught that

blessings

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/4 23:32**

i hope you and your wife are doing well andrew, good to see you still posting here

blessings

**Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/4 23:47**

Hi amrkelly even though I have not come to the same conclusion as what you have on this subject, I also am glad to see you posting, you have much to offer.

**Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/4 23:47**

Hi amrkelly even though I have not come to the same conclusion as what you have on this subject, I also am glad to see you posting, you have much to offer.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/4 23:49**

your right proudpapa i agree he has much to offer, tho my hearts resonates with much andrews writes

oh that link you posted was an interesting read andrew

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/4 23:59**

I think often times people jump to a strong defense of this doctrine because they think that by denying it that you are somehow denying the sinfulness of mankind or somehow suggesting that man is able to save himself apart from the Grace of God or that somehow by denying this doctrine, that men are somehow denying their own personal sinfulness.

None of the which I find is a true, Preachers whom have challenged this doctrine have been blacklisted from the Church such as Finney.

Of all the sermons that I have heard the one that seems to expose mans depravity the best and most accurately I feel is Ten Shekels and a Shirt by Paris Reidhead.

of whom spoke out strongly against Augustines understanding of original sin

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

## Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin

**Re: , on: 2012/11/5 0:08**

Quote:  
-----Hi amrkelly, the last post in that thread which by the way I will say was written by a dear sister, but that does not mean that I am in a greement was Augustines position I see very little evidence for it other than the Fact that Jesus was begotten Of God and not Joseph.(a large conclusi on to form just from that fact)

amrkelly can you show any evidence of such a position being held by the early church fathers before Augustine?? proudpapa  
-----

Hi Brother

No it would be unlikely that you would find such a thing stated in the early church with any substance. As for Augustine I have no further thoughts on Him than those I have stated in other threads.

Just to settle the point made by Sister GinnyRose. We know today that the male has 2 types of spermatazoa x and y sided. The male sperm is larger and physically stronger than the female sperm. Regardless of this physical reality however the only woman who could have existed without having any concepted inheritance was Eve. Every woman born of Eve was conceived of Adam and his seed was the determining influence physically as to whether the offspring would be male or female. But whether male or female that offspring was of his seed. This means that his first daughter would have inherited his nature as well. Mary though she was a virgin with regards to Joseph her betrothed husband (not actual husband) was blessed amongst women, not above women. "Blessed art thou amongst women" said the angel. So the point about the nature of the flesh which Jesus had with regards to His physical body is an academic one at best and misleading if gone into too theoretically. Jesus had a physical body which was according to a woman and according to the working of God. As far as the woman was concerned it was a genetic implication which she bore in her own DNA and which was itself a lineage of every male and female born of Adam and Eve.

The fact that sin is accounted from Adam is a completely separate issue altogether and is a misleading topic if it is confused with the physical body we all inherit from our parents. In conclusion I would say myself that although Jesus did not have any direct DNA from Joseph, He did inherit the DNA of his mother. And the DNA of his mother came directly from Adam. This does have an implication but it is only with regards to taking account that Jesus was truly tempted in every way as we are. That is to say Jesus was physically the same as we are, yet He was without sin. Its interesting to me that Adam's personal conduct is never mentioned in the bible once after his decision to take the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil from the hand of his wife, Eve. Yet by Genesis chapter 6 "all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth".

**Re: , on: 2012/11/5 0:10**

Yes thanks Gary. We are fine and well. The Lord is good and faithful.

**Re: - posted by stevet83, on: 2012/11/5 0:30**

Brothagary,

My bad bro, my intention wasn't to label, just to point out an obvious distinction between those who believe in this doctrine (myself included) please accept my sincere apology... I do not consider myself a Calvinist or any other "ist", but some things are too clear to deny in the Scriptures.

Your bro in Christ,  
Steve.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 0:45**

no brother steve ,i never said what i said ,to get an apology,,no need to apologize ,,i never considered it an attack ,,bless you ,,just thought i would make my position a little more clear that all

blessings

**Re: the first sin - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 1:02**

hi proud papa

iv herd ten shekels many times ,and listent to the link you posted ,,,,

and what iv noticed and disagree with is that both do not deal with or explain that scripture that expressed the idea of us all being made sinners by adams desobedence

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

we all know what parise says and agree that we wanted to sin so we are sinners for that reason

but the bibles we were made sinners by adams transgreshen

and this is not delt with

we can all rave talk about the false doctrine one like augustine held and blame him for the reformed churches teaching original sin ...which may be partly true

but whoes going to explain and give and exposae of the verses like the one above and the others i posted like

roms ;5 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

which shows i believe verry clearly we are condemed in adam becasue of the first and ordiginal sin comited by our parents

thats the question

i here everyone esteem the bible and so we should ,,why then do we go to sermons from others who in my view have not given a full exposition on the verses that are used to support the doctrine of original sin to explain what the verses are really saying

paris reid head does not touch at all on these verses

i cant work out why this is ,

blessings

**Re: brothagary - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/5 1:43**

Hi brothagary

Why did God make man??

Why did God create man so that he could sin??

Why Did God place the temptation right in the midst of the garden ??

Romans 5 is speaking of physical death, no one is denying that the fall had serious implications for all of mankind and all of creation, My point is that the infant is naked and not ashamed he has no guilt in his conscience because he understands no law as Romans 5 says "sin is not imputed when there is no law." nevertheless Death still reigns as we agree Adams sin has consequences for all of creation being removed from the Garden from God from the tree of life causes everyting to naturally die.

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.

Just as when we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead righteousness is imputed on us at this moment.

When we personally come into a state of understanding as Paul speaks of in Romans 7:9 and we fail our own understanding (our own judgment of right and wrong) guilt enters into the conscience and condemnation (Sin) is revived from our parents unto our own. Paul says at this state "I died."  
guilt entered his soul and as in Adam all die.

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

edit: I was working on two posts at the same time accidentally pressed the wrong submit repasted instantly and replaced post, because I was not finished with the other one and it did not make any sense with what I had written thus.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 1:49**

hi proud papa

you asked Andrew Kelly weather it was taught before Augustine wiki seems to indicate that this doctrine was believed in the second century

The concept of original sin was first alluded to in the 2nd century by Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons in his controversy (written in Greek) with the dualist Gnostics. Its scriptural foundation is based on the New Testament teaching of Paul the Apostle (Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15:22). Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and Ambrosiaster considered that mankind shares in Adam's sin, transmitted by human generation

i haven't verified this in the writings of the church fathers

but i dare to say is probably correct

**Re: brothagary - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/5 1:56**

Hi brothagary no one is denying the fall, it is the extreme conclusions that theology has placed upon the fall.

wiki also says ///The Greek Fathers emphasized the cosmic dimension of the Fall, namely that since Adam human beings are born into a fallen world, but held fast to belief that man, though fallen, is free. They thus did not teach that human beings are deprived of free will and involved in total depravity, which is one understanding of original sin. During this period the doctrines of human depravity and the inherently sinful nature of human flesh were taught by Gnostics, and orthodox Christian writers took great pains to counter them. Christian Apologists insisted that God's future judgment of humanity implied humanity must have the ability to live righteously.///

I feel that I am in agreement with this

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 2:26**

hi papa

i'm certain you already have your answers to those three questions but i assume you think that my answering those questions will somehow change my mind about this issue

god made men for two motivating reasons  
to show his glory  
and to show grace and mercy

god created adam to be able to sin, to show glory and grace and mercy through a salvific process  
he put temptation in grasp to test man's obedience

sin is not imputed is referring to the law given such as the ten commandments, and the Noahide laws

even though the fundamental law of God wasn't given till Moses where by our sins are imputed to our selves were by the law killed men who were under that law and made sin to be exceeding sinful

death still reigned from Adam till Moses because of Adam's sin, even though no else sinned in the exact same way as Adam

I agree babies even though are in the loins of Adam, are overlooked or acquitted, due to the fact that they have not the capacity to repent nor understand

but in the same way they inherit the body of death and inherit genetic sickness and die from hereditary diseases they inherit a sinful spirit, which is there at conception

sin reigned and I died

this shows that sin was always with him but when he came to understand the law sinful passions were aroused by the law, it made sin exceeding sinful

sin in us will kick hard against the law of God when we are not regenerated by the spirit whose laws are then written on our hearts

reign is meaning aroused

in the same way the spirit is revived in us through a revival or baptism of spirit

it doesn't mean it just appeared when he understood something of sin by the law

the Bible just doesn't teach that

Paul said the law was to show the sin that is already there, "through the law is the knowledge of sin"

it is seen as a wretched thing, rather than just normal or justifiable by the carnal mind

the law doesn't produce the sin or trigger off the sin it just shows the sin for what it is

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 2:43**

ohh regarding your last post, I thought you were asking about original sin, not the fall, wops

**Re: the first sin, on: 2012/11/5 3:42**

Quote:

-----hi proud papa

you asked Andrew Kelly whether it was taught before Augustine Wiki seems to indicate that this doctrine was believed in the second century

The concept of original sin was first alluded to in the 2nd century by Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons in his controversy (written in Greek) with the dualist Gnostics. Its scriptural foundation is based on the New Testament teaching of Paul the Apostle (Romans 5:12-21 and 1 Corinthians 15:22). Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose and Ambrosiaster considered that mankind shares in Adam's sin, transmitted by human generation

I haven't verified this in the writings of the church fathers

but I dare to say is probably correct Gary

-----

The title of this thread Gary is "The First Sin".

The first sin, if that means Adam's first sin (Satan the Father of Sin -sinned first) must have both a factual or physical and moral basis in reality for Adam, and Eve, as well as every other human being. There are three parts to this claim. They have to do with Adam, Eve and then Adam's seed or else all those who are born of a woman, beginning with Eve whose name does not draw attention to this problem, but its solution. "Mother of the Living". There is also a serious need to understand why Adam sinned. What his sin was and both how it is accounted to "all men" as well as how it affects or has relevance beyond that "accounting" for individual men and women. Focusing on a single element of this complex problem will result in difficulties and in the end division. We should strive for unity of understanding as well of unity of purpose. Otherwise we will have gained nothing at all.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/5 4:36**

yea i agree i think there se plenty of deviation already

i feel if one can explain from scripture in love the reasons for believing a doctrine ,we can come closer to except why we see things different

rather than make rash harsh statements against one another ,through not understanding each others positions

and the for example calvinism or arminianism wont seem to us like a dirty word ,but variations of understanding the same principle

what you said should apply to all the conversations and debates so to speak

i do also feel that if it explained properly there would be less people saying things like if god did this he would be evil , he would be unjust ,, this not good to say ,it would be better to say we agree to disagree on a doctrine rather than to mention god being unjust wrong

i did mean the first of adam but to explain what an eye

one should go back to the true original sin of satan

im sure my attempt to explain this would be limited

many would already know how through pride satan lifted up his heart against god ,and was jealous

one sin was enough against a god of infinite value

he mentions he left his own abode with one third of the angels ,and was evicted from heaven for ever

they came down to regions of the earth and remain in darkness in the air chained till the day of judgment

tempting and possessions ,an obsessing all that they can

i believe that their eviction was a common knowledge in the heavens and on the earth

even adam and eve knew what happened to satan

the punishment didn't seem to fit the crime

satan still had freedom in the air and he roamed the earth two feet at will

the mercy god showed this but a full angle was evident to eve and adam

it led them to question in their hearts gods authority and severity

the tree of knowledge always held attractive mystery in their eyes

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

when satan temted eve to eat ,,the idea that god is soft he wont punish us servery ,was i believe the first false thoughts t hat were givern room in there mind

this led to a clouded thought process and made her and adam vunrable to satan so satan struck as a serpent strikes

this is the first big mistake that the sons of adam make ,false thinking about gods rigeous judgmnt and severity

satan stole out of her the word of god and she became fruitless ,and partook of the fruit of the tree of knowlage

the lak of knowlage of god ,caused the desire of pride to rise ,and inturn the hunger for forbiden knowlage became the goal

this is what happens to the sons of adam now

this thinking is intamently conected to the children of adam

blessings

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 10:19**

by brothagary on 2012/11/5 1:36:18

yea i agree i think therese pleanty of devision allready

i feel if one can explaing from scripture in love the reasons for believeing a doctrine ,we can come closer to except why we see things different

How 'bout explaining this that we might have a better relationship:

"What does it mean when you say we all became dead because of Adam's sin"?

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/5 10:43**

Andrew wrote ///We should strive for unity of understanding as well of unity of purpose. Otherwise we will have gained nothing at all.///

brothagary wrote

///yea i agree i think therese pleanty of devision allready

i feel if one can explaing from scripture in love the reasons for believeing a doctrine ,we can come closer to except why we see things different

rather then make rash harh statments against one another ,through not understaing each others possisions

and the for example calvinism or ariminisim wont seems to us like a dirty word ,but varations of understanding the same princale///

wounderful thoughts, I am in agreement

Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 10:59

Quote:  
-----i believe that there eviction was a comon knowlage in the heavens and on the earth  
even adam and eve knew what happened to satan  
the punishment didnt seem to fit the crime  
satan still had freedom in the air and he romed the earth two frow at will  
the mercy god showed this butafull angle was evedent to eve and adam  
it led them to question in there hearts gods athority an severity  
the tree of knowlage allways held attractive mystery in there eyes  
when satan temted eve to eat ,,the idea that god is soft he wont punish us servery ,was i believe the first false thoughts that were givern room in there mind  
this led to a clouded thought process and made her and adam vunrable to satan so satan struck as a serpent strikes  
this is the first big mistake that the sons of adam make ,false thinking about gods righeous judgmnt and severity  
satan stole out of her the word of god and she became fruitless ,and partook of the fruit of the tree of knowlage  
the lak of knowlage of god ,caused the desire of pride to rise ,and inturn the hunger for forbidden knowlage became the goal  
this is what happens to the sons of adam now  
this thinking is intamently conected to the children of adam. Gary.  
-----

Interesting thoughts Gary. May I ask where your thoughts come from? Is it a view which you have read or are these your own thoughts? I must say I have an altogether different view of time and context myself. But I do think that it just shows how difficult it is to find a simple answer to the question of why Adam disobeyed God. We know that in the end Eve was deceived and so she disobeyed at a disadvantage as it were. We know that before she disobeyed she understood that s he ought not to eat that particular fruit. We also know that Adam had the same knowledge of God' will and that he was n ot deceived, yet he disobeyed God without a seeming reason to do so. We could take this a little further and say that we know what Satan thought about his act of rebellion because we have the very words in Isaiah. But what was in it for Ada m? He wasn't deceived there was no reason for pride, he was innocent, this precludes any possibility of pride, and yet h e still thought to disobey.

Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 11:10

Re: the first sin

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 7:59:56

"interesting thoughts Gary. May I ask where your thoughts come from? Is it a view which you have read or are these your own thoughts? I must say I have an altogether different view of time and context myself. But I do think that it just shows how difficult it is to find a simple answer to the question of why Adam disobeyed God. We know that in the end Eve was deceived and so she disobeyed at a disadvantage as it were. We know that before she disobeyed she understood that she ought not to eat that particular fruit. We also know that Adam had the same knowledge of God' will and that he was not deceived, yet he disobeyed God without a seeming reason to do so. We could take this a little further and say that we know what Satan thought about his act of rebellion because we have the very words in Isaiah. But what was in it for Adam? He wasn't deceived there was no reason for pride, he was innocent, this precludes any possibility of pride, and yet he still thought to disobey.  
-----

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

Can we not see that for the reasons of Adam's failure, Jesus is now so highly exalted by His Father?

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 11:36**

Quote:  
-----Can we not see that for the reasons of Adam's failure, Jesus is now so highly exalted by His Father? croref.  
-----

Absolutely we can see it and its the most wonderful reality in the whole universe because Jesus is exalted through obedience.

The reason for discussing these things is not to draw a thread so as to make a rope so as to hang ourselves, it is to understand why despite what we can see, we still sin and this is contrary to God' will. If following Christ was just as easy as knowing that Jesus is exalted we would have all become perfect already. Yet this is not the case and worse than this many saints don't even know how to make sense of it. Though I can't think why you should feel that something is wrong with asking the questions which make for wisdom if we find an answer to them! Or by that means we encourage one another to grown in wisdom and understanding resulting in obedience.

The most important reason for looking into these things seems to me to be because we are Christ' inheritance. We are intended to become His bride in whom He takes Joy. We are to be the honour of His Name. Right now we are somewhat less than vestal and pure. How will we make ourselves ready if we don't understand why despite the fact that we have a new life, we still sin?

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 11:54**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 8:36:31

Quote:  
-----Can we not see that for the reasons of Adam's failure, Jesus is now so highly exalted by His Father? croref.  
-----

Absolutely we can see it and its the most wonderful reality in the whole universe because Jesus is exalted through obedience.

...

The most important reason for looking into these things seems to me to be because we are Christ' inheritance. We are intended to become His bride in whom He takes Joy. We are to be the honour of His Name. Right now we are somewhat less than vestal and pure. How will we make ourselves ready if we don't understand why despite the fact that we have a new life, we still sin?  
-----

If we will accept the fact that our new birth, though of God, is not a prevention but the very life of the "Word" Jesus experienced, we will have set before us, by revelation, what keeps us as that which kept Him, i.e., the "indwelling love" for the Father and ALL His Father purposed for having created man. By that same Love, Jesus had a VISION and JOY set before Him. Do we? Would that not be the mark of the new born of Him; the mark of them that love Him?

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 13:12**

Quote:  
-----If we will accept the fact that our new birth, though of God, is not a prevention but the very life of the "Word" Jesus experienced, we will have set before us, by revelation, what keeps us as that which kept Him, i.e., the "indwelling love" for the Father and ALL His Father purposed for having created man. By that same Love, Jesus had a VISION and JOY set before Him. Do we? Would that not be the mark of the new born of Him; the mark of them that love Him? croref  
-----

Prevention is a bit late once the condition is fully set in. Overcoming is a better word and not just sin, but sin, the flesh and the devil.

That which kept Christ was Christ Himself through obedience. If we desire to know something we must judge ourselves and have a proper estimation of ourselves. Jesus was obedient unto death. Jesus didn't experience the Word, He is The Word made flesh. Even as a 12 year old boy Jesus understood this. His sole attitude was one of obedience and an interest in His Father's house.

Do we have a vision and joy set before us? Ill say so! If we didn't have such a hope how would we run?

The mark of those that love Jesus is obedience.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 13:39**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 10:12:12

Quote:  
-----If we will accept the fact that our new birth, though of God, is not a prevention but the very life of the "Word" Jesus experienced, we will have set before us, by revelation, what keeps us as that which kept Him, i.e., the "indwelling love" for the Father and ALL His Father purposed for having created man. By that same Love, Jesus had a VISION and JOY set before Him. Do we? Would that not be the mark of the new born of Him; the mark of them that love Him? croref  
-----

Prevention is a bit late once the condition is fully set in. Overcoming is a better word and not just sin, but sin, the flesh and the devil.

That which kept Christ was Christ Himself through obedience. If we desire to know something we must judge ourselves and have a proper estimation of ourselves. Jesus was obedient unto death. Jesus didn't experience the Word, He is The Word made flesh. Even as a 12 year old boy Jesus understood this. His sole attitude was one of obedience and an interest in His Father's house.

Do we have a vision and joy set before us? Ill say so! If we didn't have such a hope how would we run?

The mark of those that love Jesus is obedience.  
-----

Dear amr, Why are you doing this? Is what I wrote not truth? You seem to think so by, in some way, picking fly dirt out of pepper only to have me wondering what your agenda really is.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 14:29**

Quote:  
-----Dear amr, why are you doing this? Is what I wrote not truth? You seem to think so by, in some way, picking fly dirt out of pepper only to have me wondering what your agenda really is. Croref  
-----

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

It is just a difference of emphasis brother in the end of it and no agenda either. But I do understand your asking. As long as we judge ourselves we will not be judged. You emphasized love I emphasized obedience. Both are true 1 John 3:1-2 4.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 14:46**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 11:29:49

Quote:  
-----Dear amr, why are you doing this? Is what I wrote not truth? You seem to think so by, in some way, picking fly dirt out of pepper onl  
y to have me wondering what your agenda really is. Croref  
-----

It is just a difference of emphasis brother in the end of it and no agenda either. But I do understand your asking. As long as we judge ourselves we will not be judged. You emphasized love I emphasized obedience. Both are true 1 John 3:1-2 4.

-----

Had I not objected, do you believe anyone would have figured that out?

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 15:05**

Quote:  
-----Had I not objected, do you believe anyone would have figured that out? Croref  
-----

I don't know brother. I suppose that would depend on how well the reader knew the Scripture. As I said I understand why you asked the question. It is possible to state the truth and at the same time make a provocation. Some will see the provocation and miss the truth. Others will see the provocation but take pleasure in the truth. Others do not see the provocation at all. "Love believes all things". Forgive me if it seemed to you to be unlovely.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/5 15:19**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 12:05:33

Quote:  
-----Had I not objected, do you believe anyone would have figured that out? Croref  
-----

I don't know brother. I suppose that would depend on how well the reader knew the Scripture. As I said I understand why you asked the question. It is possible to state the truth and at the same time make a provocation. Some will see the provocation and miss the truth. Others will see the provocation but take pleasure in the truth. Others do not see the provocation at all. "Love believes all things". Forgive me if it seemed to you to be unlovely.

-----

Love doesn't provoke to confuse but for understanding.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 16:14**

Quote:  
-----i believe that there eviction was a comon knowlage in the heavens and on the earth  
even adam and eve knew what happened to satan  
the punishment didnt seem to fit the crime  
satan still had freedom in the air and he romed the earth two frow at will  
the mercy god showed this butafull angle was evedent to eve and adam  
it led them to question in there hearts gods athority an severity  
the tree of knowlage allways held attractive mystery in there eyes  
when satan temted eve to eat ,,the idea that god is soft he wont punish us servery ,was i believe the first false thoughts that were given room in there mind  
this led to a clouded thought process and made her and adam vunrable to satan so satan struck as a serpent strikes  
this is the first big mistake that the sons of adam make ,false thinking about gods righeous judgmnt and severity  
satan stole out of her the word of god and she became fruitless ,and partook of the fruit of the tree of knowlage  
the lak of knowlage of god ,caused the desire of pride to rise ,and inturn the hunger for forbidden knowlage became the goal  
this is what happens to the sons of adam now  
this thinking is intamently conected to the children of adam. Gary.  
-----

Interesting thoughts Gary. May I ask where your thoughts come from? Is it a view which you have read or are these your own thoughts? I must say I have an altogether different view of time and context myself. But I do think that it just shows how difficult it is to find a simple answer to the question of why Adam disobeyed God. We know that in the end Eve was deceived and so she disobeyed at a disadvantage as it were. We know that before she disobeyed she understood that she ought not to eat that particular fruit. We also know that Adam had the same knowledge of God's will and that he was not deceived, yet he disobeyed God without a seeming reason to do so. We could take this a little further and say that we know what Satan thought about his act of rebellion because we have the very words in Isaiah. But what was in it for Adam? He wasn't deceived there was no reason for pride, he was innocent, this precludes any possibility of pride, and yet he still thought to disobey.

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/5 17:10**

hi, it is my weird belief that adams sin was so severe because he not only ate of the tree of the knowlege of good and evil; but rejected the tree of life(Jesus).jimp we have the same problem today.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/5 23:25**

Quote:  
-----hi, it is my weird belief that adams sin was so severe because he not only ate of the tree of the knowlege of good and evil; but rejected the tree of life(Jesus).jimp we have the same problem today. Jimp  
-----

If The Tree of Life was the same in meaning as God's own eternal life (as most believe that it was) then Adam certainly had an opportunity to possess the same life as God possesses. However given that Adam was innocent for most of the t

ime he had access to The Tree of Life it seems unlikely that his not eating of that fruit was an act of rejection. How could an innocent man reject something? As a matter of fact Jim your "weird" belief contradicts what really happened. It was God Himself who removed Adam from the possibility of eating of this Tree of Life and recorded the fact for our benefit. It was an act of mercy on God's part not an act of rejection on Adam's part. Innocence does not mean ignorance nor can it be cynical or critical or for that matter anything which contradicts its nature. Adam was good and perfect and lacking in nothing for life. He was a living soul. How do we come to have such a view of our forefather in his innocence that we have attributed to him every kind of stupidity and ignorance?

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/5 23:32**

hi, of course i was talking about before the fall. all the trees were available except one. my sermon on this preaches real good.loljimp  
choose religion or choose Jesus...

**Re: jimp - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/5 23:43**

Hi Jimp

your inclusion of "we have the same problem today." made it all make perfect sense to me, It actually may be one of the deepest insights That I have read on these forums,

The more I meditate on what you wrote the more insightful I realize it is!

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/6 0:12**

Quote:  
-----hi, of course i was talking about before the fall. all the trees were available except one. my sermon on this preaches real good.loljimp  
p&#8232;choose religion or choose Jesus...jimp  
-----

Yes I too intended to speak about Adam before the fall. Before the fall Adam was innocent not stupid or ignorant. Neither was he deceived. Neither did he need religion. He walked with God. Who needs religion if you can walk with God? It is easy to say that the Tree of The Knowledge of Good and Evil meant "religion" and that The Tree of Life meant "Jesus" but there is no actual Scriptural evidence for this is there? It just an idea presented by some one or other at some time or other. Though I have no doubt that it "preaches real good". I don't mean this to be disrespectful Jim I just speak plainly if I can. I think that at your age and years in The Lord, speaking plainly won't cause a problem. Today Jim eternal life is in Christ Jesus. But in the garden it was right on a tree. Not a euphemism for the "cross", but a tree. Just as Eternal life can be found on a tree in Revelations in the New Heavens and the New Earth. Whilst Jesus (The Lamb) will be found in the New Jerusalem with The Father. None of these things are euphemistically intended or else we don't have a faith at all, but a mystery that cannot be understood. Yet the Scriptures are given us for correction, reproof and training in righteousness.

**Re: - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/6 0:52**

RE:///Before the fall Adam was innocent not stupid or ignorant///

was he controlled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."??

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/6 2:31**

hi, if you eat of this tree you will be as God.(religion) he ate after his wife ate.so stupid that it put the whole human race under bondage. the ground was cursed and produced thorns.Jesus took that curse when He bled from the crown of thorns on the cross etc.jimp we who believe now have eternal life because of Jesus and his finished work.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/6 3:37**

hi brot,,,,, in adam all died ,,when adam sin seperated him god ,( he who comits sin is a slave to sin ,,,, he was sperated from the spiritual life of god and became spiritual dead in sin and recieved the death penatily in the flesh ,,as we do because we were in him in his loins

in contrasted ,,us now being in the second adam and receiveing resarection life and the gift of righeoeness

in christ all will be made alive

blessings

brother andrew most of that s my thoughts ,,wile i was typing certaint things actualy came to me

i asked questions in my mind a few years ago,,and felt that satans fall was well known to adam and all the angels

and it was seen by them as a weak punishemnt from god

but just yesataday i relised that the false thoughts conjered up in there minds about god not being a harsh punisher ,,was the begining of the sin ,,and the reason that this pure creation adam and eve was able to be led in to pride ,,and want t he forbiden knowlage

and i think this is a major problem with men today ,,there fasle ideas about gods righeous judgments and serverity ,caus e them to twist god in there minds change the atributes of god ,,this gives birth to the sin of idolarty

just prior to the fall due to a false view of god which was compounded by not repenting of false thought about ,,this happend to adam and eve ,and alowed them to be tempted an led astray by the devil ,,who would have previosly had know power to effect them

now that just how im seeing it .i dont expect others to see it that way

can i say tho that wile i was typing this post ,i only just relised that the proplem led to idolarty

strange i didnt know this 1 hour ago

when we worship god with a false view of gods atrabutes we a worshipping a god we are recreating in our own imgaination

this happened in the beggining and is happening right now as a reflection or shadow of what went on in the garden

and it leds to foggy perception and spiritual deception ,and a sickening hunger for forbiden knowlage of all variations

andrews thanks for asking the questions yestaday andrew

i feel the holy spirt has givern me a litle clarity ,or an expilnation

iv allways wonder how adam and eve could be led into evil  
wile they did not have a flesh nature for satan to tempt them through

blessings everyone in jesus mighty name

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/6 5:33**

Quote:  
-----Â...Â...and i think this is a major problem with men today ,,there false ideas about GodÂ' righteous judgments and severity ,cause t  
hem to twist God in there minds change the attributes of God ,,this gives birth to the sin of idolatry. Gary  
-----

Your comment here Gary is an interesting one because in a very real sense Idolatry is the great sin of all time. By it's v  
ery meaning, (and there are many forms of meanings regarding idolatry), it is a denial of God Himself. There are many w  
illful individuals named in the bible and most of time this willfulness is in connection with idolatry. Right there at the foot o  
f Sinai the golden calf is an astonishing thing when you consider what the Hebrews witnessed in order to get there. Man  
y of the Kings of Israel and Judah sinned in this way as well. Satan led on and was led on by those who adored him and  
led to pride and a direct desire to "be like God". In having such a desire he blasphemed God but eventually he concei  
ved it formerly and then he was caste down. In the garden of Eden, as Jim said, this temptation was made (and Eve beli  
eved it). Adam however didn't believe it because had he done so he would have necessarily been deceived as well. Bu  
t following this logic regarding idolatry being the "great sin" we would have to ask in what sense was Adam's sin also  
idolatrous?

It would be wrong to suggest that I have any personal revelation on this subject. Nevertheless I am fully persuaded that  
Adam sinned for one reason only. He took regard to his wife. What this means can only be understood in the light of so  
mething the apostle Paul said "know you not, that he who loves his wife loves himself". Perhaps your observation or t  
hought about Adam's perception of God's mercy in allowing Satan to continue may be off track in the detail, but God did  
show mercy when He judged Adam's sin. Both the serpent, as a creature lending itself to Satan's purposes, was physic  
ally judged to the extent that it is thereafter without limbs or means of flight; as was Satan judged further because it is at  
this time that the means of dealing with him were fully revealed (the bruised heal and the crushed head). Finally Eve wa  
s physically judged as well not only in an increase in childbirth but in her emotional constitution as well. I have always int  
uitively believed that it has suited Satan's purposes to make Eve the scape goat for Adam's sin. Apart from the consequ  
ences this has had on women over the ages, it has obscured the fact that God held Adam himself accountable in the en  
d for his sin (sin is reckoned through Adam) yet in judging Adam, God shows considerable mercy. I don't say that a cur  
sed earth and eating from the sweat of hard labor is a trivial thing. But Adam by taking regard to his wife was a "taking re  
gard to himself". In doing this he disobeyed God and made his own desire more important than obedience to God.

In contrast Jesus denied Himself completely and thereby kept Himself in obedience. It is obedience that made the sacrifi  
ce of His body on the cross, acceptable to God. Had Jesus just once put any natural and reasonable desire before the vi  
sion and joy which was set before Him His sacrifice would have been rejected, we would yet be lost and Satan would no  
t have been defeated once and for all time. For a more formal presentation of this teaching concerning the real meaning  
of Adam's sin you would have to find it in Watchman Nee's ministry. Off hand I don't know where but I read it 30 years  
ago and have seen it played out ever since. We are told that having believed in Jesus we have been given the gift of ete  
rnal life, by grace without works. This is of course true. But we forget that following Jesus comes after belief in Jesus an  
d this following requires that we deny ourselves and take up our own cross in life. If we want to really please God we not  
only have to believe in His only begotten Son, but we will have to deny ourselves also. The one to eternal life, the other t  
o a part in the glory of the Kingdom of His beloved Son.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 8:08**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/5 20:25:37

Quote:  
-----hi, it is my weird belief that adams sin was so severe because he not only ate of the tree of the knowlege of good and evil; but reject ed the tree of life(Jesus).jimp we have the same problem today. Jimp  
-----

If The Tree of Life was the same in meaning as God's own eternal life (as most believe that it was) then Adam certainly had an opportunity to possess the same life as God possesses. However given that Adam was innocent for most of the time he had access to The Tree of Life it seems unlikely that his not eating of that fruit was an act of rejection.  
-----

Re:jimp

hi, it is my weird belief that adams sin was so severe because he not only ate of the tree of the knowlege of good and evil; but rejected the tree of life(Jesus).jimp we have the same problem today.  
-----

Why take it that far?? How 'bout it was just simple 'neglect'?? Did Adam have a "pressing need" that he should be drawn to it??

Question: Why does one come to Christ??

**- posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/6 8:14**

was Adam controled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."??

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 8:15**

by brothagary on 2012/11/6 0:37:36

hi croft,,,,, in adam all died ,,when adam sin seperated him god ,( he who comits sin is a slave to sin ,,,,, he was seperated from the spiritual life of god and became spirtual dead in sin and recieved the death penatily in the flesh ,,as we do because we were in him in his loins

in contrased ,,us now being in the seconed adam and reciveing resarection life and the gift of righeoeness

in christ all will be made alive  
-----

Good. So we can rightly say that death meant being separated from God, correct?

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 8:17**

by proudpapa on 2012/11/6 5:14:26

was Adam controlled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."??

-----

Who are you addressing??

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/6 8:53**

hi, i picture the tree of life as a somewhat ugly tree with somewhat non descript lookin fruit so it was not something that s parked desire to try .somewhat like the bible prophecies about what Jesus would look like when He would come.jimp wh ere the tree of the knowlege if good and evil was very desirous.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/6 12:22**

Quote:

-----Why take it that far?? How 'bout it was just simple 'neglect'?? Did Adam have a "pressing need" that he should be drawn to it??

Question: Why does one come to Christ?? croref

-----

The Father draws one to Christ. As Jesus said no one could believe in Him unless The Father draws him. The Father als o drew Adam's attention to the tree of life both indirectly by providing or else creating "all" the trees physically in one garden as well as by placing the two trees at the heart of the garden together. Not only this but the Scriptures have man y examples of God's expectation that His invisible attributes make for a possibility in understanding His will with regards to those physical things. Marriage for example of a man to one woman is a physical restraint and meaning which is said to be a "natural" affection. Therefore, to do the opposite amounts to exchanging a natural affection for an unnatural o ne in contradiction of ones own understanding as well as God' intention. The Tree of Life may well as Jim says have bee n the less attractive of the two trees we know the names of. Yet even if this were true it would in that not amount to ignor ance, but would simply be a thing to seek out, even as Christ is one to seek out.

Quote:

-----"...was Adam controlled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."?? proudpapa

-----

When I first read this brother in the first posting of it, a vague thought crossed my mind. Now that this thread has moved on a little in seeking to answer the OP question I believe that you have said this very well. When Paul said "he who lov es his wife loves himself" I believe he wasn't making a negative statement which by inference would mean, don't lov e your wife too much etc. I think he was making a statement based in reality. When Adam first laid eyes on his wife to be , his immediate understanding was real, this is "woman" "flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone". Clearly his ment al powers were acute and functioning very well indeed. He wasn't informed of this fact; he was simply equipped to kno w it. This tells me two things. That when Paul said "know you not that when a man loves his wife he loves himself" he was saying nothing more than Adam himself understood the first time he set eyes on his wife. It also tells me that not onl y was he not capable of being deceived by the serpent but he had all the abilities to know realities. He named all the ani mals; that is quiet a feat of intellect because this too denotes an ability to understand the nature of every animal. This is t he meaning of having authority to name something. Parents name their own children having an understanding of someth ing that took place in their privacy; namely "this is our child" Parents don't name other peoples children.

In short brother when Adam saw Eve stretch out her hand he was quiet capable of doing something about it. Whatever t

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

thoughts crossed his mind, in the end he proffered to go with the emotional and intellectual comfort of agreeing with his wife. This is self before God and this is the first sin of man and this is the basis of the fall. It is a form of Idolatry, putting self before God. It is called disobedience but it is obedience to self interest before obedience to God's will; in this case experienced internally by a compulsion of that which he could see and hear outwardly, namely that he loved and adored his wife who was of himself.

The words of God to Adam in dealing with the problem of this sin were "because you have listened to the voice of your wife" Genesis 3:17. The action of eating a piece of fruit is no great thing. But for Adam listening to the voice of Eve his wife whom he loved as himself, in the end becomes rebellion in his progeny.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 13:39**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/6 9:22:00

Quote:  
-----Why take it that far?? How 'bout it was just simple 'neglect'?? Did Adam have a "pressing need" that he should be drawn to it??

Question: Why does one come to Christ?? croref  
-----

The Father draws one to Christ. As Jesus said no one could believe in Him unless The Father draws him. The Father also drew Adam's attention to the tree of life both indirectly by providing or else creating "all" the trees physically in one garden as well as by placing the two trees at the heart of the garden together. Not only this but the Scriptures have many examples of God's expectation that His invisible attributes make for a possibility in understanding His will with regards to those physical things. Marriage for example of a man to one woman is a physical restraint and meaning which is said to be a "natural" affection. Therefore, to do the opposite amounts to exchanging a natural affection for an unnatural one in contradiction of one's own understanding as well as God's intention. The Tree of Life may well as Jim says have been the less attractive of the two trees we know the names of. Yet even if this were true it would in that not amount to ignorance, but would simply be a thing to seek out, even as Christ is one to seek out.

-----  
Adam was innocent. No drawing by God would ever have been an issue; never a necessity to be drawn to the Tree of Life anymore so then any other tree.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/6 15:38**

Quote:  
-----Adam was innocent. No drawing by God would ever have been an issue; never a necessity to be drawn to the Tree of Life anymore so then any other tree. croref  
-----

The very fact that God tells Adam that he could eat of any tree in the garden was an act of drawing attention to something in this case a number of trees bearing a variety of fruits. As I said brother "God drew Adam's ATTENTION to the Tree of Life etc." You being a teacher formerly I thought you would have known how to pay attention. 2 out of 3 for that one! You understand brother.

Quote:  
-----The LORD God planted a garden toward the east, in Eden; and there He placed the man whom He had formed. Out of the ground the LORD God caused to grow every tree that is pleasing to the sight and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Genesis 2:8-9

The LORD God commanded the man, saying, "From any tree of the garden you may eat freely; but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat from it you will surely die." Genesis 2 16-17  
-----

Did you actually read what has been shared brother? Why not comment on something more substantive at least that would have a purpose which is easily recognised. We don't have to agree. But if we don't use our minds at all we may never really come to an understanding mind ourselves. Of course we could all just wait for a fresh revival but if by then we have hardened our hearts even then we might not benefit. Do you know why there is so much sin in the lives of believers? Or is it just theology? Perhaps it is just mysticism if so perhaps we should all join a contemplative order of monks! On the other hand we could really desire to know what it is that ails the churches today. Beginning with our selves of course both you and me.

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/6 15:45**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/6 12:38:08

Quote:  
-----Adam was innocent. No drawing by God would ever have been an issue; never a necessity to be drawn to the Tree of Life anymore so then any other tree. croref  
-----

The very fact that God tells Adam that he could eat of any tree in the garden was an act of drawing attention to something in this case a number of trees bearing a variety of fruits. As I said brother "God drew Adam ATTENTION to the Tree of Life etc." You being a teacher formerly I thought you would have known how to pay attention. 2 out of 3 for that one! You understand brother.  
-----

Easy Bro. Given Adam believed he needed nothing, give a reason why Adam should be "drawn" to anything \_\_without a need to satisfy what he might have believed he did not already possess?

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/6 16:44**

hi, it does not really matter. it does paint a great picture that has been true throughout the history of mankind. but, unless you have THE SECOND ADAM it just does not matter. Jesus is the only thing that i know and Him crucified. jimp

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/6 17:14**

Quote:  
-----Easy Bro. Given Adam believed he needed nothing, give a reason why Adam should be "drawn" to anything \_\_without a need to satisfy what he might have believed he did not already possess? Croref  
-----

Now that is a brilliant question! Also thank you for being so gracious with my last post.

Jim expressed a thought that the Tree of Life might have been less beautiful than the Tree of The Knowledge of Good and Evil. In fact Jim used the word "non-descript". The Genesis passages however makes no precise distinction but simply says that all the trees were "pleasing to the sight and good for food". After Eve was deceived it is written that she "looked and saw that the fruit of The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil was pleasing to the eye, she looked and saw that it was good for food, and she looked and saw that it was able to make one wise". Given that Eve knew that God had forbidden the eating of this particular fruit, it seems reasonable to accept that she only "looked" with such an interest after the issue of obedience to God was "removed" by the removal or questioning of God's integrity and authority. We do not read that Eve or Adam looked at any other fruit of the many trees that were available to them, including the Tree of Life. Yet given that they were for food as well and God Himself placed Adam initially in the midst of them it seems unlikely that they paid no attention to them whatsoever after Eve was presented to Adam. Together they lived amongst them. How could they have been unaware of their presence or the fact that they were given for food as well? "You may eat of any tree except for etc."

As to Adam's innocence and the possibility that he would have not been able to conceive of a need to eat of The Tree of Life I don't have an absolute clarity to this question. It appears to be beyond a simple rational explanation. Yet I can see that Adam was an exceptional being with a huge intellect. If Einstein was smart then Adam must have been at least as smart or how else did Einstein come by such an intellect. Who begot whom? I believe that Adam would not have been drawn by a need as though he lacked anything, but I also believe that he would have been smart enough to be able to seek God out when Eve disobeyed. Had he put his trust in God at that moment and disregarded his own reasonable affection to take heed to his wife he would have been able to find an answer to her "new" condition (deceived and knowledgeable) from God.

The one thing about Adam that is wholly difficult to understand is the fact that he was innocent. We read that no man has sinned after the "similitude" of Adam's sin. I don't suppose this means no one is able to take from Eve's hand a forbidden fruit and eat it. That defies rational but it does mean I believe that no one was ever innocent again as Adam was innocent. The fact is we ourselves cannot imagine what innocence is like. We can impute its meaning by an observation of a small child. But we cannot personally experience it. The best that we can do ourselves is to believe what the Scriptures tells us lies at the root of all sin and what God's remedy for sin is, beginning with the promise to Adam's wife that she will become the mother of the living (lit: Eve). It is the promise of her seed, even Immanuel that becomes the basis for all hope. You just have to look at how Eve rejoiced when she was delivered of her first son to recognize that she took the promise seriously.

I am sorry that my posts are so long but this business of being found worthy of the revealing of the coming Kingdom of God in visibility when Christ will reign is no small matter. And this is my concern. I have no interest in what happened in Eden for the sake of it. It has to do with Christ Himself most of all because He is worthy already through His obedience unto death. How will we be found worthy, (to His glory and praise), if we have not understood the most fundamental reality of what it is that ails and defeats the walk which Jesus made possible through His obedience and sufferings. Jesus Himself does not compel us to such a walk. He simply says, "Whosoever will come after Me let him deny himself, take up His cross and follow Me". As for believing in Christ Peter said to the thousands in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost "God commands all men everywhere to repentance". Rejecting Christ crucified for sin is worthy of hell and the lake of fire. But the coming kingdom is a "whosoever".

Adam was a living soul. He didn't need the Tree of Life to be a living soul he already was one, just as we are ourselves. But he was given an opportunity to share in God's own uncreated eternal life and he personally lost it. Today we now have that very life through Logos, The Word made flesh, His death, resurrection, and His obedience thereto. So we are not back in Eden we are in Christ yet the same reason why Adam failed presents itself to every one of us daily in a choosing to deny or else fulfill the inclinations of "self life" (the flesh). We cannot do this ourselves in probably the same way Adam as an innocent man wouldn't have been able to figure out that he was being offered eternal life and not just soul life; A living eternal spirit with God, and not just a psyche; God's life and not just his own life. We need Christ to do it for us, just as Adam needed God to address the problem of Satan and his effect on his wife. So Christ addresses the problem of sin and death in our lives by giving us a new life through which we are able to please God and rely on Him daily. And no I haven't even come close to realizing this precious reality in my own life either. But I can see it and would that God would draw me into obedience in Him as well and for all of us who love The Lord Jesus.

Edit head to head

**Re: Croref - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/6 21:44**

////was Adam controled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."??

Who are you addressing?////

anyone

**Re: amrkelly - posted by proudpapa, on: 2012/11/6 22:14**

Hi amrkelly

amrkelly wrote

///When I first read this brother in the first posting of it, a vague thought crossed my mind. Now that this thread has moved on a little in seeking to answer the OP question I believe that you have said this very well. When Paul said "he who loves his wife loves himself" I believe he wasn't making a negative statement which by inference would mean, don't love your wife too much etc. I think he was making a statement based in reality. When Adam first laid eyes on his wife to be, his immediate understanding was real, this is "woman" "flesh of my flesh and bone of my bone". Clearly his mental powers were acute and functioning very well indeed. He wasn't informed of this fact; he was simply equipped to know it. This tells me two things. That when Paul said "know you not that when a man loves his wife he loves himself" he was saying nothing more than Adam himself understood the first time he set eyes on his wife. It also tells me that not only was he not capable of being deceived by the serpent but he had all the abilities to know realities. He named all the animals; that is quiet a feat of intellect because this too denotes an ability to understand the nature of every animal. This is the meaning of having authority to name something. Parents name their own children having an understanding of something that took place in their privacy; namely "this is our child" Parents don't name other peoples children.

In short brother when Adam saw Eve stretch out her hand he was quiet capable of doing something about it. Whatever thoughts crossed his mind, in the end he proffered to go with the emotional and intellectual comfort of agreeing with his wife. This is self before God and this is the first sin of man and this is the basis of the fall. It is a form of Idolatry, putting self before God. It is called disobedience but it is obedience to self interest before obedience to God's will; in this case experienced internally by a compulsion of that which he could see and hear outwardly, namely that he loved and adored his wife who was of himself.

The words of God to Adam in dealing with the problem of this sin were "because you have listened to the voice of your wife" Genesis 3:17. The action of eating a piece of fruit is no great thing. But for Adam listening to the voice of Eve his wife whom he loved as himself, in the end becomes rebellion in his progeny.///

that was some good thoughts Brother Andrew,

Here are some verses That come to mind

"And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed."

"For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

1 Peter 2:25

For ye were as sheep going astray; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 2:34**

by proudpapa on 2012/11/6 18:44:58

///was Adam controled by a voice of reason "the mental powers concerned with forming conclusions, judgments, or inferences."??

-----  
Who are you addressing??///  
anyone  
-----

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: the first sin**

No. He was subjected to vanity and failed the test.

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/7 6:08**

hi, could it be so simple as adam did not see any change in eve after she ate of the tree and thought it must be safe to eat of?

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/7 7:31**

Quote:  
-----hi, could it be so simple as adam did not see any change in eve after she ate of the tree and thought it must be safe to eat of? Jimp  
-----

On the face of it Jim (Genesis 3:7) Adam and Eve became aware of a change in their minds only after Adam himself ate. This change is expressed as "their eyes were opened" and "knowing they were naked". This type of "seeing" is of the mind. The eyes are simply the vehicles of sight. There is nothing said about what Eve may have thought before Adam ate. So to accept the record as it is written would almost certainly mean that Adam didn't comprehend a change in Eve because it didn't occur until they were both fallen. When I was thinking about this during the post it occurred to me that whatever Eve understood after becoming deceived it was of no account. Deceived is deceived. When a person is deceived the details seem far less important than the fact of it. It is pure speculation on my part but I have also wondered if Adam's position as head did not actually keep Eve in some way from the immediate effect of disobedience, so that Adam's decision to eat is what really carried the authoritative weight, consequence and responsibility. As it is written sin is reckoned through Adam.

Adam was innocent so safe seems like a nice word, but he was also the one to whom the command was given directly. If Eve knew before she was deceived, (and she did because she said so) then Adam could not have known any less than his wife. I find it difficult to attribute to Adam anything less than his responsibility so "safe" seems to ill fit the circumstance. Who knows what he might have thought though!

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 10:49**

I repeat\_\_Adam was unwillingly subjected to vanity\_\_with the hope he would not succumb.

**Re: the first sin , on: 2012/11/7 14:03**

Quote:  
-----I repeat\_\_Adam was unwillingly subjected to vanity\_\_with the hope he would not succumb. Croref  
-----

Is the unwillingness on Adams part? And is the hope on God's part? Given that you are insistent I thought it would be worth asking!

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 14:53**

by amrkelly on 2012/11/7 11:03:19

Quote:  
-----I repeat\_\_Adam was unwillingly subjected to vanity\_\_with the hope he would not succumb. Croref  
-----

Is the unwillingness on Adams part? And is the hope on God's part? Given that you are insistent I thought it would be worth asking!

-----

God did the subjecting as the only means for Adam to prove himself, his allegiance to Him, by a choice given Adam. God did it with a hope that Adam would come through and if that was not the case then God gave him something he could not perform. God obviously planned for his failure.

cf Romans 8:20

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/7 15:16**

hi, one of my favorite books i have read is part of a trilogy by c.s. lewis. the book is titled perelandra and it is about men flying to a planet where the two humans have not disobeyed God. it brings out the sinful nature of men from earth except for the Jesus type character (ransom). great allegory. jimp

**Re: - posted by RobertW (), on: 2012/11/7 16:24**

I'm a bit late to this conversation, but wanted to touch on Romans 8:20 a bit contextually.

For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected in hope, Because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. (Romans 8:19-22)

Verse 19 points to a future time when the sons of God will be manifest to the creation (creature). After the fall God had placed the earth in a state of inutility. Our word here for vanity is *vanitas*; it comes from a word meaning devoid of force or vain; that is to say, fruitless and without results.

If we interpret V.20 as the Creation being in a state of 'inutility' and couple that with the 'curse' that caused the earth not to produce as it did prior to the fall then I am left to think that the whole creation is sort of limping along. I think this was done as a preventative measure to insure that Adam would have to work by the sweat of his face instead of walking around picking fruit. In short, God put the earth in a state in which man had a lot less time for leisure because the earth did not work as well as it did at first.

Some creation scientists tell of a time when the whole earth was in a state of symphonic equilibrium. Everything was working like a perfectly tuned machine or a well oiled watch. The earth is in a state of complete utility (if you will). Everything functioned exactly as designed. Everything worked together in perfect harmony with just the right balances and processes. But today, we are in a state of 'inutility'. We have seasons of summer and winter and have to work hard to get our necessary food.

In the auto industry cars have computers that monitor and adjust the functions of the engines to insure that everything is perfectly tuned at all times. I'm not 100% sure if it's true today, but back in the 80's and 90's when something went catastrophically wrong with an engine feedback system the computer went into what we called 'limp in mode'. This was a default setting that goes into play when certain sensors cannot be trusted and the vehicle needs to be able to merely make it into the shop. The car is drivable, but the performance is far less than if things were in a 'closed loop operation.' A closed loop system takes into account sensor readings (especially oxygen content in the exhaust) to keep the air-fuel mixture, ignition timing, etc. all in perfect balance. This is happening many hundreds of times per second almost like a 'refresh rate'. You don't even notice its happening when all is well; but in 'limp in' mode things don't run right.

This is how I see the issue of 'inutility' or 'vanity'. We are subject to the bondage (slavery) of corruption. This is a word that is similar to death or dying. There is a winding down that is happening in both the creation and in our mortal bodies. In a way, I think this was a measure employed by God to reduce the effectiveness of the earth so as to make life more difficult. An idle mind is the devil's workshop. God got man busy by placing the earth in inutility. Just my view of it. Blessings.

**Re: - posted by jimp, on: 2012/11/7 16:39**

hi, wonderful post,robert.jimp

**Re: - posted by Croref, on: 2012/11/7 17:12**

by RobertW on 2012/11/7 13:24:50

This is how I see the issue of 'inutility' or 'vanity'. We are subject to the bondage (slavery) of corruption. This is a word that is similar to death or dying. There is a winding down that is happening in both the creation and in our mortal bodies. again, I think this was a measure employed by God to reduce the effectiveness of the earth so as to make life more difficult. An idle mind is the devils workshop. God got man busy by placing the earth in inutility. Just my view of it. Blessings.

-----

For sure, that is the traditional thinking of it all \_\_\_that doesn't fit the situation. I'll stick with my understanding because it does fit that the rest of the 'dots' can be connected.

**Re: - posted by brothagary, on: 2012/11/8 3:27**

i watched roberts viedo of the beating of the drums was a well presented gosple message and it was good to put a face to the name thanks for posting the link

i think creation was subject to courption for one ,,it was an inherterce for the sons of men,,so it needed to be either taken away from man ,or changed to suit the circumstances

blessings