

Scriptures and Doctrine :: Sin

Sin - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/9 1:50

The first mention of sin in the Bible is in connection with what Cain did.

God said to Cain:

Gen. 4:7 "And if you do not do well, sin is crouching at the door; and its desire is for you, but you must master it."

This is what Cain did:

Gen. 4:2-3 - Cain was a tiller of the ground. So it came about in the course of time that Cain brought an offering to the LORD of the fruit of the ground.

Question:

What is bad about what Cain did?

Re: Sin - posted by StirItUp (), on: 2018/1/9 2:40

Hi Jade,

It may be the first time the word sin is used but not the first time sin was committed.

As we know, it goes back to the sin of Adam and Eve, transgression of God's command, inspired by the spirit of Pride and Rebellion from satan.

Cain did wrong by not doing what was right.

We can conclude, reading between the lines, as it were, that both Abel and Cain knew what God required but only Abel's heart was right and only he brought an offering acceptable to God.

Blessings,

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/9 7:21

Hi William,

Agree. It was through Adam that sin entered into the world, and death through sin, and so death spread to all men, because all sinned (Rom. 5:12).

Adam's sin that brought sin into the world and death through sin to all men was this:

He ate from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

Gen. 2:16-17 - 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."

Rom. 6:23 "For the wages of sin is death"

I am thinking that the fountainhead of all sin is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and out of this flow every other deed of sin. And the first deed of sin to flow out from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is to give to God what God cannot accept, illustrated by Cain's offering.

I am also thinking that Cain wanted to be accepted by God but his way was wrong.

Prov. 16:25 - There is a way which seems right to a man, But its end is the way of death.

What do you say?

Blessings

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/9 7:57

"I did it my way" is the ultimate statement and description of sin.

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2018/1/9 8:29

Hi Jade,

Everything you wrote makes complete sense.

Eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil always makes me think of the first sinner, the devil, who wanted to exalt himself to be god.

It is the same spirit who inspires fortune telling etc. where we want to know the future. We want to be like God.

Instead of loving Him, glorifying Him, trusting Him and obeying Him we want to be Him.

This is the root of sin

Re: - posted by StirltUp (), on: 2018/1/9 8:30

Agreed Todd,

I I I. I am the captain of my own ship, the master of my own destiny etc.

Re: Sin - posted by JFW (), on: 2018/1/9 10:12

Sister Jade asked;

"This is what Cain did:

Gen. 4:2-3 - Cain was a tiller of the ground. So it came about in the course of time that Cain brought an offering to the LORD of the fruit of the ground.

Question:

What is bad about what Cain did?"

Sweet sister your question (in my understanding) illustrates the "first fruits" of sin, and as such is a very important topic to consider and dig into for it is the pattern of all that seeks to serve God but in an unacceptable way.

After an extended time of prayerful consideration some time ago it became quite clear what the reason is for God rejecting Cain's offerings.

Cain offered the "fruits" of his own works...

whereas Able took what the Lord had provided and offered from that portion.

This (for me) illustrates quite well the Atonement, where God Himself provided the offering in Jesus- whereas the Pharisees (like Cain) offered the fruits of their religious works. When looked at through the lens of righteousness as a requirement; one is offering what God has provided (His righteousness) while the other is offering the work of their own hand (self-righteousness).

This seems, to me, to be one of the major patterns addressed throughout the whole of scripture and especially in Paul's epistles.

At the end of the day, the only acceptable things we have to offer God is what He has given us but all too often we offer what "we have done" which is really just self-righteousness or pride...

Hope that helps you in your studies:)

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/1/9 11:09

BranchVINE,

The book of Hebrews actually clarifies this for us:

Hebrews 11:4--By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and through it he being dead still speaks.

Now Cain lacked faith, and his offering was rejected. Now jealousy, envy, and murder were crouching at the door, waiting to spring upon him if he wasn't ready. And sure enough, it did.

I don't think it is right to say that just because it was the fruit of the ground that it was unacceptable. After all, these types of offerings were acceptable in the OT Law. The issue was faith, of which, unlike his brother Abel, he had none.

Re: - posted by MrBillPro (), on: 2018/1/9 13:05

The only thing I can add is, most pastors today, do not preach enough on sin, that's probably why most folks don't understand a lot about sin.

Re: Sin - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/9 14:55

Gen 3 :17. Gen 5:29. I wonder if maybe offering God something from the ground that was cursed, the 2nd ref being toil denoting works?

What do you guys think??

I have pondered this off and on over the years and it is clear from scripture that they both had a relationship with God or at least some degree of conversation I would imagine on a regular basis.

Re: better sacrifice - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/9 16:04

God said "ye shall not eat of the tree". The sin from the outset lay in just eating of the tree let alone what the tree might produce in us.

To me, human autonomy, "ye shall be like gods" was the motivating factor. There is in humanity the innate desire to be like his creator but this snake-invite had some twists to it.

Tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Knowing right, wrong, good, evil...all sounds like a tree where one goes to obtain a knowledge of these things. A tree of morality.

Yet, forbidden of God. Why? Because through hindsight learning, we found out what that serpent had in mind.

First, you had to be immoral=disobey God before you partake of a tree giving knowledge of morality.

Secondly, You had to leave God out of the equation like Adam and Eve did. They didn't call out to God, didn't pray, didn't say "hey, lets find out why God's holding back, lets meet up again with him?"

Nope, just straight to the tree autonomously, and of course Adam was in arms-reach of Eve and partook himself.

What happened? They understood in a measure what happened, a sense of guilt, hiding, their human autonomy at first innocent, now guilt-laden.

The way I see it, sin is leaving God out of our lives, seeking after wisdom, knowledge, good, evil, right and wrong and determining by our own understanding how we should thus live.

The knowledge of good and evil is to come by way of the revelation of God, not by self seeking what appears to be good to eat and then partaking of it.

As to Cain's offering, God gave both seed to the sower and bread to the eater and all the beasts of the field.

Yet, Abel's was better...and I think Havok nailed it there.

Faith...but I would not rule out the thought that without blood there is no remission for sin. Grain offerings are not sin-offerings per-se.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/9 16:47

I see Eve as being beguiled according to scripture, but Adam sinned, I believe it came down to his love for Eve over his love for God, along with obedience. But I am very simplistic in my understanding of this account. I have read some pretty head scratching things about it from a great many different authors but I still tend toward simple. I can see the faith aspect in as much as they could not eat of it in faith so what is not of faith is sin but I really think it goes deeper than that

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/9 19:31

Thank you all for your posts! Much food for thought. Let me think about all you have written and reply asap.

Blessings

Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2018/1/9 19:41

Yes Amen, faith is a primary factor but faith in *whom* is the question?

Technically everything we do is an act of faith in something or someone but only those things which are done in faith towards God are acceptable to Him.

For example, I have faith that my home will support my family and keep them warm and dry, otherwise I wouldn't subject them to it-

However that is not necessarily faith towards God...

The same could be said for doctors, financial institutions, etc... but just because I believe the doctor can heal my sickness a

and go in faith to receive said healing doesn't mean that I am necessarily believing in and acting in faith towards God.

So what is the object of faith?

(For me) Abel believed all that was needed was already provided by God and he acted in faith according to this belief- Cain on the other hand believed his own efforts would be accounted as righteous and acted in faith according to this belief-

One had faith in God

The other had faith in his own works...

In my reading of scripture (which may be flawed as I can only walk in the light I have at any given time) every time the "act in faith" clause is present it is understood that this is faith in or towards God. Where as the Pharisees acted in faith also, but their faith was in the works they performed to make them righteous and were outright rebuked for it.

Abraham is another example as he offered what was provided by God (Isaac) and not what was made by his own efforts (Ishmael)...

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/9 19:57

The way you phrased faith and framed it was very enlightening and great food for thought, I will be chewing on that as well as what others have said on this thread for sometime. Reread it a few times more I am sure. God bless

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:10

Todd wrote:

"I did it my way" is the ultimate statement and description of sin."

Yes.

Isaiah 55:8-9

"For My thoughts are not your thoughts,
Nor are your ways My ways," declares the LORD.
"For as the heavens are higher than the earth,
So are My ways higher than your ways
And My thoughts than your thoughts."

Jer. 10:23

I know, O LORD, that a man's way is not in himself,
Nor is it in a man who walks to direct his steps.

Ps. 37:23

The steps of a man are established by the LORD,
And He delights in his way.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:16

Hi William,

You said:

"Instead of loving Him, glorifying Him, trusting Him and obeying Him we want to be Him.
This is the root of sin."

Agree.

Ex. 20:3 - You shall have no other gods before Me.

(NLT: You must not have any other god but me.)

Never self/"I" as god, definitely!

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:19

Fletcher wrote:

“Cain offered the “fruits” of his own works...

whereas Able took what the Lord had provided and offered from that portion.

This (for me) illustrates quite well the Atonement, where God Himself provided the offering in Jesus- whereas the Pharisees (like Cain) offered the fruits of their religious works. When looked at through the lens of righteousness as a requirement; one is offering what God has provided (His righteousness) while the other is offering the work of their own hand (self-righteousness).

“This seems, to me, to be one of the major patterns addressed throughout the whole of scripture and especially in Paul’s epistles.

At the end of the day, the only acceptable things we have to offer God is what He has given us but all too often we offer what “we have done” which is really just self-righteousness or pride...”

AMEN!

This is a gem!

Thank you, brother Fletcher.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:21

havok20x wrote:

“The book of Hebrews actually clarifies this for us:

“Hebrews 11:4--By faith Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, through which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and through it he being dead still speaks.”

Agree. Faith is the secret.

Fletcher wrote:

“So what is the object of faith?

“(For me) Abel believed all that was needed was already provided by God and he acted in faith according to this belief-

Cain on the other hand believed his own efforts would be accounted as righteous and acted in faith according to this belief-

“One had faith in God

The other had faith in his own works...”

Yes!

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:24

Hi Marvin,

You wrote:

“God said “ye shall not eat of the tree”™. The sin from the outset lay in just eating of the tree let alone what the tree might produce in us.”

You are taking words away from what God said.

God said:

“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*****.”

God was not after robotic obedience or God could have just created robots and He would be spared the countless heart aches that errant mankind has given Him since creation.

God created man as intelligent beings and gave man a will that man may align his will with God’s™ will which is a supremely good will.

Jer. 29:11 - 'For I know the plans that I have for you,' declares the LORD, 'plans for welfare and not for calamity to give you a future and a hope.’™

God’s™ real concern is that man should choose the right way and have life and not death.

Ezekiel 18:32 - "For I have no pleasure in the death of anyone who dies," declares the Lord GOD.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/10 8:27

havok20x wrote:

“I don't think it is right to say that just because it was the fruit of the ground that it was unacceptable. After all, these types of offerings were acceptable in the OT Law.”

Dohzman wrote:

“Gen 3 :17. Gen 5:29. I wonder if maybe offering God something from the ground that was cursed, the 2nd ref being toil denoting works?”

Excellent food for thought.

Still thinking

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/1/10 9:10

Jade,

I really appreciate the way you are handling this conversation.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/10 12:00

Hi Jade:

I'm not sure where I subtracted from God's word.

Maybe because I didnt finish the scripture text itself?

Here's the gist of it.

What command was broken?

Gen 3:3 but God said, 'You shall not eat of the fruit of the tree that is in the midst of the garden, neither shall you touch it, lest you die.'

That is the command of God, therefore I quoted only a portion of the text. The first sin was disobeying God in partaking of what God had forbidden. (speaking in general terms)

But why the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?

I can think of a couple of reasons.

That tree could very well be re-labeled Morality tree, Law tree, Code of ethics tree.

What state was Adam and Eve in at the time of their temptation? Sinlessness. They were perfect, no alienation from God, no guilt, no sinful nature...perfect images of God living in the world.

What did satan do? He brought into question two things.

Their own condition was lacking therefore they needed the tree's fruit. Gen 3:6 So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate, and she also gave some to her husband who was with her, and he ate.

The key phrase I want to emphasize is "tree was to be desired to make one wise,"

Eve bought into the temptation because of the good that could come to her from that tree. As Paul says...The law is good.

But the irony is Eve didn't need this "perceived improvement". She was already perfectly acceptable as-is.

1Ti 1:9 understanding this, that the law is not laid down for the just but for the lawless and disobedient,

Adam and Eve in this state was already just.

Remember the initial command? "Thou shalt not eat"?, yet she was going to break the command of God to improve herself in the sight of God.

The picture in Genesis can also display very early on what it means for man to disobey God and yet run to the law of God for wisdom and justification of himself. That theme runs the entire length of scripture and this scene with Satan tempting mankind to 'improve himself' against the commands of God is as common as dirt.

Hopefully you can see I intended no deception with a lack of quotation.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/10 17:21

Quote:

----- What command was broken?

What if we were to explore God's direct words to Cain:

"Why are you angry?"

and then:

"Sin is crouching at your door".

What is the sin God is speaking of?

Is it not something about Cain himself, a condition of his heart, something that explained his bad countenance... something that motivated him to murder?

What could have made Cain THAT evil?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/10 17:36

What if God had never said "thou shalt not"?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/10 17:54

What if God had never said "thou shalt not"?

Todd, there's always one of 'those guys' in the crowd...)

Molinism is annoying to me.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/10 18:57

Sorry Marvin but I truly have no idea what molinism is.

I grant you it was a rhetorical question.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/10 19:03

Todd: yea it was rhetorical...and normal people need not concern themselves Molinism. God's middle knowledge.

Re: just wondering - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/10 21:42

I was looking fresh at Cain offering and the wording of Ables offering, I wonder how close in age these two were, if maybe Cain gave the first fruits or possibly he may have given just to keep up with his brother out of obligation like Anais and Sapphira in the book of Acts, their act got them killed by the Hand of God, ouch!

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/10 21:47

My impression has always been that Cain withheld his best for himself and gave God leftovers, so I tend to agree Dohz.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/11 2:13

Dohzman wrote:

"maybe Cain gave the first fruits or possibly he may have given just to keep up with his brother out of obligation like Anais and Sapphira in the book of Acts, their act got them killed by the Hand of God, ouch!"

Todd wrote:

"My impression has always been that Cain withheld his best for himself and gave God leftovers, so I tend to agree Dohz."

Sorry, but where in the Bible is that written???

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/11 2:14

havok20x

Thanks for the support!

Much appreciated.

Blessings

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/11 2:16

Hi Marvin and Diane,

Will reply to your posts when free asap.

Blessings

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/11 7:18

//Sorry, butâ€”where in the Bible is that written???

If the Bible was explicit about what Cainâ€™s sin was exactly, your OP would not have been necessary. We are left to conjecture.

We can know one thing with certainty- the core of his sin was that he chose to do something (whatever that was) his way, and not Godâ€™s way.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/11 7:29

Hi Diane,

The text in Gen. 4:7 is:

"And if you do not do well, sin is crouching at the door"

How do you interpret "And if you do not do well" ?

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/11 7:54

Todd,

You wrote:

"We can know one thing with certainty- the core of his sin was that he chose to do something (whatever that was) his way, and not Godâ€™s way. "

Do you disagree that the "something" he did was the offering he brought to God?

You also said:

"If the Bible was explicit about what Cain's sin was exactly, your OP would not have been necessary."

We know that Cain brought an offering to God of the fruit of the ground and God had no regard for it. So my OP asked: "What is bad about what Cain did?" Scripture does interpret scripture and I have not yet found scripture to throw light on why the offering of the fruit of the ground Cain brought to God was bad.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/1/11 9:30

We know that from the verse in Hebrews, that Cain's lack of faith was the main issue. Did that manifest itself in him keeping the best for himself? Did it manifest itself in him offering what was left over? Did he offer the best, but not really believe that it was going to do anything? Did he simply do it because his younger brother did it? We will not know the answers to any of those questions--all we know is that God rejected his offering, that Cain's lack of faith was the main reason, and that the lack of faith is what helped to breed sin. Cain had no faith, expected the same results as Abel, and the result was the murder of Abel.

Romans 14:23 and the principals behind that whole chapter may apply here.

"But he who doubts is condemned if he eats, because he does not eat from faith; for whatever is not from faith is sin."

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/11 10:47

It's not spelled out specifically but seems to make sense when you read the account from Gen 4. I imagine if Cain would have given to The Lord the first fruits of the ground that the written account would have been more specific as it is with Abel's offering. Other than that I do not have a specific verse. It seems to make sense though, what do you think?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/11 11:29

Hi Jade-

I don't think the problem was that Cain brought vegetables/grain/fruit and Abel brought blood.

Being a tiller of the soil seems to mean that Cain would value those things. As a shepherd Abel valued his lambs. It is not clear that the lambs were Cain's to bring. They were not his.

In my heart of hearts I do not believe that God rejected Cain's offering because it was not a blood sacrifice. It is possible but I do not believe that is what the passage teaches us. His sacrifice was rejected because of his heart condition.

In that context, "doing well" means having a pure heart that is right towards God.

Re: - posted by TheophilusMD (), on: 2018/1/11 12:04

By faith Abel brought God a better offering than Cain did. By faith he was commended as righteous, when God spoke well of his offerings. And by faith Abel still speaks, even though he is dead. (Hebrews 11:3)

By faith. I believe this is where the answer is found. I think it was Ron Bailey who gave a simple, practical definition of faith and that is - "the right response to the word/revelation of God" The sacrifice of Cain was not accepted because he offered something which he may have thought was best or at least good for God and NOT what the Lord wanted him to offer. He made the choice what to offer rather than give to God what He asked from him. Whatever was not offered by faith, however wonderful and good it may seem, is sin.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/11 14:52

I forgot all about those passagesby faith..... good reminder

I want to tell you all on this thread - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/11 18:02

Just wanted to say to every one on this thread thank you. I have received much food for thought and have been reminded about some faith principles I just plain forgot about, this has been to me personally a productive thread.

Re: I want to tell you all on this thread - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/11 18:57

Texts like the Cain and Able story reveal bits and pieces of what it means to bring an offering and it be rejected and yet another's offering accepted. I like to look downstream of human history where I can find much more detail than the Cain and Able passages.

I hope if you peruse this text you can see the same thing, (Cain quality sacrifices) and God's reaction to them.

Isa 1:10 Hear the word of the Lord, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah.
11 To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the Lord: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.
12 When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?
13 Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting.
14 Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them.
15 And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.
16 Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil;
17 Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.
18 Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.
19 If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land:
20 But if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

Instead of trying to nail down the specific sin of Cain in this instance (not saying any previous posts were wrong) I like to see where God does discern their hearts and then speak about it plainly so that I have a fuller understanding of 'rejected sacrifices' that can be understood in principle and matched up so I can recognize it in a New Covenant context.

The Cain Able passage is eluded to by the writer of Hebrews (well done Havok and others) This faith=acceptance of an offering seems key to the opposite in Cain. But it is still bare bones so to speak. As Todd said earlier, lots of room for conjecture.

But Isaiah texts' now that is so full and meaty I come to a full course meal rather than a single morsel given in Genesis 4

The bible does a constant unveiling of the human heart and the character of God, Genesis gives me a snapshot of a failed sacrifice to God, Isaiah gives me a Rembrandt.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/12 8:57

Hi Marvin,

You wrote:

â€œBut why the tree of the knowledge of good and evil?

I can think of a couple of reasons.

That tree could very well be re-labeled Morality tree, Law tree, Code of ethics tree.â€

I have a different view.

The Bible does give us a very good illustration of what the knowledge of good and evil is.

The key scriptures are:

Deut. 1:39 - Moreover, your little ones who you said would become a prey, and your sons, who this day have no knowledge of good or evil, shall enter there, and I will give it to them and they shall possess it.

Heb. 3:19 - So we see that they were not able to enter because of unbelief.

The children who could enter the land were the ones who had no knowledge of good and evil. Therefore the men who could not enter the land and died in the wilderness were the men who had knowledge of good and evil. Heb. 3:19 says that they could not enter because of "unbelief". Therefore we can link the "knowledge of good and evil" with "unbelief".

If we dig into the story of those men who died in the wilderness, we would be able to see the "knowledge of good and evil" and "unbelief" illustrated.

This is their story:

God had delivered the children of Israel out of their bondage in Egypt and Moses had led them to Kadesh-barnea. There Moses said to them:

Deut. 1:20-21 "You have come to the hill country of the Amorites which the LORD our God is about to give us. See, the LORD your God has placed the land before you; go up, take possession, as the LORD, the God of your fathers, has spoken to you. Do not fear or be dismayed."

Instead of trusting God to lead them, the men said to Moses:

Deut. 1:22 "Let us send men before us, that they may search out the land for us, and bring back to us word of the way by which we should go up and the cities which we shall enter."

So Moses chose 12 men, one from each tribe, and they went to spy the land.

They came back with some of the pomegranates and the figs and a branch with a single cluster of grapes that had to be carried on a pole between two men (Num. 11:23). They gave this report:

Deut. 1:25 "It is a good land which the LORD our God is about to give us."

Num. 13:27 "It certainly does flow with milk and honey, and this is its fruit."

And then, their fears and doubts when Moses had said to them "Do not fear or be dismayed":

Num. 13:28-29 "Nevertheless, the people who live in the land are strong, and the cities are fortified and very large; and moreover, we saw the descendants of Anak there. Amalek is living in the land of the Negev and the Hittites and the Jebusites and the Amorites are living in the hill country, and the Canaanites are living by the sea and by the side of the Jordan."

Num. 13:21 "We are not able to go up against the people, for they are too strong for us."

Num. 13:32-33 - So they gave out to the sons of Israel a bad report of the land which they had spied out, saying, "The land through which we have gone, in spying it out, is a land that devours its inhabitants; and all the people whom we saw in it are men of great size. There also we saw the Nephilim (the sons of Anak are part of the Nephilim); and we became like grasshoppers in our own sight, and so we were in their sight."

They grumbled in their tents and said:

Deut. 1:27 "Because the LORD hates us, He has brought us out of the land of Egypt to deliver us into the hand of the Amorites to destroy us."

Num. 13:4 - So they said to one another, "Let us appoint a leader and return to Egypt."

Moses said to them:

Deut. 1:29-31 "Do not be shocked, nor fear them. The LORD your God who goes before you will Himself fight on your behalf, just as He did for you in Egypt before your eyes, and in the wilderness where you saw how the LORD your God carried you, just as a man carries his son, in all the way which you have walked until you came to this place."

But in this matter they did not trust the Lord their God, who went before them on their way, to seek a place for them to encamp, in fire by night and cloud by day, to show them the way in which they should go (Deut. 1:32-33).

Contrast with the faith of Joshua and Caleb:

Num. 14:6-10 - Joshua the son of Nun and Caleb the son of Jephunneh, of those who had spied out the land, tore their clothes; and they spoke to all the congregation of the sons of Israel, saying, "The land which we passed through to spy out is an exceedingly good land. If the LORD is pleased with us, then He will bring us into this land and give it to us-- a land which flows with milk and honey. Only do not rebel against the LORD; and do not fear the people of the land, for they will be our prey. Their protection has been removed from them, and the LORD is with us; do not fear them." But all the congregation said to stone them with stones.

So the Lord said to them:

Deut 1:35 "Not one of these men, this evil generation, shall see the good land which I swore to give your fathers"

Num. 14:29 "except Caleb the son of Jephunneh and Joshua the son of Nun."

Deut. 1:39 - Moreover, your little ones who you said would become a prey, and your sons, who this day have no knowledge of good or evil, shall enter there, and I will give it to them and they shall possess it.

Heb. 3:19 - So we see that they were not able to enter because of unbelief.

Heb. 11:6 - And without faith it is impossible to please Him, for he who comes to God must believe that He is and that He is a rewarder of those who seek Him.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/12 13:10

Hi Jade:

Wow: what a nice long post to explain your view, I appreciate that.

There are a couple of things that I cannot reconcile in my own mind regarding your viewpoint.

1. That text is part of Moses rehearsal of all the events from the failure to enter the promised land unto the crossing of the Jordan into the land to possess it.

Vs 39 speaking of their very young children "and your sons, who this day have no knowledge of good or evil," is referring to their extreme young age...they had yet to be taught at all the language, customs or laws pertaining to them.

(I don't think is a debating point)

But how you incorporated it into the Genesis text feels like apples and oranges to me so in that way it becomes debatable.

You were upfront on your train of thought...

Therefore we can link the "knowledge of good and evil" with "unbelief".

But when I read the Genesis account Eve's temptation had nothing to do with being tempted to partake of 'unbelief', what she was tempted by was "wisdom, like-god status"

She fully expected knowledge when she partook, she didn't expect 'unbelief' of knowledge from the tree.

Now where it gets a little weedy, Eve did show 'unbelief' in that she disobeyed God's command "thou shalt not eat of the tree...." and chose to believe the Serpent's claims which are "you will be as gods, and you will not die" The foundation for all of this lay upon the insinuation "Gen 3:5 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.

Meaning God knows once you eat this fruit you will be as gods...so it will no surprise to God once he sees your "as god" status change.

So, for me, I cannot reconcile unbelief being "knowing good and evil" either from the Genesis account or the Deuteronomy account.

If what you said was misunderstood by me...well I've had fly-over before, please correct my understanding.

Thanks for the dialog.

Re: - posted by havok20x, on: 2018/1/12 20:36

I found another verse that helps explain things I think:

Jas 3:13-16 "Who is wise and understanding among you? Let him show by good conduct that his works are done in the meekness of wisdom. But if you have bitter envy and self-seeking in your hearts, do not boast and lie against the truth. This wisdom does not descend from above, but is earthly, sensual, demonic. For where envy and self-seeking exist, confusion and every evil thing are there.

Cain most certainly experienced envy and self-seeking

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/12 21:02

I see the test of Adam and Eve as a thou shalt not, the same test that was given through the law, thou shalt not, there is something in the nature of man that responds to that by I will, therefore when Jesus came He laid down things like deny yourself take up the cross and follow me. The whole of the sin nature is born in all of mankind, I understand what has been said about faith, belief, etc but I believe it takes an act of God to save us. I see in scripture Eve beguiled, but Adam sinned, I believe his sin was willful and motivated by his love for Eve over his love for God and because of that 1 act of disobedience the nature of sin, man's self will, has been passed down to all mankind. I have often wondered what the outcome would have been had Adam would have stood steadfast in obedience to God's command not to partake of The Tree of The Knowledge of Good and Evil..

I see the sin nature expressed in Cain because he saw God and really needed no faith there, but the belief portion of Hebrews I haven't reconciled as of yet in my thinking.

Re: - posted by rbanks, on: 2018/1/12 21:50

Notice the scriptures:

Genesis 3:4-6 (KJV) 4 And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: 5 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. 6 And when the woman saw that the tree good for food, and that it pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat.

Notice the scripture says when she saw and this seeing came after she was under the temptation of the serpent. He told her that she would not die like God had said, and that God was just keeping her back from her eyes being opened to being on par with the gods in knowing good and evil.

It is plain to see that Eve disobeyed God's clear command because she listened to the serpent who deceived her into thinking that God was holding her back from something that was good for her to have. She disobeyed God in taking an action independent of God, that was forbidden, so that she could become a god in knowing and receiving everything that she thought would be good for her. This is the sin of the devil and this is the sin of the human race to become their own god in deciding what is best for themselves, instead of being submitted to the Almighty Living God in loving obedience.

Notice the scriptures:

Genesis 4:3-7 (KJV) 3 And in process of time it came to pass, that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering unto the LORD. 4 And Abel, he also brought of the firstlings of his flock and of the fat thereof. And the LORD had respect unto Abel and to his offering: 5 But unto Cain and to his offering he had not respect. And Cain was very wroth, and his countenance fell. 6 And the LORD said unto Cain, Why art thou wroth? and why is thy countenance fallen? 7 If thou doest well, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou doest not well, sin lieth at the door. And unto thee his desire, and thou shalt rule over him.

Hebrews 11:4 (KJV) 4 By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts: and by it he being dead yet speaketh.

It is clear from scripture that the offering that Abel brought to the Lord was an offering of faith that pleased God. The Bible says without faith it is impossible to please God. Cain's offering was not of faith that pleases God. The scripture also says that what is not of faith is sin.

God accepted the offering of Abel because He came to God the way God prescribed and Cain didn't. The scriptures says that Cain got angry because what he did wasn't what God wanted. Now this attitude is sin and leads to more sins which cause Cain to murder his brother. If Cain had been humble before God and brought an offering of faith for his sins, because he was a sinner needing atonement for his sins, then God would have accepted him and his offering.

The biggest problem with mankind today is that they think they know more than the God who gave us His Son Jesus Christ to redeem us from all sin. Many don't want to submit to God and His way, they want Him to accept them on their terms, but it ain't gonna happen. Jesus is the way, the truth, the life, and no man can come unto the Father, but only by Him. Jesus paid it all and all to Him we owe! We must come to God through faith in His Son Jesus Christ on the ground of His shed blood, by His atoning sacrifice for our sins.

Blessings...rbanks

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/12 23:27

Jade if you could succinctly state how you equate "the knowledge of good and evil" with "unbelief" it would help me decide if I am tracking with you. As it stands I am not sure.

If you are likening worldly wisdom to knowledge of good and evil (ie you believe they are synonymous) I think I agree with you. But you must take one step further and equate worldly wisdom to unbelief. I believe that worldly wisdom sets the stage for unbelief, but I don't think unbelief necessarily follows from worldly wisdom.

To put it another way, a person full of worldly wisdom is perhaps more likely to fall into unbelief.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/13 0:27

Hi Marvin,

You said,

"Vs 39 speaking of their very young children "and your sons, who this day have no knowledge of good or evil," is referring to their extreme young age...they had yet to be taught at all the language, customs or laws pertaining to them.

Yes and too young also to eat of the tree that was desirable to make one wise to reason and rebel against God.

Mark 10:14-15 - Permit the children to come to Me; do not hinder them; for the kingdom of God belongs to such as these. Truly I say to you, whoever does not receive the kingdom of God like a child will not enter it at all.

These were the children who had absolute trust in God who crossed Jordan to take Jericho solely by the grace of God.

How did they do it?

They marched round the city once for 6 days. And on the seventh day they marched round the city 7 times, seven priests blew the trumpets of ram horns they were carrying before the ark, the people shouted and the walls of Jericho fell down.

Heb. 11:30 ' By faith the walls of Jericho fell down, after they had been encircled for seven days.

You also said:

"You were upfront on your train of thought...

Therefore we can link the "knowledge of good and evil" with "unbelief".

But when I read the Genesis account Eve's temptation had nothing to do with being tempted to partake of 'unbelief', what she was tempted by was "wisdom, like-god status"

She fully expected knowledge when she partook, she didn't expect 'unbelief' of knowledge from the tree.

What is faith but the absolute trust and dependence on God that by His divine power He will grant us everything we need for life and godliness (2 Pet. 1:3).

1 Cor. 8:6 (ESV) - yet for us there is one God, the Father, from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things and through whom we exist.

When Adam and Eve chose to have their own "wisdom, like-god status" did they not also turn away from faith in God to faith in themselves so that for them there is "us" from whom are all things and for whom we exist, and "us" through whom are all things and through whom we exist?

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/13 7:31

Todd, If I were to give you a reply as per your requirements I will be going the way of worldly wisdom. But I will still like to give you a reply. Will do so tomorrow as I have run out of time today.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/13 10:13

Haha take your time!

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/14 3:33

OK....reply when free.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/15 0:50

While we are trying to dig out a library from a few obscure verses on Cain's failing sacrifices. Allow me to question another assumption.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil. I conjecture it is a law tree, tree of morality or ethics. This tree is God given and God designed. In other words it is holy, right and true.

I do not see anywhere the tree is alluded to as a tree of human wisdom or a tree of natural knowledge like nature, biology etc. There are no allusions to the tree being anything but holy.

My concern is our present (and mine over the years) interpretation make this tree into a 'human wisdom tree'. But God didn't design fallen-sinful-arrogant-human-concepts. God's actions are always pure; any wisdom God has is altogether holy, perfect, righteous and glorious. There is no knowledge of good or evil that God has which is not altogether perfect. Our preachers and I myself have said (in times past) it is something other than what it is purported to be in scripture. But recently I have been moving more and more away from this idea simply because it's a confusion. (at least to me)

The law is good and holy Paul said in Rom 7, but our sinfulness causes to at least two things to occur in relating to the good and evil= God's moral standard.

1. We amplify our sins because the law just exposes the sinfulness of our condition, it has no power remedy the sinful nature. (this is what happened after eating of the tree, they knew they were naked and were afraid)
2. We attempt to deceive ourselves by using the moral standard of God to judge other as to their failures and we judge ourselves as victims of the deeds of others (so Adam did....Gen 3:12 And the man said, The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat.)

I am attempting to clarify two things, namely the sin and the command. Rom 7:11 For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me.

Rom 7:12 Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.

Rom 7:13 Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful.

The Romans text tends to shed more light on the workings that occurred from eating of that tree rather than the human wisdom interpretation.

But someone will say "yea Marv, but isn't it human wisdom to hide from God, blame others or justify yourself by the law?"

Yes it is, but this is why I quoted the Romans 7:13 text.

Eve need beguiling= to seduce or lead astray before she became willing to eat. Because Satan knew that sin would work death in Eve by what was good.

Like all things Satan seeks to corrupt, he takes that which is good and twists it into what is evil, human wisdom is never of itself something evil, it only becomes evil when it is combined with the sinful nature willing to use that wisdom for its own ends and not the glory of God.

This very thing the Jews did with the law; what was the crowing point of the law for the Jew? "righteousness by the keeping of the law"

Without become tedious on this point, I submit that claiming the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is 'human wisdom' is probably in error. I think more exactly the self-serving human nature attempts to use the tree of morality for justifying its own means and its own ends. Such as humanity does the world over. One thing is not the other. God's morality and ethics are perfect and pure, mankind's perverse use of that standard modified again and again and again combined with human autonomy gives rise to everything from atheism to every false religion in the world. The bad fruit growing from the bad soil of the human heart does not prove the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is itself evil and corrupt.

The temptation as I said before was for Eve to get an 'improvement' from that tree, not realizing she needed no improvement and all the wisdom to become everything that God wanted was resident right there in himself...and available from him by revelation, not helping-themselves to what was forbidden in order to be 'better'. They didn't need the morality tree, because they were perfect and the forbidding of it was to preserve their perfection and the direct revelation they could have from God himself.

Submitted for your discernment.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/15 8:01

Hi Todd,

On second thoughts I have decided not to give you a reply as what I wanted to say is really a digression from the topic of this thread.

Blessings

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/15 8:03

Hi Marvin,

I am trying to follow what you wrote....

Are you equating the tree of the knowledge of good and evil with the law?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/15 11:24

Jade: Yes, the knowledge of good and evil equates to Law or morality or ethics or blessings or cursings, or righteousness or unrighteousness.

Just an aside.

In the midst of the garden there are two trees, the forbidden one is 'good and evil'...one wonders why the tree of life was banned only after they had sinned?

Probably because in their perfect state they were commandment keepers and therefore had access.

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

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/15 15:52

What a joy to return and see this thread developing! I'm convinced that we get further ahead by taking time to consider the bigger picture.

Quote:

----- from the verse in Hebrews, that Cain's lack of faith was the main issue.

In other words, it's an issue of works vs faith. Cain was trying to earn God's favour, Abel trusted in God's grace. This would support the theme of scripture:

Quote:

----- The bible does a constant unveiling of the human heart and the character of God

I'm more inclined to view the Tree of Knowledge, not as a cause of Cain's sin, but as the experiential outcome of universal sin. I'll comment on this:

Quote:

----- The bad fruit growing from the bad soil of the human heart does not prove the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is itself evil and corrupt.

I see this "tree" as a pictorial expression of a state of being, meaning: the conscious awareness of good and evil, a form of self-consciousness which comes as a result of sin: "Their eyes were opened and they saw their nakedness (something wrong about them)." Gen. 3:7. They became self-conscious. Compare that to our bodily condition: We would not be conscious of good health if there was no such thing as bad health. Apart from bad health, the idea of health would be non-existent in our minds. Sadly, because our eyes are "opened" to the condition of good vs bad health, our consciences are burdened by rules, ideals, whatever it takes to avoid all that bad health that troubles our lives. Is that not true for the spiritual condition as well?

Jade comments:

Quote:

-----The children who could enter the land were the ones who had no knowledge of good and evil.

Jade, Do you mean that they couldn't tell the difference between good and evil? I'd agree with that. Still, would you agree that had the experiential knowledge of both good and evil? (Note, I'm using "knowledge" in a different way).

Quote:

----- ...one wonders why the tree of life was banned only after they had sinned?

It's been said that this tree of life was forbidden because we cannot live eternally in our sinful condition (defiled conscience, lack of innocence, shame-bound, separated from God). God never provided a way back into the Garden of Eden for eternal life. The Tree of life is in the next life, attained through FAITH, trusting in God's grace.

Now, applying that to Jade's question:

Quote:

----- The text in Gen. 4:7 is: "And if you do not do well, sin is crouching at the door"

How do you interpret "And if you do not do well" ?

Surely this is about belief, as already noted. God pointed out that if Cain didn't get a handle on this he would be consumed by it, through his unabated anger (over God rejecting his "works".)

Cain was a legalist. Isn't that the fruit of the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil?

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/15 17:17

Marvin,

So as not to be lost in too many words, first:

You said:

“The tree of the knowledge of good and evil” is holy, right and true.

Gen. 2:17 - but from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat

Question:

If the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is holy, right and true why can't it be eaten? Wouldn't Adam and Eve become holy and right if they eat of it?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/15 18:12

Hi Jade, thanks for the question,

I explained why I believe they were forbidden to eat it.

"They were already perfect, there was nothing from that tree that they needed".

In an earlier post I quoted Paul...1Ti 1:8 But we know that the law is good, if a man use it lawfully;

1Ti 1:9 Knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane, for murderers of fathers and murderers of mothers, for manslayers,

1Ti 1:10 For whoremongers, for them that defile themselves with mankind, for menstealers, for liars, for perjured persons, and if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine;

specifically "...the law is not made for a righteous man"

Adam and Eve were perfect, there was no need for any law, or any knowledge of good and evil = morality seeing as they were already perfectly moral, perfectly righteous and sinless in the sight of God.

This is an important underlying truth about God's law.

The law of God presupposes something about human nature, namely, that it is already sinful, blinded to God's word and willingly disobedient to God. This equates to our sinful nature inherent in all of Adam's progeny.

God forbid them from touching that tree because there was nothing to be gained by it, the law presupposes sin indwelling and Eve had no 'indwelling sin', nor did she have a sinful nature.

So, in order to protect Eve's righteous understanding of herself she was forbidden. (there may be other reasons I don't see)

But this is EXACTLY where Satan attacked, it was to presuppose her condition inherently lacked wisdom and godlikeness...and here's the strange part; Why not go directly to God herself? She already had perfect access every moment, but Satan needed Eve to act autonomously (act according to her own will and for her own reasons) to gain a wisdom or god-

likenss.

Important side note:

Now, its very important when attempting to understanding biblical truth from events that are designed to show very limited detail that we do not "infer, extrapolate, or conjecture" our way into an encyclopedic quantity of assumptions when there is absolutely no reason for us to do so. It's a dangerous hermeneutic and the upside is rare.

God is the source of wisdom and godliness for us, it has never been our own estimation of ourselves as 'being wise' or godly.

As you can see, the very fall of man is representative of our human natures seeking justification for ourselves by the use of morality and ethics. But God shows us the righteous do not need to justify themselves by any law, God has done that when "in Christ were were justified from all things" and are now 'new creations in Christ Jesus'. But this is an extrapolation from a variety of biblical sources that I can overlay the fall of man so as to recognize again from the beginning of man Satan's quest to bring men to evil by acting autonomously, seeking justification by the law that can only show their sinfulness. For Satan, this is where he wants to end every story, but Genesis is the beginning of the Story of Jesus Christ emerging from the fall of man.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/15 19:47

Adam was told ,thou shalt not....there is a good possibility that Eve was not present and latter she received those instructions from Adam, hence in the ensuing judgement she became subject to man, her desire, etc... Adam sinned by following Eves council, but Eve was beguiled. They were removed from the garden of eden afterward so they could not eat from the Tree of life, in other words God spared them eternal damnation, note The Lord covered them with an animals skin, hence God Himself performed the first sacrifice and made atonement by it and covered thier nakedness. As to the subject of righteousness it is an action word and kin to a more passive one called justification. When we come to the 10 Commandments given by Moses, the same thou shalt nots were present and had the same effects, something in the heart of man rebelâ€™s against that, but with the 10 Commandments came a process of atonement, or at one mention. God made away for His people to stay in communion with Him.

Social norms vary greatly around the world and that is a very broad subject and very difficult to equate into an ethic that strives to be a son of god.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/15 21:52

Hi Marvin,

You wrote:

â€™ explained why I believe they were forbidden to eat it.

â€™â€™They were already perfect, there was nothing from that tree that they neededâ€™â€™.

If, as you say, the tree is holy and good and they were perfect, what is wrong in adding more holiness to holiness? Or, what is wrong in eating of a holy tree that will most certainly not ruin their holiness?

I see the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as an evil tree that will ruin their holiness and that is why they must not eat of it.

And you wrote:

â€™Why not go directly to God herself? She already had perfect access every moment, but Satan needed Eve to act autonomously (act according to her own will and for her own reasons) to gain a wisdom or god-likenss.â€™

â€™God is the source of wisdom and godliness for usâ€™â€™

â€™from the beginning of man Satan's quest to bring men to evil by acting autonomouslyâ€™

Agree.

Do you disagree that when Satan tempted Eve to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, his intention was to get them to move out of God and into themselves i.e. into the self-life and into Satan's own kingdom i.e. the world? In other words:

It was through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that Adam and Eve were brought out of God and into self-life and into Satan's kingdom.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/16 11:10

What if Eve had taken a bite but spit it out before swallowing the fruit?

I am not merely being silly; it goes to the issue of whether it was the fruit itself or the act of eating that was the problem.

Presumably at face value the fruit on the tree of life had to be eaten for its benefits to apply.

If Eve was purely innocent with no evil nature how could she possibly know she was being tempted to evil? How did she know what evil was?

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/16 14:45

The bigger question is why is she just now seeing this tree? What was the process the devil used to draw her away? How did disobedience enter her thinking?

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/16 15:30

I have to assume there is much more to the story than is told- is there any indication how long Adam and Eve were in the garden before the fall? I suppose it could have been a long while.

For example, how did Eve know what "die" meant? God told her she would surely die if she ate of that tree. Presumably there had to be some unrecorded discussion of what "die" meant.

As we know, the surest way to make a very young child do something is to tell him/her not to do it.

I am just wondering if there was not more discussion of the TOKOGAE than what is recorded. Why wouldn't God have preemptively just placed a flaming cherubim in front of that tree like He did for the TOL?

So many questions.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/16 16:16

Hi Jade: Some interesting questions.

Allow to summarize.

I'll place my proposition into a syllogism.

Premise 1. God is perfect, Leviticus 19:2

Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am holy

Premise 2. God's works are perfect and all them righteous

Psalms 33:4 For the word of the Lord is right; and all his works are done in truth

Premise 3. God created and placed the Tree of the knowledge of good and evil in the garden of Eden.

8 And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed.

9 And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

Conclusion The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is good, righteous itself.

Now to the first question. Jade asked..."what is wrong in adding more holiness to holiness? Or, what is wrong in eating of a holy tree that will most certainly not ruin their holiness?"

The answer is not contained in the qualities of the tree, (whether they be good or bad) the issue is God declared a command:

16 And the Lord God commanded the man, saying, Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat:

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

This is THE command that Satan was twisting in such a way that Eve by his lie 'you shall not die' and by his implication Eve could improve her situation 'you shall be as gods'

Now, allow me to divert your attention to another text with very similar words and actions done by Satan to tempt Jesus. matthew 4:3 And when the tempter came to him, he said, If thou be the Son of God, command that these stones be made bread.

4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

I will draw a parallel here of the genesis account between Satan and Eve and Satan with Jesus.

Satan's temptation to Eve "act on your own behalf and eat to your benefit"

Satan's temptation to Jesus "act on your own behalf and eat"

But notice how Jesus handled the situation

"man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God"

What word was given to Adam and later taught by Adam to Eve?

She said it herself "... We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden:

3 But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die"

This command is the only command recorded and the only command Eve needed to 'live by', she didn't need anything from the tree of the knowledge of good and evil.

This is where Satan launched his attack upon Eve; Satan had to get Eve to 'eat' against the command 'not to eat'.

Jesus teaches us that to act autonomously for our own benefit is falling into the temptation of Satan and when doing so, we sin against God. Now this is important,

Jesus was hungry and bread was a real necessity for him, it was a 'good thing in itself'

Eve saw the tree was good, and the trees there were all good in and of themselves.

Where lay the sin? Was it in the nature of the bread? Or in the nature of the tree? It is neither, the sin lay in breaking the command of God...even when that 'thing' is of itself good.

Jade, your final summation

that when Satan tempted Eve to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, his intention was to get them to move out of God and into themselves i.e. into the self-life and into Satan's own kingdom i.e. the world?

I AGREE.

Then you said...

It was through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that Adam and Eve were brought out of God and into self-life and into Satan's kingdom.

I DISAGREE.

The sin was in breaking the command of God "not to eat"

The temptation for Eve and the temptation for Jesus were in most respects identical...but thank God for Jesus Christ and his wisdom and obedience.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/16 22:04

Hi Marvin,

Firstly ---

Thank you for reminding me of Gen. 2:9.

Gen. 2:9 - 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.

I will qualify my statement and say:

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is evil in the wrong hands.

Gen. 3:22 - Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil."

Only God is to have the knowledge of good and evil. Only God is to be God.

Edit:

God's knowledge of good and evil is supremely good.

Man's knowledge of good and evil is extremely evil.

Secondly ---

Consider this:

If we tell X, "If you eat this poison you will die."

And X does not believe us and eats it and dies.

Sure, he died because he ate it.

But is it the "act" of eating or the poison itself that caused his death???

Thirdly ---

What is your understanding of the tree of life?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/16 22:55

Hi Jade:

I'll answer quickly on this go round.

Jade said..I will qualify my statement and say:

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is evil in the wrong hands

I agree in general, presupposing I understand what you've said from previous posts.

Only God is to have the knowledge of good and evil. Only God is to be God.

Edit:

God's knowledge of good and evil is supremely good.
Man's knowledge of good and evil is extremely evil.

Because of our fallen state, our knowledge of good and evil is only according to the revelation by the Spirit we have received (in accordance with his word)

In a perfect state, the intimate knowledge of evil was unnecessary because there was no way of knowing what it really was. Now that we have fallen, we know it by way of having an intimate association with guilt, shame, remorse, regret, lack, doubt, fears etc.

But how do we even know those things in relation to evil?

Because of a divine communication to our soul by the power of God. God doing this to sinner and saint alike.

Consider this:

If we tell X, "If you eat this poison you will die."

And X does not believe us and eats it and dies.

Sure, he died because he ate it.

But is it the "act" of eating or the poison itself that caused his death???

In your example the poison itself is by nature deadly. The act of unbelief or the act of eating it are equally deadly.

The tree as I mentioned in the syllogism is pure, because God is pure all he does is pure.

The analogy is not identical (in my mind to the tree) therefore I make the differentiation.

The tree of life is another subject fraught with difficulties because of a lack of explicit information.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is fraught with difficulties as well...but we know it will not be replaced in the garden of God...only the tree of life.

Lastly, I want to make sure everyone is tracking the same. My understandings are drawn from inferences, and some extrapolations. While I believe I am safe in the confines of scripture, I may very well be wrong because some fundamental and explicit truths about the tree are absent in scripture text. I am not here attempting to forge doctrine from inference and extrapolation.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/17 3:16

Eccl. 12:13 - Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments: for this is the whole duty of man.

1 John 3:23 - This is His commandment, that we believe in the name of His Son Jesus Christ, and love one another, just as He commanded us.

Have faith in Jesus' Name. Christ is the great "I AM". Everything we need for life and holiness are in Him.

1 Cor. 1:30-31 -- But by His doing you are in Christ Jesus, who became to us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification, and redemption, so that, just as it is written, "LET HIM WHO BOASTS, BOAST IN THE LORD."

Moment by moment I'm kept in His love,
Moment by moment I've life from above;
Looking to Jesus till glory doth shine;
Moment by moment, O Lord, I am Thine.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/17 16:27

I think Eve's participation as having been beguiled is not the main focus here, I believe Adam's willful following her into this act is. He loved her enough to willfully disobey the directive given to him by God. Note she added to what The Lord told Adam, she said shall not touch as well as eat, which leads me to believe she received the command second hand but really did not understand what had been delivered to her.. The process by which she was beguiled has not changed, sin still draws away so that it may work its destructive force against our souls.

I believe you may be right as to the time frame and what exactly were the conversations that Adam and the Lord had in the cool of the evening.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/19 12:00

Quote:

----- The tree of life is another subject fraught with difficulties because of a lack of explicit information.

The tree of the knowledge of good and evil is fraught with difficulties as well..

Might I add another difficulty: It is our cultural programming which has shaped the way we think. In observing discussions on this topic over the years, I'd say, that it is our "scientific" way of analysis that gets in the way. We must throw out our "microscopes" and dissecting "scalpels" - and let the text simply say what it's trying to say - without trying to add explanations that fit into our own paradigms. Remove the restrictive modernist cognitive paraphernalia.

And then Cain's problem may become clearer.

I'm convinced that if we lived in 1000 BC we'd see this scripture through a different lens.

Why wouldn't the "tree of life" simply refer to eternal life as implied in Revelation, and the other tree simply refer to a conscious awareness that was never intended for humans - because humans are not God?

The "serpent" promised that their "eyes will be opened" if they chose the "fruit". What would they see?

What happened when their "eyes were opened" - after choosing the way of self-mastery, self-knowing, self-god"? What did they "see" that they never saw before?

That may help explain what was actually forbidden.

Something to consider:

Do you think that the ancient people reading Genesis believed that a Redeemer would crush a fleshly snake with his fleshly heel? Does the New Testament ever suggest that?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/19 12:46

Diane: This is another reason why people like YOU, are a blessing to me.

I no doubt am the epitome of the microscope and surgeon guy, and I a product of my culture.

Your post helps to remind me of what I am and that's a good thing.

you said...if they chose the "fruit" - in other words, self-mastery, self-knowing, self-god".

and again you said...a conscious awareness that was never intended for humans - because humans are not God?
I think this is a revelation from God you just wrote to us.

This is why I have maintained the double whammy of what happened when the tree is understood as 'the law'. Eve didn't understand the paradox as we see it now, she had to break the law of God "thou shalt not eat" in order to partake of the law of God from the tree. What was the fruit of her fallen-ness once she partook of the law as a sinner?

Rom 7:7 What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

It was because she partook of that tree, the law did it's work and she and Adam understood 'self' and 'alienation' this is what we are taught from Genesis to Revelation that the law does...it opens our eyes to what we are in relation to the holiness of God's law and God himself.

Therefore they hid themselves.

you said...

Something to consider:

Do you think that the ancient people reading Genesis believed that a Redeemer would crush a fleshly snake with his fleshly heel? Does the New Testament ever suggest that?

The word is bruise..Heb. 'shoof' to break or bruise.

Isaiah 53 speak of God 'bruising' Jesus 'daw kaw' to bruise or beat to pieces. This being done by the conspiracy of the Pharisees and Romans to put him to death on the cross.

But when the new testament speaks of Satan being bruised explicitly, it speaks of the Church doing it.

Rom 16:20 And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen.

When Jesus 'bruises' Satan it is spoken of in military terms, Col 2:14 Blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross;

Col 2:15 And having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a shew of them openly, triumphing over them in it.

here, spoiled; apekdouomai to spoil or divest for himself their power over mankind.

In effect Satan's effort to destroy Jesus turned out to be the destruction and despoiling of his own power.

in simple slang...Satan hit Adam and gained power over mankind, Satan hit Jesus and lost power over mankind.

Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2018/1/19 18:36

Isa.55:12. Indeed we all approach the Word of God with baggage. Good post Diane

Re: - posted by ManOfG0d (), on: 2018/1/19 18:53

James 4:17 KJV

Therefore to him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/19 21:10

Hi Elijah,

What is "good"?

Blessings.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/20 16:13

Quote:

----- Indeed we all approach the Word of God with baggage.

It's so hard to see how our "baggage" burdens down our thinking with a quagmire of twists and justifications.

Many years ago someone helped me see how Dispensationalism was "baggage". After that I'd stay unconvinced whenever I needed to go cross-eyed to see a "truth" in the text. I came to believe that no major doctrinal claim needs to be founded on one verse or on "eisogesis"(reading into the text) . Not sure yet how that applies here

Quote:
----- Eve didn't understand the paradox as we see it now, she had to break the law of God "thou shalt not eat" in order to partake of the law of God from the tree.

So her eyes were opened to something that innocence protects one from. I still suspect this is about the experiential 'knowing', as in, a conscious awareness. (Here again, we so easily apply our cognitive conditioning 'where' 'knowing' is synonymous with conceptual information (know ABOUT).

It seems that the 'tree' represented a spiritual law that cannot be defied, just as gravity is a natural law that cannot be defied. We could tell people: 'thou shalt not disobey the law of gravity'. Really, they can't defy this law even if they tried! But they can experience (know) the consequences of trying to defy gravity. (you get hurt, or die).

When humanity disobeyed and 'ditched' God (which they can't actually do) they imposed the need for laws, as in rules. (Is that what the "tree" becomes for sinners? imposed laws? Naturally, the outcome would be irreconcilable guilt - alienation from God.

Quote:
----- Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet.

What a burden to carry - because of sin.

There's one word in the text that's key I think, and doesn't readily accommodate our legal/law frame of mind. It's the word: SHAME 'at the beginning and at the end of the Bible. Why is this word 'shame' used when 'sin' might have made more sense to us? (The word "sin" isn't even found in the account of the fall).

"SHAME" - WAS ABSENT BEFORE THE FALL:
'The man and his wife were both naked, and they felt NO SHAME'. Gen. 2:25

WAS PRESENT AFTER THE FALL
'Then the eyes of both of them were opened, and they realized they were naked; so they made coverings for themselves.' Gen. 3:10

THE FRUIT OF SALVATION:
'Anyone who believes in him will never be put to shame.' Romans 10:11

ABSENT IN THE NEW 'JERUSALEM':
'Blessed is the one who stays awake and remains clothed, so as not to go naked and be SHAMEfully exposed.' Rev. 21:27

Was shame Cain's problem?

Re: - posted by JFW (), on: 2018/1/21 8:47

Sister Diane,

Wow!! That was a deeply insightful post... one of the best I've read anywhere in quite a long time as it has set off a cascade of revelations in my mind, quickened by Holy Spirit:)

Thank you for sharing this,... there's so much meat it's gonna take a bit to digest but in any case I am grateful for such a feast:))
Again, THANK YOU!

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/21 14:01

Quote:
-----Gen. 4:2-3 - Cain was a tiller of the ground. So it came about in the course of time that Cain brought an offering to the LORD of the fruit of the ground.

Question:

What is bad about what Cain did?

Answer: Nothing!

Next question:

What did God mean when he said, "Sin is crouching at your door" ?
Had a sin been committed yet?

PS: I'd still like to explore the problem of SHAME as it is explicitly related to the fall - and Cain's problem.

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/21 14:51

â€œBERKOWITZ: That moniker, Son of Sam. That was not ... That was a demon. That was a demonic entity that I was serving in my ignorance, in my shame.â€ (From interview with David Berkowitz, â€œSon of Samâ€ serial killer).

A common result of shame is to lash out in anger at the person that shamed you; if that is not possible to lash out of others. A bully is often shamed at home.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/21 21:28

Hi Diane,

Firstly:

Gen. 4:2-3 - Cain was a tiller of the ground. So it came about in the course of time that Cain brought an offering to the LORD of the fruit of the ground.

Verse 5 - but for Cain and for his offering He had no regard. So Cain became very angry and his countenance fell.

I asked: â€œWhat is bad about what Cain did?â€

You replied: â€œNothing!â€

This is what Cain did:

He brought an offering to the Lord of the fruit of the ground that the Lord had no regard for. The problem was in the offering he brought. He became angry AFTER the Lord rejected it.

Secondly:

You wrote:

â€œWhat did God mean when he said, â€œSin is crouching at your doorâ€™ ?
Had a sin been committed yet?â€

Sin was already there. It was crouching at the door. It was blocking Cain from the door to something for what is a door

but an opening to something. I suggest that it was blocking Cain from God's acceptance, fellowship and the glory and the blessings of God.

Isa. 59:2 -- But your iniquities have separated between you and your God, and your sins have hid his face from you, that he will not hear.

Rom. 3:23 -- for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God

Add (1):

John 10:9 -- "I am the door; if anyone enters through Me, he will be saved, and will go in and out and find pasture.

Add (2):

It is "self" or "self" (i.e. the "self-God" and self-life) that comes between us and Christ.

Luke 9:23-24 - And He was saying to them all, "If anyone wishes to come after Me, he must deny himself, and take up his cross daily and follow Me. For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it, but whoever loses his life for My sake, he is the one who will save it."

Add (3):

At this point Cain could still acknowledge his wrong and return to God as the prodigal son did in Luke 15:11-32.

The prodigal son did the wrong thing in leaving his father.

He did the right thing in acknowledging his sin and returning.

Luke 15:18 -- "I will get up and go to my father, and will say to him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in your sight'."

And God would have welcomed Cain back with an embrace and a kiss and organised a sumptuous feast to celebrate his return as the father did for his prodigal son.

Unfortunately Cain moved further away from God to the point of no return.

Thirdly:

Is shame the cause of sin or the effect of sin?

Add:

Luke 9:26 -- For whoever is ashamed of Me and My words, the Son of Man will be ashamed of him when He comes in His glory, and the glory of the Father and of the holy angels

Re: - posted by TMK (), on: 2018/1/22 7:06

//This is what Cain did:

He brought an offering to the Lord of the fruit of the ground that the Lord had no regard for.//

Why?

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/22 7:48

Quote:

----- The problem was in the offering he brought.

Surely no "right" offering can make one right with God.

Psalm 51: 16-17

You do not delight in sacrifice, or I would bring it;
you do not take pleasure in burnt offerings.

My sacrifice, O God, is a broken spirit;
a broken and contrite heart
you, God, will not despise.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/22 10:33

Diane wrote:

Surely no "right" offering can make one right with God.

Psalm 51: 16-17

You do not delight in sacrifice, or I would bring it;
you do not take pleasure in burnt offerings.

My sacrifice, O God, is a broken spirit;
a broken and contrite heart
you, God, will not despise.

Surely then Cain's problem must be one of PRIDE.

Gen. 3:22 -- Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil"

Ezek. 28:2 (ESV) -- Because your heart is proud, and you have said, "I am a god" yet you are but a man, and no god, though you make your heart like the heart of a god'

There was an offering that God had regard for:

Gen. 4:4 -- And the LORD had regard for Abel and for his offering

Heb. 11:4 (ESV) -- By faith Abel offered to God a more acceptable sacrifice than Cain, through which he was commended as righteous, God commending him by accepting his gifts.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/22 15:45

Quote:

----- Surely then Cain's problem must be one of PRIDE.

Gen. 3:22 -- Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, knowing good and evil."

Ezek. 28:2 (ESV) -- Because your heart is proud, and you have said, "I am a god," yet you are but a man, and no god, though you make your heart like the heart of a god.

Jade, I think this is it! I'll extrapolate a bit:

1. BOTH Cain and Abel were born with the sinful condition and separated from God.
2. For BOTH, "their eyes were opened" ie:
BOTH knew (experienced) a conscious awareness of good and evil.
3. BOTH knew the unbearable experience of shame (their nakedness before God).
4. BOTH needed divine mercy to cover their shame and to fellowship with God.
5. BOTH could never know God's favour apart from His grace.

HERE'S WHERE THEY DIFFERED:

Abel accepted the depth of his sinful condition.
Cain refused to accept his sinful condition.

Abel's offering was an expression of gratitude and faith. (Heb 4:11!)
Cain's offering was an effort to earn his way back to God.

IT WENT DOWNHILL FROM THERE:

1. Cain somehow realized that God accepted Abel's offering and not his.
2. God showed mercy to Cain by warning him and giving him a chance to repent.
3. Cain clung to his own righteousness (PRIDE).
4. Cain's sin degenerated into jealousy and murder -- all because he refused divine mercy -- the same mercy which Abel accepted.

The difference is simply this: WORKS vs FAITH.

Isn't that the universal problem?

Do we need to complicate Cain's problem with extraneous explanations?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/22 15:59

If Dianes explanation is right and my explanations are right, I just back up one step in the ladder and ask...

Who wanted to kick off the grace vs law problems with mankind? Satan. How did he do it? By lying to Eve and telling her , you wont die by that tree, it will make you like a god and you know good and evil.

In her righteous state (grace per-se) she was tempted to go to the law for more righteousness. When in fact that act would be unrighteous and the law has nothing to offer but the opening of your eyes to what you truly are...and for Adam and Eve, it was nakedness then shame then hiding.
What does the law do? Paul said the letter=law kills.

This has been my contention...Adam and Eve did not need the Tree of good and evil or any of its fruit, their state was already everything that Satan said they needed.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/23 7:35

Agree, Diane, it is about WORKS vs FAITH.

A deeper understanding of Cain's problem can give us more answers for a Christian life that works.

Faith RESTS in God's GRACE.

Gen. 5:29 -- Now he called his name Noah, saying, "This one will give us rest from our work and from the toil of our hands arising from the ground which the LORD has cursed."

Matt. 11:28-30 -- Come to Me, all who are weary and heavy-laden, and I will give you rest. Take My yoke upon you and learn from Me, for I am gentle and humble in heart, and YOU WILL FIND REST FOR YOUR SOULS. For My yoke is easy and My burden is light.

Heb. 4:9-10 -- So there remains a Sabbath rest for the people of God. For the one who has entered His rest has himself also rested from his works, as God did from His.

Eph. 2:8-9 -- For by grace you have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not as a result of works, so that no one may boast.

Verse 10 -- For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works, which God prepared beforehand so that we would walk in them.

Gal. 5:5 -- For we through the Spirit, by faith, are waiting for the hope of righteousness.

NOT BY OUR WORKS BUT BY BELIEVING AND RESTING IN OUR GREAT HIGH PRIEST IN HEAVEN TO BRING THE LIFE OF HEAVEN INTO US

Heb. 7:18-19 -- on the one hand, there is a setting aside of a former commandment because of its weakness and uselessness (for the Law made nothing perfect), and on the other hand there is a bringing in of a better hope, through which we draw near to God.

Heb. 6:19-20 -- This hope we have as an anchor of the soul, a hope both sure and steadfast and one which enters within the veil, where Jesus has entered as a forerunner for us, having become a high priest forever according to the order of Melchizedek.

Heb. 7:15-16 -- And this is clearer still, if another priest arises according to the likeness of Melchizedek, who has become such not on the basis of a law of physical requirement, but according to the power of an indestructible life.

Excerpts from Andrew Murray's book "The Holiest of All":

=====

This better hope is the access our High Priest in heaven gives us into God's very presence, into the enjoyment of His fellowship and blessedness, even while here on earth.

There is a sanctuary in which God dwells. There was a veil that separated man from God. Jesus came from within to live without the veil, and rend it, and open a way for us. He is now there for us as Forerunner. We may now enter in and dwell there, in the power of the Holy Ghost.

Jesus is in heaven for thee, to secure thee a life on earth in the power and joy of heaven, to maintain the kingdom of heaven within thee, by that Spirit, through whom God's will is done on earth as it is in heaven. All that Jesus is and has, is heavenly. All that He gives and does, is heavenly. As High Priest at God's right hand, He blesses with all heavenly blessings. Oh, prepare thyself, as the glory of His person and ministry in the heavenly places are now to be opened up to thee, to look upon it, and appropriate it all, as thy personal possession. And believe that His High Priesthood not only consists in His having secured certain heavenly blessings for thee, but in his fitting and enabling thee to enter into the full personal experience and enjoyment of them.

Every act of His holy and blessed priesthood, every application of the fruits of His eternal redemption, is wrought in the power of an endless life.

Each work He does for us He is able to do in the power of an endless life. He works it within us as a life, as our own life, so that it is our very nature to delight in God and in His will. His priesthood acts as an inner life within us, lifting us up, not in thought but in spirit and in truth, into a vital fellowship with God. He breathes His own life in us. And He works it in as the power of life, a life that is strong and healthy, because it is His own life from heaven. And He works it in the power of an endless, an indissoluble life, a life that never for a moment need know a break or an interruption, because it is the life of eternity, the life maintained in us by Him who is a Priest for ever, a Priest who abideth continually.

Everything Christ as my High Priest in heaven does for me He does in the power of an endless life, as a Priest who abides continually; what He works can abide continually too. Oh for faith to consider and know and trust Christ Jesus, Priest for ever, Priest after the power of the endless life!

Christ is no outward Saviour, nor can He give us any salvation as an outward thing. All He does for us and to us, He puts into our heart, makes it our life. We need to know that all He does as High Priest for us in heaven. He also does within us as a life He gives. He is Priest, and can save in no other way, than after the power of an endless life. It is only as a life within us that His priesthood can attain its object.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/23 8:22

Quote:

----- just back up one step in the ladder ...

What a brilliant idea, Marvin! There we see the origin of sin.

Quote:

----- Who wanted to kick off the grace vs law problems with mankind? Satan.

So then, legalism fell into our nature back in the garden and that's what poisons our offerings, our self-righteous morality. Hey we'd better not point fingers at the legalists because we all have a bit of that original fruit stuck in our teeth!

Quote:
----- the law has nothing to offer but the opening of your eyes to what you truly are...and for Adam and Eve, it was nakedness then shame then hiding

So true! If you've lived in a religious culture where legalism rules strongly, you've noticed the effects of shame, the ungodly cover-ups, pride, comparing, better-than-them attitudes, guilt trips, unending rules, controllers, toxic shame, striving to win approval, perfectionism, pleasers, condemners, denials.. mental health issues, broken relationships.

sounds like our society!!

Quote:
----- This has been my contention...Adam and Eve did not need the Tree of good and evil or any of its fruit, their state was already everything that Satan said they needed.

No wonder the serpent began his approach with Eve by getting her to assume that God was a mean miser. She was the first legalist. God was not the one who said: "you must not TOUCH it." Gen. 3:3 Satan got her thinking that way.

Quote:
----- Faith RESTS in God's GRACE.

Those are fantastic verses, Jade. Thanks for posting. They prove that rest is really a freed conscious freedom from the self-imposed slavery, trying to cover our shame with our own never-ending strivings.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/23 9:13

No, Diane. Rest is resting from our own works to attain to the glory of God. Rest is resting in our Lord Jesus Christ. Christ in us is our hope of glory.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/23 9:19

Marvin,

This is a stalemate.

I still say that it is through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that Adam and Eve moved out of God into themselves and into Satan's kingdom i.e. the world.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/23 13:59

Quote:
----- No, Diane. Rest is resting from our own works to attain to the glory of God. Rest is resting in our Lord Jesus Christ. Christ in us is our hope of glory.

I suspect weâ€™re â€œon the same pageâ€, just saying it in different ways. Let me try again:

Godâ€™s Rest is freedom from the slavery of works as a means to absolve guilt, to earn the way back to God/grace/salvation/divine absolution, etc.

Itâ€™s the â€œSabbath restâ€ = grace through Christâ€™s cleaned heart â€™.
Yes?

Quote:
----- This is a stalemate.

I still say that it is through the tree of the knowledge of good and evil that Adam and Eve moved out of God into themselves and into Satan's kingdom i.e. the world.

Marvin, Can you explain this â€œstalemateâ€ as you see it... or have we pretty well exhausted this topic?

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/23 16:00

Hi Jade:

This is the great thing about discussion boards like this, we don't always come to the same conclusions, but we did open the scriptures, pray, inquire, read, think and explain ourselves to one another, that is a good thing and beneficial to us both.

It is a great benefit to me when someone challenges or disagrees with me and helps me to work through my own thoughts on the subject. For that Jade, I am very appreciative.
Secondly I got a chance to interact with you, for that I count it a joy and thank God for it.

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/23 16:19

Hi Diane:

I think the stalemate entails the conclusion Jade and I have come to, we disagree as to the real 'nature' of the tree (I think) where Jade understands the tree to be inherently a tree that will corrupt once eaten.

I view the tree as inherently good, but Adam and Eve could not partake of it without a change of nature in themselves first; henceforth the tree now serves to open their eyes to that change of nature. A 'good' tree did its work to expose their sin. A tree of human wisdom (by inference) would not have had that effect, I would assume it would justify their choice (as all human wisdom does)

But this is the difficulty with scripture silence as to the explicit nature of the tree, we can only infer various things as we understand scripture's on-going revelation of what the Law does, or human wisdom, or what Grace does.

I personally have not read anything postulated about the subject that is not an inference from other texts (especially my own). I've read the entire thread since its OP. The discussion has been good, but I don't think anyone else wants to tackle the subject beyond what has already been presented.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/24 6:52

I said:

“Rest is resting from our own works to attain to the glory of God. Rest is resting in our Lord Jesus Christ. Christ in us is our hope of glory.”

Diane said:

“God’s Rest is freedom from the slavery of works as a means to absolve guilt, to earn the way back to God/grace/salvation/divine absolution, etc.

“It’s the ‘Sabbath rest’ = grace through Christ. a cleaned heart.”

Yes, Diane, what you said is included in what I said.

Grace for redemption. Grace for righteousness. Grace for holiness. Grace for a heavenly life in Christ. Grace for the riches and the fullness of God in Christ in us.

Ps. 87:7 -- All my springs are in you

Ps. 36:7-9 --

How precious is Your lovingkindness, O God!

And the children of men take refuge in the shadow of Your wings.

They drink their fill of the abundance of Your house;

And You give them to drink of the river of Your delights.

For with You is the fountain of life;

In Your light we see light.

Eph. 3:19 -- “that you may be filled up to all the fullness of God.

Eph. 3:20-21 -- Now to Him who is able to do far more abundantly beyond all that we ask or think, according to the power that works within us, to Him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus to all generations forever and ever. Amen.

Re: - posted by BranchinVINE (), on: 2018/1/24 6:55

Thanks, Marvin.

This thread has been beneficial to me.

Thanks all for your input.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/24 9:38

Quote:

----- I personally have not read anything postulated about the subject that is not an inference from other texts

I've heard that any interpretation of a text must be well supported through other texts and it must corroborate with the overall narrative of scripture. I'd say that this thread has done just that.

Someday it may be worth discussing the use of imagery in scripture as a means of conveying spiritual realities. I hate to admit how long I had no idea what that "tree" was other than a forbidden food product.

Perhaps someday there can be a discussion on the experience of shame, and how that drives human behaviour and how grace covers shame.

So thank you Marvin, Jade, and others!! You got me thinking!

Re: - posted by Gloryandgrace (), on: 2018/1/24 16:06

Diane's post.

Quote:

just back up one step in the ladder ...

What a brilliant idea, Marvin! There we see the origin of sin.

Quote:

Who wanted to kick off the grace vs law problems with mankind? Satan.

So then, legalism fell into our nature back in the garden and that's what poisons our offerings, our self-righteous morality. Hey we'd better not point fingers at the legalists because we all have a bit of that original fruit stuck in our teeth!

Quote:

the law has nothing to offer but the opening of your eyes to what you truly are...and for Adam and Eve, it was nakedness then shame then hiding

So true! If you've lived in a religious culture where legalism rules strongly, you've noticed the effects of shame, the ungodly "cover-ups" pride, comparing, better-than-them- attitudes, guilt trips, unending rules, controllers, toxic shame, striving to win approval, perfectionism, pleasers, condemners, denials.. mental health issues, broken relationships.

sounds like our society!!

Quote:

This has been my contention...Adam and Eve did not need the Tree of good and evil or any of its fruit, their state was already everything that Satan said they needed.

No wonder the serpent began his approach with Eve by getting her to assume that God was a mean miser. She was the first legalist. God was not the one who said: "you must not TOUCH it" Gen. 3:3 Satan got her thinking that way.

Quote:

Faith RESTS in God's GRACE.

Those are fantastic verses, Jade. Thanks for posting. They prove that rest is really a freed conscious freedom from the self-imposed slavery, trying to cover our shame with our own never-ending strivings.

Diane

That one post alone contains the seed-bed for a week of sermons on the exposing of the origin of sin and shame and how in Christ there is deliverance for it all.

Any direction you want to go Diane will be a good one.
God grant us grace to see and obey what is revealed to us.

Re: - posted by roadsign (), on: 2018/1/25 9:23

Quote:
----- the seed-bed for a week of sermons on the exposing of the origin of sin and shame and how in Christ there is deliverance for it all.

Well for me that series of "sermons" lasted ten years. It was through a long debilitating illness that I discovered just how much I was depending on my works. When it was all stripped from me I felt utterly exposed in shame, unable to cover it myself. It's a long theological story: "Finding God's Rest".

I had a thought about that tree in the middle of the night:

Quote:
----- "the stalemate" Where Jade understand the tree to be inherently a tree that will corrupt once eaten, I view the tree as inherently good,

How's this for overcoming the stalemate: Everything in the garden was good, including the tree. But it was not fruit for humans. It was (is) very bad for the human constitution.

The tree signifies boundaries: Who's God and who's not God.

Let's admit: We all inherently want to be God, because that fruit is lodged in our spiritual digestion system. Much of life is a journey to the discovery that we are not God: No, we can't run the universe. No we can't control people. No we can't have what we want. Two year olds must learn that they are not God or they become monsters.