

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: original sin****original sin, on: 2003/11/3 17:03**

Wow, lots of complicated stuff on original sin. Especially when it is so clear what Original sin is. Genesis 1:29 says that we are given "every seed bearing plant for food". This is the Only order we are given. Similarly, in science protohumans, the *Australopithecus Afarensis*, were herbivores. Then they became scavengers and began developing the tools of the hunt, from which came war. Genesis 9:3 clearly indicates that God meant us to be herbivores! and points out the "hardness of our hearts" towards other living things.

The evolution to hunting required narrower hips for running, and guess what, this caused women to have increased pain in childbirth. Cause and effect! Original Sin brought down an abundance of ugly behaviors that complicated our lives and made us ignorant of "every seed bearing plant." Herein lies the key to health and peace.

After mankind became hunters, they became cannibals and descended into a very long history of debauchery. We would have discovered agriculture a very long time ago if we had not made this choice to go against God.

This is what Genesis tells us. We had clear and simple orders at first on how to live. We broke with these orders and then things got ugly; we compounded one sin with many. First was Adam, then Cain and Abel (*Homo Erectus* and *Australopithecus Robustus*) Next *Erectus* kills Able, and later Seth, the Neanderthals, comes and replaces the one who died.

The biblical story and scientific story are two sides of the same coin. You can't get the whole story without examining all the evidence!

Re: original sin - posted by jouko (), on: 2003/11/3 18:38

Gen 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Gen 1:27 And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Gen 1:28 And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth.

<http://www.answersingenesis.org/docs/3761.asp>

Re:, on: 2003/11/4 12:52

yes we were given dominion, and we have been doing a very lousy job of it. the only clear command, from a behavioral standpoint, was to not eat animals.

Re: original sin - posted by Jason, on: 2003/11/4 15:00

Your theory has too many holes both biblically and scientifically. First of all, your idea that Seth represents Neanderthal man and developed into modern man is not scientifically plausible.

Recent examinations of Neanderthal DNA have shown that they apparently were not linked to modern man, and made no contribution to our gene pool. <http://www.mcjonline.com/news/00/20000404a.htm>

Secondly, this view does violence to the Genesis account in many more ways than one. A particular point of oversight is that God gave man permission to eat meat after the flood had changed the makeup of the world:

Every moving thing that is alive shall be food for you; I give all to you, as I gave the green plant. Only you shall not eat flesh with its life, that is, its blood (Gen 9:3-4).

I'm sorry, but your explanation cannot be true scientifically and is even more impossible biblically. I have no problem with

your eating only vegetables, but it is ignorant to suggest that eating meat has or had anything to do with Original Sin or that it is sinful now.

Re:, on: 2003/11/12 15:37

I didn't say that Seth became modern man, just that the three brothers mentioned in the Bible correspond with the three main branches of protoman advanced by evolutionary scientists: Australopithecus afarensis, Homo Erectus, Neanderthal. We arose from HE and the role of Neanderthals is not clearly understood at this time. It is interesting that many scientists believe that the Neanderthals were the first to speak. Similarly, at the time of Seth, man begins to "call upon the name of the Lord."

Man may have been given permission to eat animals in Genesis 9:3 but God pointed out that it was only because of the hardness of our hearts.

Have you considered that the flood destroyed all of mankind except for Noah's family and that the Out of Africa theory tells us that we are all descendents of one small clan?

Then Noah plants a vineyard and mankind discovers agriculture.

There are many more points to this story and some day I will get around to putting them up on a web site. At the present time, there are too many competing activities.

Re: - posted by Chosen7Stone (), on: 2003/11/12 17:01

Speaking of Noah and what he ate...
Please read Genesis 9:3.

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2003/12/9 9:15

Amen Mary, here is Genesis 9:3

3Every moving thing that lives shall be food for you. I have given you all things, even as the green herbs.

There is nothing here about hardness of heart, in fact out of all the inhabitants of the earth before the flood, I would say that Noah had a soft heart in comparison to the rest whose every intent of the thoughts of their hearts was only evil continually.

God says here that he has given them all things even as the green herbs.

Jake, are you a vegetarian? If you are for what reason?

Re:, on: 2003/12/9 9:38

Genesis 9: The FEAR and DREAD of you shall fall upon all wild animals on earth, on all the birds of heaven, on everything that moves upon the ground and all fish in the sea; they are given into your hands. Every creature that lives and moves shall be food for you; I give you them all, as once I gave you green plants.

This tells us that originally God restricted mankind's diet to green plants! We violated this command and fell into sin.

Re: - posted by almondBranch (), on: 2003/12/9 10:02

So did Jesus sin when He ate meat?

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/9 10:12

Jake wrote: This tells us that originally God restricted mankind's diet to green plants! We violated this command and fell into sin. ! We violated this command and fell into sin.

As with all your posts Jake, you mix up revelation with speculation. But you can't add your speculation without rejecting the revelation. The revelation of Gen 1-3 is quite clearly that originally God restricted mankind's diet to green plants. Now how can you justify accepting that bit of the revelation while, at the same time, rejecting the rest?

The revelation states quite simply that man disobeyed God in the question of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. As it is referred to as 'fruit' we can only conclude that Adam and Eve did not breach their vegetarian diet. ;-) As a result of Adam's part in this rebellion mankind was banished from God's immediate presence. According to what we have in the Book inspired by the Spirit, Adam lived, sinned and died a vegetarian.

So you will see that there was no connection of any kind between a change in basic diet and Adam's falling into sin.

Now, will you tell me again that the 'inward witness told you'? Here's another little selection of good, clear thinking, Barclay. He is referring to the holy scriptures:

we do look upon them as the only fit outward judge of controversies among Christians; and that whatsoever doctrine is contrary to their testimony, may therefore justly be rejected as false. And, for our parts, we are very willing that all our doctrines and practices be tried by them; which we never refused, nor ever shall, in all controversies with our adversaries, as the judge and test. We shall also be very willing to admit it as a positive certain maxim, that whatsoever any do, pretending to the Spirit, which is contrary to the scriptures, be accounted and reckoned a delusion of the devil. For as we never lay claim to the Spirit's leadings, that we may cover ourselves in anything that is evil; so we know, that as every evil contradicts the scriptures, so it doth also the Spirit in the first place, from which the scriptures came, and whose motions can never contradict one another, though they may appear sometimes to be contradictory to the blind eye of the natural man, as Paul and James seem to contradict one another.

(Emphasis is Barclay's own)

I draw your attention again to original Quaker theology "the Spirit and the scriptures can never contradict one another" According to Barclay's criteria above your speculations are justly to be rejected as false and a delusion of the devil. This is strong stuff but those early Quakers knew they were on solid ground

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2003/12/9 10:40

Before the fall man was allowed to eat plants etc., God did not command man not to eat animals, why? we do not know, it could be for several reasons; here are a couple of possibilities:

1. Man did not need animal meat to survive:

And God said, "See, I have given you every herb that yields seed which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree whose fruit yields seed; to you it shall be for food.

2. Man ruled the animals but the animals were not afraid of them, i.e. they were close 'friends' (much closer than person or animal is today):

Then God blessed them, and God said to them, "Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth and subdue it; have dominion over the fish of the sea, over the birds of the air, and over every living thing that moves on the earth."

After the fall, when Sin entered (i.e. it already existed before Adam) the world, so did Death. Here we see the first animal sacrifice performed by God himself to cover their sin:

Also for Adam and his wife the LORD God made tunics of skin, and clothed them.

Remember that the only command God had given to man was:
but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat

It was not a breaking of a command of man only eating green plants that caused him to fall into sin as you have said, the

re was no such command!

It was not even the fall that caused God to say that now man can eat animals, it is only after the flood!

The reason why God allows man to eat animals after the flood could be due to the dramatic environment change it produced (which is another interesting topic), however lets be clear about this: it was not as a direct result of the fall.

A reason why animals had fear and dread after the flood is because man could now hunt and kill them for food.

Jake, you didn't answer my questions about you being a vegetarian and the reasons for it.

Re:, on: 2003/12/9 11:23

I am a vegetarian, but not a vegan. Health is one reason. Environmental concerns is another. The spread of disease is another. Equity is another.

A former head of the National Institute of Health wrote that if meat was a new product it would not be allowed on the market because cooked meat is far too carcinogenic. Animal production is highly pollutive and is ravaging our environment. Health experts are now predicting an viral pandemic and the source of this is predicted to be chickens kept for food. There many unnaturally crowded animals kept for food are vectors for infectious diseases.

Finally, I recognize that God gave us every seed bearing plant for good reason. The tools of the hunt are the tools of war. Plants are medicine as well as food, however we have not known "Every" seed bearing plant because we were diverted by scavenging, hunting and then a nomadic lifestyle. As a result we fail to learn what God commanded and today 99% of flowering plants have not been tested for medicinal properties. But the 1% that has been tested account for 40% of our medicines. Think about the vast storehouse of knowledge we have forgone because of our choice to kill and eat animals. I believe we would have discovered agriculture thousands of years earlier if Cain had not become the restless wanderer, chasing after game across the African plains.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/9 11:43

your quote: I believe we would have discovered agriculture thousands of years earlier if Cain had not become the restless wanderer, chasing after game across the African plains.

Jake, more speculation. Cain actually built the first city in defiance of God's command to be a restless wanderer.

When thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee her strength; a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.

And Cain knew his wife; and she conceived, and bare Enoch: and he builded a city, and called the name of the city, after the name of his son, Enoch.

Re: - posted by Nasher (), on: 2003/12/9 12:02

Quote:
-----The tools of the hunt are the tools of war.

Are you saying that because a tool can be used for war that the tool itself is bad?

Were the tools Noah used to make the ark (e.g. some sort of chopping / cutting implement) bad?

Are my hands bad because they can be used as a fist to fight someone?

Re:, on: 2003/12/9 12:35

The tools themselves are not bad. The aggressive predatory practice of hunting was very bad for us because it took us a way from our reliance on "every seed bearing plant" for food. This was a peaceful process of living. It was inevitable that nomadic hunters became warriors because of territorial and tribal concerns. If we had concentrated on developing tools for sedentary agriculture that did not develop in us the aggression required for hunting, war would have been unthinkable.

Re:, on: 2003/12/9 12:36

It is curious that immediately after the fall from grace, God gives us "animal skins" to wear. I don't think this is a coincidence.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/9 13:15

your quote: It is curious that immediately after the fall from grace, God gives us "animal skins" to wear. I don't think this is a coincidence.

Adam and Eve tried to cover their nakedness with figleaves. This is indicative of man's attempt to deal with his sin. This is DIY salvation and we can imagine how successful the effort was.

God provided leather clothes (makes me think of that Fox man again ;-)) to cover their nakedness. The implication being that the first blood shed on earth was shed by God in order to provide a covering for sinners.

Here is your 'coincidence'; this is God setting the scene for centuries to follow by showing that only by shed blood would man be fit to enter the presence of God. The blood that would finally effect this was not of bulls and goats but the blood of His own Son, by whom we now draw near to God.

This passage is not teaching anything to do with the human race becoming carnivores. It is sowing seed-truth that would be reaped generations later by Paul And, having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth, or things in heaven.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2003/12/15 11:27

Everyone seems to be looking at the result of something much more basic to the understanding of why man is fallen.

Paul writes, "You are not restricted by us, but you are restricted by your own affections." 2 Corinthians 6:12 Paul then begins to teach about the desires of men. The idea of what we yoke ourselves to. His solution is given to us in these words, "Come out from among them and be separate, says the Lord. Do not touch what is unclean." verse 17.

Many believe this passage pertains to our relationships with worldly people or fallen man. The true question is why do we associate with people of this nature? It is because we hold on to the same desires that they do. Please bear with me.

We are created in the image of Adam. One of the attributes of God is faithfulness. Adam also had this attribute. We also have this attribute. Man seeks to be faithful to something. When we teach that God created us with an emptiness which can only be filled by Him. In essence, this precept is defined by faithfulness. What motivates us, why do we seek to become what our heart gives us a passion to do?

Adam chose to walk away from God. The essence of the fall can be defined by the absence of God's Holy Spirit giving man that direction or knowledge of God's will. Only living by God's will, can man be filled by the fullness of Him.

The fall of man means that man is dead spiritually. Man has only his self as the focus of his knowledge. He seeks to find something to be faithful to, which will satisfy him. As he learns from this world his nature only become more depraved because there is not understanding, there is not wisdom, because the only truth that exists, exists in God.

Jesus taught, "Whoever drinks of this water will thirst again," '(this is seeking wisdom and fulfillment in this world), "but whoever drinks of the water that I shall give him will never thirst,..." (this represents the revelation of God to those who seek Jesus)

"Behold I have come-in the volume of the book it is written of Me-TO DO YOUR WILL, O GOD," Hebrews 10:7 His creation will only find God's fulness as they learn from our High Priest to do His will.

Finally, the fall from God, the loss of the Holy Spirits' counsel is the reason all men sin and why all are condemned. There is nothing outside of God's grace teaching us where truth exists. Salvation is revelation.

in Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/16 15:04

Jeff, you wrote Finally, the fall from God, the loss of the Holy Spirits' counsel is the reason all men sin and why all are condemned. There is nothing outside of God's grace teaching us where truth exists. Salvation is revelation

In all my other posts on original sin (my choice of title would be congenital) I have carefully avoided the word 'condemnation' because I wanted to get the ground established before we moved on to this. Condemnation is the consequence of someone having been proved 'guilty'. Personally I believe in congenital sin but NOT in congenital guilt. That is, I do not believe God holds me responsible for Adam's sin. I do not believe that I will go to hell for Adam's sin. Adam's 'condemnation' (his penalty) was banishment from the immediate presence of God and that condemnation I shared by first birth.

As you say, if I understand you correctly, Adam chose self-knowledge rather than the dependence upon God represented by the tree of Life. Initially his sin was independence which hardened into rebellion. (it was mirrored again in Saul, Israel's first legitimate king). Adam opened the door of the human race to Sin and Death came in behind. This occurred in the moment of Adam's disobedience. Physical death was part of the consequence; that passed to me too.

When a man is put back into right relationship with God through justification and regeneration a new way of life becomes possible. He (she) walks in the Spirit and does not fulfil the lust of the flesh. The order is important here. We do not restrain the lust of the flesh and thereby walk in the Spirit. We listen to what He says and in obedience lies the outworking of our salvation.

Your phrase is 'Salvation is revelation'. I would prefer 'the outworking of salvation is by revelation.' We live by faith. Faith is right response to revelation. But it is God who both works and wills; the dynamic and the desire are all God's gift to us. We work out what He has worked in and we do it by 'abiding in Him, and allowing His word to abide in us'.

But we cannot be saved just by obeying the revelation. We must be brought out of Sin and Death and receive a new inward law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus which frees us (in a moment) from the law of Sin and Death. Let me express it in a historical context. Israel was brought out of Egypt without raising a finger; God made His arm bare. But to enter the promised land they had to fight for every inch, under the continual direction of Joshua (Jesus).

So by a sovereign act of regeneration God brings us out of the old, endues us with new life and becomes our Captain. Then salvation, His life within, must be manifested in daily obediences to His command.

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2003/12/16 16:03

Hi Ron,

I am not at all aware of these terms people use to explain what someone else defined as positions of doctrine held. What I do have is the Scriptures. And so we are back to Romans 5.

vs 16..."And the gift is not like that which came through the one who sinned. For the JUDGEMENT which came from one offense RESULTED in CONDEMNATION, but the free gift which came from many offenses resulted in justification."

vs 18..."Therefore, as through one man's offense JUDGEMENT came to ALL MEN, RESULTING IN CONDEMNATION, even so through one Man's righteous act the free gift came TO ALL MEN, resulting in justification of life."

Please explain how all are not condemned prior to the Holy Spirit providing counsel to fallen man.

Also going back to what I said about why all are condemned. What do you think about the choice of men and why they yoke themselves to either self or the Holy Spirit?

Back at you
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/16 18:01

Jeff
very quickly and then I'm off to bed! What do you understand 'condemnation' to mean in these verses? This condemnation has evidently already 'resulted'. So what was it? What was the sentence that the judge passed?

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2003/12/16 18:26

I'm sorry Ron,

I am a rookie in terms of reaching out past my physical being. I pray you have a good night sleep. So maybe we can continue tomorrow.

The condemnation of man is the result of God removing the effect of His Holy Spirit in all men born of a woman. All men are without God's righteousness. Righteousness means "equity of character." Righteousness of God allows men to know His will.

As a child born of a woman, this baby has no direction unless God chooses to give the Holy Spirit as in the case of John the Baptist. This is a precept of election in terms of the calling to a special work.

The child grows in this world being polluted by the philosophies of men. He becomes a rational being driven by what he accepts as truth by his environment. This only further increases his depravity. There is a counter force which put man under His law. This law is revealed through the conscience that God gives to every man.

If man continues to rebel against the conscience, God at some point will give them over to the depravity of their own mind. Romans 1. With a seared conscience man is condemned forever.

The priestly order of Melchizedec imparts God's righteousness into those who cry out to God for His deliverance. In chapter 8 of Hebrews we are given the purpose for which the order of Melchizedec exists. "For every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices; wherefore IT IS OF NECESSITY THAT THIS MAN HAVE SOMETHING TO OFFER..." vs 4 Then the offering of the order of Melchizedec is identified in vs 10-12.

Jesus and the Father work through the Holy Spirit to reveal God's will for man. It is only when we learn of God's righteousness do we begin the restoration of our souls.

In love
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2003/12/17 4:44

Thanks Jeff,
Thanks I slept well.

I would still like you to define the specific 'condemnation' that the human race sustained as a result of Adam's sin. There is no doubt that Romans teaches the above fact. What I am trying to do is 'hear' the judge's sentence. So I ask again "what is the condemnation that passed into the human race?". What was the race 'sentenced' to?

To give you a clue in my thinking, I don't think it is the same 'condemnation' referred to in John 3. The John 3 'condemnation' seems to be as a result of someone 'not believing in the name of the only begotten Son of God. People who will not come to the light because their deeds are evil. If it is true that they cannot believe in him of whom they have not heard this would imply that the John 3 'condemnation' is upon those whose who have heard but refused to believe. People who have refused the light. That 'condemnation' seems to be that they 'perish', but what was the condemnation that came on the race as a result of Adam's sin? WKIP

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2003/12/17 11:00

Good morning brother,

There is a separation of condemnation. Thankyou for that insight. I will have to read the Scripture some more and meditate on your thoughts.

I just listened to Paris Reidhead, The Grace Of God That Brings Repentance. Much of what we are discussing here is spoken of in his sermon. Isn't wonderful how Jesus brings hearts together. Thankyou for sharpening me.

in Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/9 5:33

Clutch wrote Re:

Hi Ron,

The Pharisees over here (with whom I associate), have built a doctrine around a couple of verses that would indicate that being responsible for our sin has nothing to do with knowledge:

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

Romans 5:12-15 "12 Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned:

13 (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

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

I know you've done some of this on a similar thread regarding folks with mental handicaps. I too have to agree that somewhere in God's Grace and Mercy that type situation is covered. I just can't point it out in the Bible.

Clutch

I've resurrected this theme, as I think it the best place to handle it. We might have started another one called 'Are the heathen lost?' but where we left this might be a good place to start.

I do believe strongly in what is usually called original sin; I prefer 'congenital' sin. Personally, I don't think the Psalm 51 reference has anything to do with it, but the Rom 5:12 is the locus classicus; the prime site for this doctrine.

Condemnation has passed to all men. but the question is 'what was that condemnation?' Almost all bible students conclude that this is the same condemnation referred to in John 3:19, but I don't think it is. The word 'condemnation' has the sense of a judicial sentence, so what was Adam sentenced to (as a result of his unique sin) and consequently what condemnation has passed to us?

I think the condemnation is Death. Not physical death which is little more than absence of life, but Death which is the presence of a Tyrant on the throne, part of the consequence of Death is death, but they are not identical. (2 Corinthians 1:10 Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us; - this is not referring to death but to Death.)

Death is an aggressive permeating condition which touches every part of our life. It spoils and pollutes all it touches; this is what I have in mind when I think of 'total depravity'. Not that everything is as bad as it can be, but that nothing has escaped its rule. However, and this may call down a feeding frenzy on my head, I don't read that this condemnation results in 'perishing'. In other words, I don't think we are hell-bound because of what Adam did; I think we are hell-bound because of what we did. Please feel free to challenge me on this.

This 'condemnation' is now. It has already arrived. But I think there is another 'condemnation' coming. The coming condemnation is different; it is a sentence passed but not yet executed. It is the result of 'knowing and not doing'. John 3:18 speaks of those who have not believed and are consequently 'condemned'. This condemnation/sentence is that such 'condemned men' perish. These are they who do not come to the light because their deeds are evil.

I don't see these 'unbelievers' as those who have not heard, but those who have been faced up with the Son, and who have not believed. Those who have not 'obeyed the truth'.(see later)

In Rom 2:5ff speaks of the coming judgment of God, and of those who according to their hardness and impenitent heart treasure up unto themselves wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God. This is clearly a future judgment.

Paul then shows how God will make his judgments. to them, who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honour and immortality, eternal life. There is a promise of future eternal life here for some.

But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish. There is promise here of future judgment for some. This group, notice, have known but not done; they have known but not obeyed the truth. This condemnation is not because of what Adam did but because of what they have done (or not, as the case may be)

Later on Paul indicates the process in Rom 10:12-17. There can be no faith without the word of God. If God has not spoken men cannot obey nor believe. Will He hold them responsible for not doing what He did not tell them?

There are obvious questions which arise from this, but I will let you or others ask them.

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/9 6:38

Ron said:

"However, and this may call down a feeding frenzy on my head,..."

Yes, I can see that it's already begun around the outside top!

Ron, If you hear a knock, don't answer the door! :-D

I find your views on "congenital" sin interesting, and I'd like to believe it that way. However, at this point my spirit man is unconvinced. Let me re-read what you've said, and let the Holy Spirit work in me about this.

I just got done reading the previous posts on this thread. Once again, "It's a fine kettle of fish you've gotten us into this time Ollie." I was surprised to see that bro. Jake is a vegetarian.

Holy Cow! I thought he was a methodist.

Clutch :-P

Re: - posted by crsschk (), on: 2004/2/9 7:09

Quote:
-----Death is an aggressive permeating condition which touches every part of our life. It spoils and pollutes all it touches; this is what I have in mind when I think of 'total depravity'. Not that everything is as bad as it can be, but that nothing has escaped its rule. However, and this may call down a feeding frenzy on my head, I don't read that this condemnation results in 'perishing'. In other words, I don't think we are hell-bound because of what Adam did; I think we are hell-bound because of what we did. Please feel free to challenge me on this.

Rom 7:23 But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

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

Quote:
-----I think we are hell-bound because of what we did.

Yes. I believe this wholeheartedly. Somewhere in all this something smacks of 'choice'.

If anyone of us would have been in the originators of our kind's shoes *without* the knowledge we now have, what choice would we have made, at 'The Suggestion'?

Being that they accepted to partake of that 'knowledge' which has been passed on to us, are we not even worse off in a sense?

Since the remedy is provided...*but we love darkness more than light?*

As with the Cross. *WE* put Him there. *WE* are responsible. Which is what makes anti-semitism so bizarre to me in this regard.

When your 'system' gets challenged, when the cops come busting in with their searchlight, the cockroaches scatter, the arrogant revolt and resist arrest and the humble plead for mercy.

It's not Adam and Eve and the Jews and the Roman soldiers and Hitler and....*there is NONE righteous.*

It's *US*, all inclusive.

Back to the Romans verse. Somewhere in this dusty, disorganized file system of a brain I recall hearing about...wait, found it;

Ver 24; Re; 'body of death'

"Tradition says that an ancient tribe near Tarsus tied the corpse of a murder victim to its murderer, allowing its spreading decay to slowly infect and execute the murderer - perhaps that is the image Paul has in mind."

From The MacArthur Study Bible

Thankfully, as Mr. Ravenhill put's it, "there is verse 25"

Hope I didn't muddy the waters here, feel free to turn the hose on me.

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/9 7:31

Hi Mike,

I think that the major point of contention here is not about those who have heard the gospel and either accepted or reject it. But, about those who because of circumstances beyond their control, have not been given the opportunity to hear and respond. Some of the basic issues are:

- 1."What is THEIR responsibility before God?"
- 2." Are they accountable to God for what they haven't been given opportunity to receive?"
- 3."Are there varying degrees of accountability in regard to eternal salvation/damnation?"

I believe that we are either in Adam, or in Christ. Those in Adam go to where the boogerman lives when they die, and those in Christ go to be with the Lord Jesus when they die (physically). I just haven't found in scripture clear and convincing evidence of the special dispensations of Grace; that may be there, hidden to me. I reserve the right to be wrong, and I will repent and change when I've erred; I've done it before.

However, in the mean time, I do know this:

"It is the glory of God to conceal a thing: but the honour of kings is to search out a matter." Proverbs 25:2

Clutch :-)

Tough Questions - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/9 9:23

Another emotional form of the question is, "*Does God condemn those who die in infancy to hell?*"

Confronted with questions like this, my usual answer is, "I don't know, because the scripture does not directly address this, but I'm sure that the God of righteousness will have the most just way of dealing with them."

Thus far, in my study of the scripture, I could not find a certain and definite answer.

Philologos:

Your distinction between "congenital sin" and "congenital guilt" would have resolved the problem by accepting the former and not the latter. From this point of view, infants who died would be congenitally sinful but not condemned to eternal perdition since they are not guilty congenitally.

This argument is rather appealing, however, I'm not sure if the apostle Paul really had such a distinction in mind when he wrote:

*So then as **through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men**, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men. (Romans 5:18)*

On this key text, your approach is to further distinguish between "condemnation to death (a present condition of sin)" and "condemnation to perdition (a future judgment)". The condemnation in Romans 5:18 would fall into the former category according to this thought, and is therefore not related to our future destiny in hell or in heaven.

All this sound very good, except I am not certain whether that is what Paul really had in mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. The distinctions made do not seem that clearly cut in my own reading.

Millard Erickson used a different approach in *Christian Theology*.

We all were involved in Adam's sin, and thus receive both the corrupted nature that was his after the fall, and the guilt and condemnation that attach to his sin. With this matter of guilt, however, just as with the imputation of Christ's righteousness, there must be some conscious and voluntary decision on our part. Until this is the case, there is only a conditional imputation of guilt. Thus, there is no condemnation until one reached the age of responsibility. If a child dies before becoming capable of making genuine moral decisions, the contingent imputation of Adamic sin does not become actual, and the child will experience the same type of future existence with the Lord as will those who have reached the age of moral responsibility and had their sins forgiven as a result of accepting the offer of salvation based upon Christ's atoning death. The problem of the corrupted nature of such persons is presumably dealt with in the way that the imperfectly sanctified nature of believers will be glorified."

Erickson's argument is based upon the concept of "the age of accountability." The biblical basis: Deuteronomy 1:39; Isaiah 7:15-16; Jonah 4:11.

So Erickson would agree with you that infants who died before they have a moral consciousness will not go to hell.

However, on the question of those who had not heard the gospel before but are beyond the "age of accountability", Erickson would disagree with you. He wrote, "*We become responsible and guilty when we accept or approve of our corrupt nature... if we acquiesce in that sinful nature, we are in effect saying that it is good. By placing our tacit approval upon the corruption, we are also approving or concurring in the action in the Garden of Eden so long ago. We become guilty of that sin without having committed any sin of our own.*"

Erickson's arguments are interesting, however, not convincing enough for me to fully embrace it.

After studying various arguments on the issue of original sin, to date, I can only say the same thing in answer to the question of original sin: "I don't know, but I trust God will deal with every problem justly."

Re: Tough Questions - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/9 11:23

Ron's and Secret Agent persons,

I read the scripture that 001 offered about the age of accountability doctrine. I won't go there except to say unless there's more scriptural backup, it's pretty weak, and I think a stretch ,(but I like it).

Could it be that we cannot apply the same level of accountability to a baby than to a capable thinking adult that has never heard the gospel.

Romans 1

19 ¶ Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them.

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

Romans 2

11 For there is no respect of persons with God.

12 For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law;

13 (For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.

14 For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves:

15 Which shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another:)

16 In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.

I submit we are responsible for what we don't know. It could be a generational thing that I have no personal knowledge of, but this is MY watch, and I'M responsible.

II Timothy 2:15

15 Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.

Clutch :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/9 12:06

Hi Mike

you wrote Back to the Romans verse. Somewhere in this dusty, disorganized file system of a brain I recall hearing about..wait, found it;

Ver 24; Re; 'body of death'

"Tradition says that an ancient tribe near Tarsus tied the corpse of a murder victim to it's murderer, allowing its spreading decay to slowly infect and execute the murderer - perhaps that is the image Paul has in mind."

From The MacArthur Study Bible

Thankfully, as Mr. Ravenhill put's it, "there is verse 25"

The murdered corpse illustration has been used by many, Watchman Nee, Leonard Ravenhill, I have never been convinced. For me, such as illustration springs too quickly into view at this point with nothing to give us prior warning.

I think this is the 'body of sin' from Rom 6:6 but we might do well to stay out of Rom 7 for a while. There's valuable stuff in there but I think it will spread our attention too widely at this stage.

The 'body of sin' in Rom 6:6, I think, needs to be distinguished from our 'mortal body' in 6:12.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/9 12:21

Let's put it into the wider context of Romans...

In Romans 1-4 Paul is in a law-court. He brings the accusation against the whole world and concludes there is no difference; For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. He then shows how God has been able to 'pass over' the sins of generations before Christ. The payment for sins was already seen in the one slain from before the foundation of the world, and on this basis God was both 'just and the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus'. In Rom 4 Paul asks the question 'what was Abraham's experience?' and expounds the truth of justification by faith, as he comes to the end of that chapter he shows the basis for our justification. But justification, vital though it is as a foundational doctrine, is not the climax of Romans; he is still only up to the end of Chapter 4.

Chapt 5 continues and shows other aspects of our salvation, and several times through this chapter we get the phrase 'much more' which is used 4 times in this chapter. Chap 5 is the 'much more' of the gospel.

Rom 5:12 is one of the most amazing pieces of literature in the world. It is the only explanation to the question "how did we get into this mess?" The rest of Chapter 5 is concerned with 2 men and 2 events. The men and the events are contrasted, but Paul says that the 1st man is a figure of him that was to come. Although the verses are detailing the contrast between the 2 men and the 2 events, there is a similarity which Paul calls a 'type'. We have lots of wonderful teaching about scriptural types, but it is not often we hear reference to Adam as a type of Christ; according to Paul, he is. Adam did something and it has its consequences; Christ did something and it has its consequences. In what follows we shall need to remember Adam and Christ are parallel characters. In another place (1 Cor 15:45, 47) Paul calls Christ the Last Adam and the Second Man.

Romans 5:12 tells us that sin entered the cosmos by one man. This is a unique revelation. Sin pre-dated Adam; but it came into the cosmos through Adam in one act of disobedience. This is a vital revelation; sin is older than the human race, but it came into the human race through one man. The revelation continues in telling us that death 'entered' through sin; and death passed to all men, for that all sinned. The tense of verbs used in this passage are Aorist; there is a finality in the Aorist tense, the old grammarians used to say it implies an action complete in itself at a point of time. These verbs are references to a single completed act at a point of time. Sin entered once, it passed into all men once, all sinned once.

There is something else of significance in this passage. For the remainder of the passage the word sin is prefixed with the definite article; that means it has the sense of The Sin. This is not different sins in the sense of individual transgressions but something which is singular, Sin. Sin could only enter the cosmos once, from that time on it would be already here; it could not be said to enter a second time until it had exited, but it didn't exit, it stayed. In fact, it passed into (eis-into) all men. Theologians have given different names to this truth. Some called it the Ancient Sin, others original sin, others hereditary sin. There have been lots of theories as to how it is transmitted. I don't believe it was transmitted, so I prefer my own term 'Congenital Sin'. That says we were born with it but does not try to explain any process.

Let me illustrate. There is a concept which is strange to our individualistic western minds but which is part of God's revelation as to 'how' things sometimes work. Hebrews says that the priesthood of Melchizedek is greater than that of Aaron, because Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek. Melchizedek was greater than Aaron for he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchizedek met him, and there are ongoing implications to that. I am not trying to explain it; this is simply revelation of the way in which we are more connected than we usually think. And you and I were in the loins of Adam when he met Satan in the garden, and there are ongoing implications to that too.

This post has been much longer than I intended, my apologies. I will pause having made one more point. In strict chronological terms Eve sinned before Adam, and yet her sin does not seem to have impacted Adam, but Adam's sin impacts the whole cosmos (including Eve). Why should this be? Adam was the federal head and representative of our entire race; he spoke for us, he acted for us. As Daniel once told Nebuchadnezzar that 'thou art this head of gold' (he was the embodiment of the whole Babylonian empire), so Adam was mankind. Eve was not and consequently her sin had no knock-on effect. (you ladies always knew it wasn't your fault didn't you?)

It is because we have a congenital condition that we need to be born again from above. Sins can be forgiven but the only way that Sin can be dealt with is by us having a brand new start. Justification will deal with sins; it will take regeneration to deal with Sin. In terms of our nature, we shall need to be re-generated.

If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature, old things are passed away behold all things are become new.

This is just to give more background. I'll return to the distinction between sin and guilt next.

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/10 5:56

Hi Ron,

As High Priest of the Columbus Ga. Sanhedrin, I'm very interested in your comments regarding "congenital guilt". An apparent lack of interest on the subject by other observers on this site, makes me SAD you see. :-D

We are a former British Penal Colony here in Georgia, and public stoning and death by crucifixion are rarely practiced anymore. We do enjoy a little electrical shock treatment, and lethal injection is really catching on (on and off Death Row). So, please let us hear from you on this subject. It won't hurt long, I promise. :-o

Clutch :-P

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/2/10 6:51

As Ron pointed out the fact that The Sin entered the world through one man, and I add that The Life is there too. In Genesis 3:15 the curse on Satan, Eve, and Adam and all generations can be summed up in this. Hatred would exist from this point forward in mankind. The sons of God through The Life would be hated by the offspring of Satan. Adam and Eve just prior to the curse saw that they were naked. I believe that they lost the Holy Spirit. As Jesus said, There is no one who is good except the Father. Man without the Holy Spirit became naked. So as the revelation of God's word grew over time we learn that the only way to restore man is through the work of The Life directing the Counselor to lead us. So all sin because we do not know the will of the Father. Jesus said, The volume of this book is written of Me to **do Your will O God**. It is The Life that gives us understanding of God's will for us. Prior to the regeneration, man is lost in his rational thought.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/10 8:26

clutch wrote

I just got done reading the previous posts on this thread.

In fact this thread got broken. The earlier part, also called Original Sin, can be found [here](#)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/2/10 8:45

Ron

I went back to your link, is your question in regard to what Reidhead said? I guess I should listen to his sermon on original sin.

However, again, what does it mean in Romans when Paul writes, "Therefore God also gave them up?" Without faith man can only continue to sin. The absence of the Holy Spirit allows man to sink into depravity. Man born of the flesh is without the Holy Spirit, therefore he is condemned. Without knowledge of God's will man sins. He chooses his own ways. Anything but God's will is sin. That is the change that took place in the garden of Eden. Darkness filled the world. But Jesus is the true light which gives light **to every man coming into the world.**" John 1:9 If man chooses darkness over the Light, God will give them up.

In Christ
Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/11 3:21

Jeff asked However, again, what does it mean in Romans when Paul writes, "Therefore God also gave them up?"

Ron commented So then as through one transgression there resulted condemnation to all men, even so through one act of righteousness there resulted justification of life to all men. (Romans 5:18)

On this key text, your approach is to further distinguish between "condemnation to death (a present condition of sin)" and "condemnation to perdition (a future judgment)". The condemnation in Romans 5:18 would fall into the former

category according to this thought, and is therefore not related to our future destiny in hell or in heaven.

All this sound very good, except I am not certain whether that is what Paul really had in mind when he wrote the Epistle to the Romans. The distinctions made do not seem that clearly cut in my own reading.

This will be a long post but I don't know how to break it up into smaller portions and leave the sense whole. I will try to answer Jeff's question and Ron's comment. This is very much a work in process with me at present.

I see two stages of God's wrath; present and future.

The present sense is one which began in the past but is still in process.

Rom 1:18 For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness; "is revealed" is present tense, passive voice which means it is a continuing process in which God is revealing his wrath. the wrath of God is being revealed...

but it is being revealed against

all ungodliness and righteousness of men who are pinning down the truth in unrighteousness. the KJV 'hold' is katexO which implies to hold something down, or hinder. It would be used of a cat pinning down a mouse. What I want to explore is the phrase 'who hold down the truth'. This phrase describes a class of men/women who are characterised by the fact that they are 'holding down ones'. It sounds clumsy in English but, for those who might be interested, it is a present participle preceded by a definite article; this shows the prevailing character of the people described. John uses this construction in John 3:16 that whosoever believeth. It could be translated the believer. So here in Rom 1:18 we have people who persistently pin down the truth; they are characterised by this behaviour. They 'suppressed truth' as a way of life.

We then have a history lesson of how this revelation of God's wrath has worked out in history. These "truth suppressors" are without excuse because God has revealed aspects of His nature in the creation; his eternal power and divinity. They knew God; but refused to accept the truth of what they knew. They did not give God his rightful place and were ungrateful. (BTW that's the way back to God... give Him His rightful place and thank Him.) Paul says something happened to these people; they became vain their thinking processes failed and they became fools who turned to idolatry. They changed the truth of God into a lie.

I want to follow this process

1. God's revelation - they knew God
2. the rejection process: refusal to accept the revelation
3. dependence on their own 'failed' reasoning powers.
4. idolatry
5. God's judgment.

Their own choices resulted in their thinking processes going awry, and ultimately in idolatry; this was a process.

God's punishment is to 'abandon' them; He gave them up. He released them to the consequences of their own choices. People begin to behave like those they worship. God abandoned them to this process, which resulted in worship and service of created things rather than God. To satisfy creature hungers became more important than the satisfying of God's intentions. The cycle takes another turn; God abandons them to "vile affections" ('dishonourable feelings') which resulted in 'unnatural behaviour'; same sex unions.

The process continues with people refusing to 'retain God in their knowledge'. There is a word-play here that I don't know how to get into English. The word 'refuse' in the ASV, 'like' in the KJV is 'dokimazo'. We use an idea from it when we say 'document your answer'; it means show me your proof for the statements you are making. I worked for a couple of years for Wedgwood the pottery manufacturers as a labourer. As a piece of pottery went through the manufacturing process it was regularly examined until it was ready for the final firing and decoration. If it was perfect the Wedgwood stamp was added to the base. If it was found imperfect and 'failed' the examination it was sold off as 'seconds' but without the Wedgwood stamp. The Wedgwood stamp didn't only mean where it was manufactured by Wedgwood, it also meant that Wedgwood 'approved' (see the word 'prove' in there) of this piece of pottery. It was quality control as well as origin. A similar process took place in ancient times and a seal or mark was added to a piece of pottery or writing to say that it was 'approved' or genuine. Here is the idea in John 3:33 John 3:33 He that hath received his testimony hath set to his seal that God is true.

The people referred to in Rom 1:28 refused to put their stamp on what they had examined and knew to be authentic; they 'failed' the revelation of God. Their punishment is that God gave them over to a 'failed mind'. The KJV 'reprobate' translates 'adokimos', unapproved. (dokimazO/a-dokimos. It is a word-play that is lost to all but the Greeks!) They refused to put their stamp of approval on God's revelation of Himself, and God abandoned them to a mind that failed the quality test. They 'failed' God and He abandoned them to the mind-set that had 'failed' Him. Their subsequent behaviour is 'not fitting'. Their understanding 'failed' and their behaviour 'failed'.

They became 'filled with all unrighteousness'. And this is man as we find him ever since. He has not just committed 'unrighteousness', he is 'filled with all unrighteousness'.

This is the outworking of the original 'condemnation'. This is death, spreading, corrupting, bringing its contagion to the whole of our human-ness. This is 'wrath, being revealed'. But there is another 'wrath' coming; And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; Who will render to every man according to his deeds: This is future wrath and its punishment is based on "every man according to his deeds". This future wrath is not the consequence of mankind's history of rebellion, but of the individual and his own response to revelation. For those who seek for glory, honour and immortality it offers 'eternal life', but those who are contentious and obey not the truth (there's that refusal to receive revelation again) there awaits indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish...

so, two aspects of the wrath of God, two condemnations, one we experience here, the other to come.

what do you think?

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/11 5:39

Hi Ron,

This is getting off track from your statement that " you are not responsible for what you don't know."

You said:

"Their own choices resulted in their thinking processes going awry, and ultimately in idolatry; this was a process."

Yes it was a process, passed down from generation to generation until there was no more knowledge of God, except what was in that invisible soulish realm of their conscience.

But the question that still remains unanswered is who will stand before God and take responsibility?

I believe it this way:

Take your pick, the judgement seat of Christ, or the Great White Throne judgement, it will be the individual giving an account of what he did, or didn't do with the things of God in his/her generation. Regardless of whether he/she knew them, or should have known. Convince me otherwise. If I'm wrong I'll receive it, repent, and line up with the Word.

I'll try to get the boys to slow down a little bit, on building the gallows.

Clutch :-)

Re: - posted by rookie (), on: 2004/2/11 6:19

Hi Ron,

You wrote: "This is wrath being revealed..."

Thankyou for this insight.

I am sorry if I missed this point, Do you believe all are without excuse?

In Christ

Jeff

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/11 8:57

But the question that still remains unanswered is who will stand before God and take responsibility?

I had a momentary glimpse, in my spirit, of someone in rags and blood and tears who stands before God. He hears our question, stretches out nail pierced hands and says "I will".

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/11 10:03

"He hears our question, stretches out nail pierced hands and says "I will"."

Matthew 27:22 Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?

Who is responsible for answering this question in the life of the mentally competent individual person?

Unless that question has been correctly answered prior to either judgement. It will be too late, and no one but the individual person will have to answer for that decision. So then, who is responsible? Whether they've heard or not? And every person will be held individually accountable for their answer, for they will be without excuse.

I think the scriptures are very clear about entering into the Kingdom of God.

Clutch :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/11 11:17

Matthew 27:22 Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?

Who is responsible for answering this question in the life of the mentally competent individual person?

Unless that question has been correctly answered prior to either judgement. It will be too late, and no one but the individual person will have to answer for that decision. So then, who is responsible? Whether they've heard or not? And every person will be held individually accountable for their answer, for they will be without excuse.

Hi Clutch

Your question deserves an answer, but as I lifted my heart I saw something else and thought I should share it. Now to the question.

If you have followed the twists and turns of my thinking we can come to some conclusions, although you don't have to agree with them.

I see sin as a double problem with a double cure. Sin, the disposition, was granted access by Adam's disobedience, and Death followed through to the whole cosmos. I believe the condemnation that accompanies this opening of a door by Adam, is Death. By Death I mean the corruption of another life that has percolated through the whole of humanity, and my humanity. I believe the condemnation is that spreading poison. It is wrath revealed now. I don't believe this condemnation includes eternal separation. I don't believe I will go to hell because of what Adam did. The Federal head of our race was responsible, and God has brought in a Second Man, the Last Adam. We don't know Adam's eternal destiny, although there are some indications as others have pointed out. But we do know Adam's temporal destiny, his condemnation... and we have shared it. This power could only be broken by Christ taking the Old Man down into death with him, and breaking his power over the human race.

But what about me and sins as deeds done in opposition to God. God holds me responsible for my actions, but John says 'there is a sin not unto death' I like the little definition of sin in James 4:17 "to him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is sin". I know that ignorance of the law is no excuse for a police officer, but I am not sure that ignorance of sin is the same. By the law, was the knowledge of sin, but what of those who did not have The Law in its Sinai expression. There seems to be an indication that knowledge increases responsibility; Amos 3:2 "You only have I known of all the families of the earth: therefore I will punish you for all your iniquities." This indicates no excuse for Israel because they knew God's will. It was one of their boasts;

I link in the Rom 2 section here which speaks of future judgment, wrath. I notice that this promises eternal life, at a future

e time, for those who 'seek'... but future judgment for those who 'disobey'... Now you can't disobey unless you have heard, can you? I think all sin has a clash of wills in it.

Let me set another rabbit running... this promises future eternal life, but the regenerate have eternal life now. This is my understanding of the old questions about Abraham. I believe he has eternal life, there and now, but the regenerate has eternal life here and now. This is why I distinguish so strongly between justification and regeneration.

Matthew 27:22 Pilate saith unto them, What shall I do then with Jesus which is called Christ?

Who is responsible for answering this question in the life of the mentally competent individual person? Many millions have never heard the earlier question. Will they be sentenced to eternal separation for not having heard?

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/11 12:08

Hey all!

My name is Samuel, or Agent001. I have been misidentified a number of times, so I thought I'd make a declaration here!

Philologos:

I think I agree with your exposition of the wider context of Romans 5. I am awaiting your case for the distinction between congenital sin and congenital guilt--why you think the former but not the latter is affirmed in Romans 5.

I also agree that the wrath of God is poured out upon us now, and culminates in the future judgement. I look forward to the completion of your argument.

Clutch:

I believe that in the Second Coming, there will be the judgment seat of Christ where Christians are judged based upon their deeds in the present life. There will also be the Great White Throne, where those who reject God will be cast in the lake of fire.

Agent001

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/11 20:08

Hi Ron, and Sam,

Sam, I believe it like you do about the two judgements. However, about those people that have never had the opportunity to hear the gospel, and will be sent to the lake of fire; I WISH that I could believe it like Ron does.

It seems to me that if things work out like Ron believes, that we are wasting a lot of time, money, and effort trying to fulfill the great commission. Also, immediately after we got saved, God could just take us on to heaven, because we would not be serving much purpose here. If what Ron says is correct, then we are certainly doing the people that live in the 10/40 window a great disservice by attempting to evangelize them. In fact, the Calvinists would be right, for the wrong reason, and we should be doing the opposite of what Jesus has commanded the church to do. If Ron is right, then by introducing them to the gospel of Jesus Christ, we are part and parcel in partnership with God unnecessarily sending multitudes to the lake of fire (The ones that do not believe). Whereas, if we leave them ignorant, they will make heaven. In my mind, that would make God evil, and I ain't buying it.

I really don't think these explanations of congenital sin, and congenital guilt get to the meat of the issue. The doctrine that makes the most sense to me, is the doctrine of congenital consequences.

Like those on the Titanic, some were there by choice, others were not. Some knew of the warnings about icebergs, most didn't, or didn't care. So, you had a group of folks that were all in the same boat so to speak. Some were more responsible than others in regard to matters of the well being of the occupants, to include themselves. But when the end came, there was only one way to get off the Titanic alive, and that was by getting into a life boat. Whether a person knew about the

the iceberg or not, whether anyone told them the ship was sinking or not, whether they knew about lifeboats or not, in reality did not matter. The bottom line was; the ONLY way to live was, you had to get into the life boat.

Ron, I hope I'm wrong about this, and I love you anyway brother. I'm like Sam, I'm trusting that There's some mysteries yet to be revealed, that will make it right. Until the day that they're revealed to me, I just have to believe it like it's written.

After all, you know that I'm not very smart (but I'm crafty and bear watching).

nite nite time,

clutch :-P

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/11 22:57

Clutch wrote

Hi Ron, and Sam,

Sam, I believe it like you do about the two judgements. However, about those people that have never had the opportunity to hear the gospel, and will be sent to the lake of fire; I WISH that I could believe it like Ron does.

It seems to me that if things work out like Ron believes, that we are wasting a lot of time, money, and effort trying to fulfill the great commission.

Not at all. We fulfill the great commission because it is a commission. Although it is a popular evangelical doctrine there is no indication in the Bible that Paul et al evangelised because they believed souls were going to hell. Of course, we love men and women, but that is not the biblical motive for evangelism.

Also, immediately after we got saved, God could just take us on to heaven, because we would not be serving much purpose here.

Not at all. Regeneration takes a moment, but the rebuilding of character may take a life time. There are things that take time, and God has given time so that these things can be accomplished. I think one of our family used to use the sign-off 'a work in process'. This is really saying that the only reason we are here is to save souls; really?

If what Ron says is correct, then we are certainly doing the people that live in the 10/40 window a great disservice by attempting to evangelize them. In fact, the Calvinists would be right, for the wrong reason, and we should be doing the opposite of what Jesus has commanded the church to do. If Ron is right, then by introducing them to the gospel of Jesus Christ, we are part and parcel in partnership with God unnecessarily sending multitudes to the lake of fire (The ones that do not believe). Whereas, if we leave them ignorant, they will make heaven. In my mind, that would make God evil, and I ain't buying it.

No each one will be judged according to the light they received, but will not be held responsible for what they could not know. If we follow the relentless route of your argument we shall end up with lots of babies hell-bound too.

I really don't think these explanations of congenital sin, and congenital guilt get to the meat of the issue. The doctrine that makes the most sense to me, is the doctrine of congenital consequences.

Like those on the Titanic, some were there by choice, others were not. Some knew of the warnings about icebergs, most didn't, or didn't care. So, you had a group of folks that were all in the same boat so to speak. Some were more responsible than others in regard to matters of the well being of the occupants, to include themselves. But when the end came, there was only one way to get off the Titanic alive, and that was by getting into a life boat. Whether a person knew about the iceberg or not, whether anyone told them the ship was sinking or not, whether they knew about lifeboats or not, in reality did not matter. The bottom line was; the ONLY way to live was, you had to get into the life boat.

Most people died on the Titanic because adequate provision had not been made and ultimately because of the decisions of Captain John Smith. (who incidentally was married to my grandmother's cousin) This is not the case with man's condition.

Ron, I hope I'm wrong about this, and I love you anyway brother. I'm like Sam, I'm trusting that There's some mysteries yet to be revealed, that will make it right. Until the day that they're revealed to me, I just have to believe it like it's written.

After all, you know that I'm not very smart (but I'm crafty and bear watching).

nite nite time,

Likewise in every part, except that around here we don't have any bears to watch, although we have one or two mean sp arrows I'm keeping an eye on. :-P

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/12 0:57

Hi Sam

you wrote...I look forward to the completion of your argument.

I'll do my best with a little study of the words used.

krinO (2919) and katakrinO (2632) with their Strong's Numbers.

These words are used more than 50 times in the writings of Paul, but the KJV does not serve us well in identifying them as it is inconsistent in its translation.

However, we can see a trend in these two examples:

Romans 2:1 Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest (2919): for wherein thou judgest (2919) another, thou condemnest (2632) thyself; for thou that judgest (2919) doest the same things.

1 Corinthians 11:32 But when we are judged (2919), we are chastened of the Lord, that we should (2632) not be condemned (2632) with the world.

These verbs have to do with a process of justice and have associated nouns.

1. krinO - is the process of assessment or judging which leads to a judgment. (it might be guilty or innocent)
2. katakrinO - is to judge against, or to sentence. In this sense it is the next stage of the process that leads to the execution of the sentence. Kata as a prefix strengthens the verb and often means 'thoroughly'.

We are to 'judge' (krinO) ourselves in the sense of monitoring our lives. In 1 Cor 11:32 this is a continuing process and uses the present tense; we are to be continually assessing ourselves. This leads to the Lord's present disciplining of our lives in chastening, rebuke, conviction etc. But there is a coming katakrima (noun)—carrying out of a sentence which is to come. This is a one-off event and the Aorist tense is used. This event is the katakrinO (verb), the passing of the sentence leading to the execution of the sentence.

Romans 5:18 Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation (2631); even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. KJV The AV adds some words here intending to clarify, but instead it muddies the waters. Young's drops the added words and gives us...

Romans 5:18 So, then, as through one offence to all men it is to condemnation (2631), so also through one declaration of 'Righteous' it is to all men to justification of life; (YLT) The essential things to see in this verse are that one offence (Adam's) resulted in 'condemnation' to the whole race. This is a continuation of the theme from

Romans 5:12 because of this, even as through one man the sin did enter into the world, and through the sin the death; and thus to all men the death did pass through, for that all did sin; (YLT)

What I have been trying to say is that the 'Death' of Rom 5:12 is the 'condemnation' of Rom 5:18. The 'sentence' that came through to the whole human race was 'Death'; not physical death which was a consequence, but spiritual Death. This sentence was executed immediately Adam ate the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil. Gen 2:17 and of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, thou dost not eat of it, for in the day of thine eating of it—dying thou dost die. 'Dying thou shalt die' is a Hebrew idiom for intensity (eg James tells us that Elijah 'prayed in his praying' KJV says 'prayed earnestly'.)

This Death is not the mere absence of life, but is the outworking of a sentence in which God abandoned man to his own choices. The world calls it 'freedom', the Bible calls it Death. There is an interesting picture of it at work in Eph 4:22 That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts. 'is corrupt' is the present participle 'the corrupting one'. Death/corruption is not a fixed state but a spring of corruption constantly bubbling up and defiling the whole man.

This is the 'sentence' that the whole human race now lives under. It has an obvious impact on our 'sins' which will receive a future 'sentence', but my conviction is that Adam's sin did not immediately 'sentence' the whole human

race to eternal punishment and separation from God. That 'sentence' will be the result of our own sins, not Adam's.
'certified as MHO at 10:30 GMT, 12th Feb 2004, but watch this space.'

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/12 5:29

Hi Ron,
I think we still pretty much disagree at every point on this issue.

"we don't have any bears to watch, although we have one or two mean sparrows I'm keeping an eye on"

Strange the way that the bears have disappeared from the British Isles. Because I do recall from my service there in the early 70's, there was lots of things there that bears like. In fact I remember distinctly there being LOTS of nuts, and not just a few berries. I also remember watching a few birds while I was there, but I'd think a man of your age and social standing would be passed all that. :-D
Clutch :-P

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/12 5:33

Hi Clutch
yes, there are still plenty of nuts over here. :-o

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/12 5:39

Hi all!

I find myself in agreement with Clutch at points, and with Ron at other points. That makes three persons with three different opinions--see how without the Christ as the centre, there will never be unity? :)

Clutch:

I think the reason of our earthly life is not just to preach the gospel, as you unconsciously implied. Going through transformation of the soul (mind, emotion, and will) and maturity in life are things that will take a lifetime to experience. But this deserves another forum.

I also think Ron is saying that the people who have not heard of the gospel will be judged by a different set of criteria--their deeds. They are not by default saved. (My problem is, given human's total depravity, we are all powerless to do good. So even if we do not consider "original sin", no one will ever attain God's standard of righteousness --doesn't that mean they deserve to go to the lake of fire, just the same?)

Ron:

Even putting original sin aside, what puzzles me is how God will judge those who have not heard of the gospel. (See above)

If God is going to judge according to each individual's deeds, then a distinction will also have to be made between those who have a moral sense and those who are not yet capable of making moral choices (infants, mentally disabled).

According to Romans 2, even those who do not have the Law will have their own laws in their conscience. The way I see it, the reality of human depravity still applies here--whatever moral ideals these people have, they would not be able to attain. So I don't see much chance for anyone to be spared from God's wrath.

The exception would be the infants and the mentally challenged. So if you could show that they have no "congenital guilt" (that is, responsible for Adam's sin), and are therefore, judged only by their actions, then maybe, just maybe, there's a good chance that they might make it to heaven.

We are treading into very speculative realms here. Are we trying too hard to fathom God's mysteries? :)

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/12 6:34

Hey Ron,
I think I like this Secret Agent Sam guy.
He said:

"I find myself in agreement with Clutch at points, and with Ron at other points. That makes three persons with three different opinions--see how without the Christ as the centre, there will never be unity? :)"

I'd wager that he's Infralapsarian too. Except for his Supralapsarian tendencies. I can appreciate someone like us, that has focus, conviction, and can feel strongly both ways on an issue. :-D

By the way, the Sanhedrin met this morning, and I've convinced the younger bulls in the heard to dismantle the gallows, and make a rope bridge from the left over rope. Also, you have a standing invitation to come to the United States and preachon REPENTANCE.

Clutch :-P

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/12 20:34

Sam,
I agree partially with your statement:

"I think the reason of our earthly life is not just to preach the gospel."

I think the reason for our earthly life is to LIVE the gospel, which I believe is more than keeping someone from going to hell. However, the new birth spiritually is square one. Until you do square one, you can't get to whatever you might think square two and beyond is.

Proverbs 11:30 ¶ The fruit of the righteous is a tree of life; and he that winneth souls is wise.

The most IMPORTANT thing we do is win folks to Jesus. Unless you go with Ron's thinking. In that case we're doing mankind an injustice by introducing Jesus to them. Leave them ignorant, so they'll go to heaven. So like Reidhead said, the Lord will reap more of the harvest that He alone is worthy to receive.

Ron's gone far out of the way to reason some babies into heaven. I think the Lord probably has it figured out another way, that He has YET to reveal.

Clutch :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/12 23:29

Clutch wrote The most IMPORTANT thing we do is win folks to Jesus. Unless you go with Ron's thinking. In that case we're doing mankind an injustice by introducing Jesus to them. Leave them ignorant, so they'll go to heaven. So like Reidhead said, the Lord will reap more of the harvest that He alone is worthy to receive.

Ron's gone far out of the way to reason some babies into heaven. I think the Lord probably has it figured out another way, that He has YET to reveal.

1. You can never be doing mankind an injustice when you obey God. Your thinking is man-centred here. Please quote me a verse where the salvation of a soul is stated to be the reason for preaching the gospel.

2. I am the first to acknowledge that 'we know in part'. But we see clearly from David's words that he expected to meet his child in an afterlife. "I shall go to him". On what 'reasonable' basis could this happen if his child was condemned to eternal separation from God on account of Adam's sin? We are expected to give a reason for the hope... Faith without revelation is superstition; we end up with neo-quakerism, as is sometimes revealed in these posts.

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/13 4:43

Clutch:

Re: Human's Chief End

Westminster Shorter Catechism --

Q. *What is the chief end of man?*

A. *The chief end of man is to glorify God and enjoy him.*

I have no objection to the Great Commission. I was merely pointing out that our purpose on earth encompasses a wider scope than saving souls. I don't think you would disagree with this either.

But you said, if there is no need to spread the gospel, then *"immediately after we got saved, God could just take us on to heaven, because we would not be serving much purpose here."*

The logic here assumes the following premises P1 & P2:

P1. The sole purpose for believers on earth before they enter heaven is to spread the gospel.

P2. The implication of Ron's idea is that there is no need to spread the gospel.

C. Therefore, the implication of Ron's idea is that God could immediately take us away from the earth and into heaven after we are saved.

The conclusion can only be made if you have implicitly assumed P1.

Re: Your Critique of Ron's Idea

Your other premise P2 also does not follow from Ron's idea, because I think you have misunderstood his point. He probably would not agree with your inferred conclusion, *"Leave them ignorant, so they'll go to heaven."*

I already mentioned in my previous mail that I think Ron's idea **does not assume** those who have not heard of the gospel will go to heaven. If this is true, your critique would be correct. But he only asserted that these people will be judged on the basis of their deeds alone, and not automatically condemned to eternal perdition simply because they did not receive the gospel.

In fact, my problem with this idea is that few, if any, would actually be saved, because man's righteousness is but ragged clothes in the eyes of God.

Phew, every time I have a discussion/debate on this topic, I would remind myself, God is more interested in the destiny of those who are living. Let's continue with the evangelistic fervour that God intended us to have. Let's go out there and save some souls. :)

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/13 5:02

Ron:

1.

"17 ¶ For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect.

18 For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us which are saved it is the power of God.

19 For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent.

20 Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?

21 For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.

22 For the Jews require a sign, and the Greeks seek after wisdom:

23 But we preach Christ crucified, unto the Jews a stumblingblock, and unto the Greeks foolishness;

24 But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.

25 Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

26 For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are

called:

27 But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things which are mighty;

I Corinthians 1:17-27

2. I agree with your point here. Where I'm in disagreement is in your conclusions based upon assessment of the scriptures that you've used.

Sam,

You said:

"Phew, every time I have a discussion/debate on this topic, I would remind myself, God is more interested in the destiny of those who are living. Let's continue with the evangelistic fervour that God intended us to have. Let's go out there and save some souls. :)"

AGREED! :-)

Ron:

A side note here. I've been sharing this discussion with Kenneth Owens who was with me at the prison a few nights ago. He was the most adamant one of us about your comment, and fussed for about two hours during the trip. I've told him some of your rationale behind your belief, and you MIGHT get a convert out of this. I have printed out our posts so that he can read what you've said, and work out his conclusions, NOT based on what I've said." :-P " Knowing Kenny O. he will not rest until he's thoroughly studied out, and prayed through the issues in question. Then, perhaps by the power of the Holy Spirit, if he "gets it" like you "gots it" based upon your respected interpretations Perhaps he can 'splain it to me in language that I understand, and then I'll "gets it " too. Anyway, he and I will kick this around some more in private. I think we've thrown enough scripture back and forth between the opinions, and we can let the Holy Spirit work with that. I'll let you know if we get revelation, but I'm basically done on this thread. If someone else wishes to take it up, I'll monitor the progress.

Clutch :-)

Re: neo-quakers, on: 2004/2/13 10:42

Philologos apparently has a problem with "neo-quakers." Ron, do you mean people like those at the American Friends Service Committee? www.afsc.org winners of the Nobel peace prize?

He asks the question, is grace earned or is it a gift? and earnestly claims that it is only a gift and cannot be earned. But what then is the point of the following:

"Then the righteous will answer Him, saying, 'Lord, when did we see You hungry, and feed You, or thirsty, and give You drink? And when did we see You a stranger, and invite you in, or naked and clothe You? And when did we see You sick, or in prison, and come to You?

And the King will answer and say to them, 'Truly I say to you, to the extent that you did it to one of these brothers of Mine, even the least of them, you did it to Me.'

Faith without works is impossible.

I am happily in the company of "neo-quakers."

Jake

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/14 5:56

Jake,
I am in shock AND awe. First there was the recent revelation that you had changed from the Methodist to the Vegetarian Church (we also have one of those in Columbus Ga., it takes up a whole city block downtown). Now you say that you've moved your letter to the Neo-Quaker Church. I'm sure the spirit is guiding you through all this, but I must caution you. With all this denomination hopping you may get a reputation for being insincere.

Have a nice day.
Clutch

P.S. Do you know of a government grant that I might get, so that I can market my recipe for squirrel soup? I thought about approaching the Campbell's Corp. on the corporate side. What do you think? :-)

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/16 2:02

Hi Jake
you asked Philologos apparently has a problem with "neo-quakers." Ron, do you mean people like those at the American Friends Service Committee? www.afsc.org winners of the Nobel peace prize?

I mean people who adopt Fox/Barclay methodology but abandon their theology.

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/16 2:15

Hi Clutch
is your long quote from 1 Corinthians your answer for my request to quote me a verse where the salvation of a soul is stated to be the reason for preaching the gospel.?

I have preached the gospel for over 40 years on street corners, in pulpits, bible colleges, schools, night clubs, even prisons. ;-) I have preached the gospel in more than 20 countries. So I don't want you to misunderstand what I am saying. I am only questioning the ultimate motivation, not the absolute necessity of preaching the gospel to every creature.

Re: squirrel soup, on: 2004/2/17 4:35

Clutch,

Laugh all you want. But, Mankind's aggression was learned through the hunt and the territorialism that comes with it. The tools of war and our reasons for warfare arose from the hunt, as well. By refusing to realize our nature and whence it came, we shut our eyes to the lessons of the past and are condemned to continue in ignorance, (and violence.)

Q: could mankind wage war or contemplate murder if they hadn't first become desensitized to blood and violence through the hunt? Scavenging led to hunting which led to war and all sorts of other sin. This is what Genesis tells us.

Jake

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/17 9:34

Jake wrote Mankind's aggression was learned through the hunt and the territorialism that comes with it. The tools of war and our reasons for warfare arose from the hunt, as well. By refusing to realize our nature and whence it came, we shut our eyes to the lessons of the past and are condemned to continue in ignorance, (and violence.)

Q: could mankind wage war or contemplate murder if they hadn't first become desensitized to blood and violence through the hunt? Scavenging led to hunting which led to war and all sorts of other sin. This is what Genesis tells us.

This irrational speculation has dominated your contributions to 'evolution'. It is utterly without biblical endorsement. It is a fantasy of your own mind and clearly becoming an obsession. It derives from your own closed world of 'inspiration' and is not what Genesis tells us; it is 'what Jake tells us Genesis tells us'.

The first sin was independence which quickly hardened into rebellion. It was not the 'sin' of a group but of an individual

uniquely placed as the federal head of the human race. Adam was an individual whose behaviour continues to impact the whole race. Jesus Christ is another individual through whom God has made a new creation. In Adam all die, in Christ all will be made alive. We are all in Adam by first birth, and can only be brought into Christ by regeneration.

Man's aggression is the result of his union and communion with a Spirit whose nature is to steal, and to kill and to destroy. We are under the sway of a cosmic vandal and only regeneration can cure the condition. Our condition cannot be repaired with education or meditation or reincarnation, which is why Christ said, unequivocally, ye must be born again.

To suggest any other cure for man's condition is to preach another gospel, and the anger of God rests on such.

Re: - posted by Clutch (), on: 2004/2/17 9:58

Ron,
I MUST protest! You said:

"Man's aggression is the result of his union and communion with a Spirit whose nature is to steal, and to kill and to destroy. We are under the sway of a cosmic vandal and only regeneration can cure the condition. Our condition cannot be repaired with education or meditation or reincarnation, which is why Christ said, unequivocally, ye must be born again.

To suggest any other cure for man's condition is to preach another gospel, and the anger of God rests on such."

AGGRESSION is spelled with two G's.

I will take Jake's sound advice when he said;

"Clutch,
Laugh all you want."

22 ¶ A merry heart doeth good like a medicine: but a broken spirit drieth the bones. Proverbs 17:22

Clutch

Re:, on: 2004/2/17 10:08

Ron, I agree with the cure, not the cause. Evil is a progression that began as a seemingly very small thing, eating something prohibited by God. Yes this was an act of independence. And Genesis 1:29 tells us what was prohibited. The myriad forms of outward sin we see today unfolded from the first cause. We sought to be like God, having power over life and death (among animals, at first).

The Jewish sacrifice of lamb's blood is symbolic of our original sin, and a (poor) means of apologizing to God by offering Him the fruits.

Jake

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/17 11:16

Jake wrote Ron, I agree with the cure, not the cause. Evil is a progression that began as a seemingly very small thing, eating something prohibited by God. Yes this was an act of independence. And Genesis 1:29 tells us what was prohibited. The myriad forms of outward sin we see today unfolded from the first cause. We sought to be like God, having power over life and death (among animals, at first).

The Jewish sacrifice of lamb's blood is symbolic of our original sin, and a (poor) means of apologizing to God by offering Him the fruits.

You see this is your import into the scripture rather than a drawing out of what is actually there. Gen 1:29 is not a comm

and or a prohibition it is a simple permission. The prohibition comes in Gen 2:17 but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die

When Adam transgressed this clearly stated prohibition he died, on the very day. He chose to live by self-provided knowledge rather than revelation. Notice it was the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. Man was to get his revelation from God, not from earth bound resources. He defied this prohibition and has fed from the same tree ever since.

Your notion of outward sins unfolding from the first cause as the first eating of meat is just nonsense. The notion that a lamb's blood was never a symbol of any kind of sin. Lambs were offered as burnt offerings not sin offerings.

Re:, on: 2004/2/17 11:43

Ron,

Clearly, the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil is a symbolic one, as is the Tree of Life. Their fruit was what happened to us when we disobeyed God or obeyed Him. Otherwise they would have been called an "apple tree" or some other specific name.

The act of eating something forbidden is the clue. The story is the same in evolution, as well. Protoman was an herbivore. Then they became scavengers, transgressed their way into being hunters, and then became cannibals and warriors.

In Genesis we eat something forbidden, begin killing, and then become nomadic (Cain the restless wanderer).

If there hadn't been this agreement between these disparate sources, I wouldn't be following this line of thought. But it is clearly there and so there is confirmation between the stories.

Don't discount this as nonsense. It fits together very well.

Jake

Re: - posted by philologos (), on: 2004/2/17 13:14

Jake

as an exposition of Gen 1 & 2 it is nonsense. Did you notice that there were two trees in the centre of the garden and that man was permitted to eat of all trees but one; hence the other tree in the centre that was not the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was available to him.

He made a choice which caused him to be banned from eating the fruit of the tree which was previously available to him.

I do call it nonsense. It only fits together well because you ignore anything that doesn't fit. If we remove all the things that don't fit it fits; there's a surprise.

Re: - posted by Agent001 (), on: 2004/2/19 3:56

In Chinese, there is an idiom, which literally translated means, "The chicken talking to the duck." It designates a complete failure in communication.

In this case, the presuppositions are so wide apart that no meaningful conversation could follow. I see no common ground at all on which the "debate" could continue!