

ORIGINAL SIN INCLUDES GUILT AND THE WILL

Harvest Inspiration Discoveries Lecture Series (HID)

WWW.prodiscoveries.com
dgmck8100@gmail.com

Lecture goes along with Power Point: Harvest Inspiration Discoveries Original Sin Rev (latest).pptx

Table of Contents

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Introduction..... | 3 |
| Major changes in our theology have taken place by the addition of the doctrine of original sin. | 4 |
| Significant changes in the cherished doctrine of righteousness by faith have taken place. | 4 |
| So What’s the Basic Doctrinal Issue? | 4 |
| Summary of Augustine’s Life..... | 5 |
| His Theology Based on His Life Experience | 5 |
| Developed Theory of Predestination..... | 6 |
| Celibacy Was His Problem | 6 |
| First to Develop Predestination & Original Sin as a System of Belief | 6 |
| The two companion doctrines, predestination and original sin Included Following Points: | 6 |
| Led to Belief in Infant Baptism..... | 7 |
| Challenged by Pelagius..... | 7 |
| Development of Both Positions Down Through History..... | 7 |
| Pelagian Views Modified..... | 8 |
| Calvin, Luther Essentially Augustinian | 8 |
| Other Protestants Disagreed With Them..... | 8 |
| Certain General Observations can be Made..... | 8 |
| First, the arguments tend to be philosophical rather than scriptural | 9 |
| Second, the awareness of enormous problems pervades this literature | 9 |
| Third, Some of the arguments advanced are simply incredible | 9 |
| Problems Facing Augustine Supporters | 9 |
| Pros and Cons..... | 9 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| What Some SDA’s Argue-Pros | 10 |
| How do the ‘Pros’ Reply to Those Who Say it is Blasphemous?..... | 10 |
| Two Ingenious Schemes to Keep Jesus From Contamination | 10 |
| Arguments against these schemes | 10 |
| Scriptures advanced in support of original sin do not bear up under investigation. | 11 |
| Romans 5:12 | 11 |
| 1 Corinthians 15:22 | 11 |
| Psalms 51:5..... | 12 |
| Ellen White’s Position on Original Sin..... | 14 |
| SDA’s Traditionally Preached Against Original Sin | 14 |
| Accepting Original Sin Doctrine Affects Other Doctrine | 14 |
| Now for a discussion of the Topic of Guilt..... | 15 |
| There is Never any Guilt in the Flesh | 15 |
| What Then is the Will?..... | 16 |
| Ellen White Assigns Responsibility to the Will For Sinning | 17 |
| What Then is a Good Definition of Guilt?..... | 17 |
| This Definition Avoids Assigning Responsibility to God..... | 17 |
| Scriptural Truths About the Nature of Guilt | 18 |
| Are There Extenuating Circumstances in Assigning Guilt? | 18 |
| Ellen White on Inheritance of Guilt | 19 |
| What has been the Traditional SDA, EGW, View | 20 |
| Do you know of any <i>unavoidable</i> inheritance other than <i>biological</i> inheritance? | 20 |
| Definition of Terms | 21 |
| By biological- | 21 |
| By inheritance- | 21 |
| By unavoidable-..... | 21 |
| First, is biological, flesh-to-flesh inheritance actually unavoidable?..... | 21 |
| Second, are there other types of inheritance that are equally unavoidable? | 21 |
| List of Other Types of Inheritance-All Avoidable | 21 |
| Therefore—This creates a monumental contradiction | 22 |
| If A Baby Inherits Guilt From Adam—Only one of two Reasons How:..... | 22 |
| Some Have Tried to Invent a Third Reason..... | 22 |
| Consider the unusual use of the terms, ‘state and condition’ in the Original Sin Doctrine. | 22 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------|----|
| Conclusion: | 23 |
| NOTES..... | 24 |
| APPENDIXA:..... | 25 |
| Augustine of Hippo | 25 |
| Pelagius | 25 |
| Jacobus Arminius | 26 |
| John Wesley | 26 |
| John Calvin..... | 26 |
| Zwingli | 27 |
| Original Sin –wikipedia | 27 |
| Augustine..... | 28 |
| Cassian..... | 29 |
| Church reaction..... | 29 |
| Protestant reformation | 30 |
| Council of Trent..... | 30 |
| Denominational views | 30 |
| Roman Catholicism..... | 30 |
| Eastern Orthodoxy | 31 |
| Classical Anglicanism..... | 32 |
| Methodism | 32 |
| Seventh-day Adventism | 32 |
| Jehovah's Witnesses | 33 |
| Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints | 33 |
| Islam..... | 33 |
| APPENDIX B | 34 |
| Louis Berkof..... | 34 |
| Justo L. Gonzalez | 34 |
| Dr. Peter de Rosa,..... | 34 |

SLIDE 1

Introduction

Hello, my name is Dennis McKeever. I am the founder of Harvest Inspiration Discoveries; not to be confused with Harvest Inspiration Ministries.. Harvest Inspiration Discoveries is dedicated to defending the historicist approach to biblical interpretation.

"Historicism" is a school of thought with regard to prophetic interpretation. I believe that the Seventh-day Adventist understanding of the great prophecies of the Old and New Testaments is indeed God's truth. Are there details that invite further study and clarification? Certainly. That is why I am doing these seminars. But the historicist framework on which the church bases its understanding of these things is the right framework, and the message that has resulted from such study is the right message. As we share these topics with you, it is my prayer that you will also think so.

And now to our present topic,

ORIGINAL SIN INCLUDING THE ISSUE OF GUILT AND THE WILL

Since it is common knowledge that Augustine's doctrine of original sin is now the dominant theology in Christianity and the Seventh-day Adventist church, it would appear that a careful examination of that doctrine should be undertaken by all who share a concern for the purity of the Christian faith.

SLIDE 1A

Major changes in our theology have taken place by the addition of the doctrine of original sin.

READ--Because the nature of God, the nature of the incarnate Christ, the nature of man and the nature of salvation itself are all involved in the Augustinian doctrine.

SLIDE 1B

Significant changes in the cherished doctrine of righteousness by faith have taken place.

READ --You may easily verify the close relationship between the concepts of original sin and the doctrine of righteousness by faith by asking advocates of the so-called "new theology" two questions:

SLIDE 1C

1: Why do you believe that it is impossible for Christians to stop sinning, even through the power of Christ?

2: Why do you believe the incarnate Christ had to take the nature of the unfallen Adam rather than a nature like ours?

READ—The same answer will be given to both questions:

SLIDE 1D

Because of original sin.

READ--Since the corruption of original sin remains in all believers until they die, it is impossible for them to ever stop sinning, even through the power of Christ. And since the inherited guilt of original sin would have disqualified Christ from becoming the Savior of the world, He had to be protected from original sin by assuming the nature of the unfallen Adam.

SLIDE 2

So What's the Basic Doctrinal Issue?

So the *basic* issue in the present discussion is not the doctrine of righteousness by faith; it is the doctrine of original sin.

READ--Before making your decision whether the doctrine of original sin should be added to the theology of the Seventh-day Adventist church, you may want to examine that doctrine in its historical context.

Somewhat abbreviated summaries of the various debates over the doctrine may be found in standard textbooks of systematic theology, such as those prepared by Berkhof, Shedd, Strong, and others.¹

SLIDE 3

Summary of Augustine's Life

READ--Aurelius Augustine (354-450) was born in Tagaste, North Africa, to a pagan father and a Christian mother. A brilliant student, he excelled in philosophy and rhetoric, and eventually served as a professor of rhetoric in Tagaste, Carthage, Rome, and Milan. Under the influence of Ambrose of Milan he became a Christian and then a priest, and finally the bishop of Hippo in North Africa. His philosophical and rhetorical skills made him the dialectical giant of the church fathers.²

He had a highly passionate nature, and as a student in Carthage gave himself up enthusiastically to the practice of the pagan vices that abounded there. "I was ashamed to be shameless," he later wrote of these years.³ He took a concubine, who bore him two sons, and lived with her for fifteen years, then put her away as he began to move toward the church.⁴

He found himself unable to control his feelings, however, so he took a second concubine and lived with her during the two years that he was listening to the preaching of Ambrose in Milan.⁵

Finally becoming convinced that it was his Christian duty, he put this second concubine away and committed himself to the lifelong tensions and frustrations of priestly celibacy.

SLIDE 3A

His Theology Based on His Life Experience

READ--Given these conditions, we are not surprised to learn that he soon announced to the world a profound theological discovery, that there is in man an *impossible to remove evil* that makes it utterly impossible for him to live without sinning, even through the power of Christ, and that this *impossible to remove evil* is, have you guessed it? Lust, sexual desire.

He eventually extended the term to include most of man's other spiritual problems, but lust was always at the heart of them.

. . . Augustine seems obsessed with the ravages which unbridled sexuality produces in human beings⁶

The worst feature of Augustinianism is the continual and undue attention it has drawn to the sphere of sex.⁷

He became convinced that all sexual desire is sinful, even within marriage, and that the ideal for both single and married persons was total abstinence from sexual expression. The very act of procreating a child was necessarily sinful, he taught.

SLIDE 3B

Developed Theory of Predestination

READ--Since he now believed that man's hope for salvation must somehow overcome the handicap of a character that could not be free from sinning, he found it necessary to establish some ground for hope. He finally discovered what he was seeking in the idea of predestination, the "sovereign decrees" of God. If God had by His irresistible decree foreordained your salvation before the world began, then you need not worry about deficiencies in your character. You would be saved anyway, through the grace of justification, simply because God had predestined you to be among His elect. Nothing that you could or could not do would have any effect on the final result, your salvation was assured, irrespective of your life and character.

In this highly artificial theological device Augustine found rest for his tormented spirit.

SLIDE 3C

Celibacy Was His Problem

READ--We are moved to wonder at this point what the world might have been spared in terms of endless theological debate if this highly passionate and desperately frustrated man had understood it to be God's will for him to have a wife, a home, and a family, so that his natural feelings might have been properly expressed. But unfortunately for the world, Augustine conceived it to be God's will for him to be a celibate priest, and the consequences of that commitment to a life for which he obviously was not qualified by the gift of continence were to be written *hugely* in the pages of church history, for he was without question the greatest intellect of his time.

SLIDE 3D

First to Develop Predestination & Original Sin as a System of Belief

READ--Neither of the two companion doctrines, predestination and original sin, was fully originated by Augustine. Catholic writers tend to see more of the "germ" of these ideas in the writings of the earlier church fathers than Protestants do, but it is generally agreed that he was the first to develop the doctrines and their implications into a system,⁹ which included the following points:

SLIDE 4

The two companion doctrines, predestination and original sin Included Following Points:

1. God imputes guilt for the sin of Adam to every human being born upon this earth in addition to their inherited moral weakness.
2. The guilt of original sin is terminated at baptism, but the moral weakness continues throughout life.
3. Because of this continuing moral weakness of original sin, it is not possible for Christians to stop sinning, even through the power of Christ.

SLIDE 4A

Led to Belief in Infant Baptism

READ--Since God imputes the guilt of Adam's sin to all infants, and this guilt is terminated only at baptism, it follows that all infants who die before being baptized are lost and condemned to the never ending tortures of hell fire. This horrifying dogma was a problem even to Augustine.

Augustine tried during one period to soften its shocking impact by proposing that the punishment of infants might be less severe than that of adults. He appealed desperately but fruitlessly to Jerome for help in solving the problem. But in the end he returned with fanatical determination to the logical consequences of his theological presuppositions, that unbaptized infants will fully experience the torturing fires of hell throughout all eternity.¹⁰

Because the guilt of original sin is terminated only at baptism, it follows that all unbaptized heathen are lost and condemned to the eternal flames.

SLIDE 5

Challenged by Pelagius

READ--In obvious self-contradiction Augustine maintained that God's sovereign will expressed in His decrees of predestination is absolutely irresistible by the will of man, yet the will of man remains totally free.

Augustine was soon challenged by Pelagius, a British monk who had moved to Rome, and who was temperamentally the opposite of Augustine. For him Christian living was apparently easy, and he was baffled by Augustine's pressing need of an accommodation with sin, which accommodation he felt was neither necessary nor scriptural.

Unfortunately he over-reacted and went to the extreme of denying that either guilt or weakness descended from Adam to his descendants.¹² As he saw it, every child born upon the earth has the same start that Adam had.

(We should remember, however, that we have very little material from the pen of Pelagius himself. Most of our understanding of his views is gained by studying the challenges to those views written by his opponents, always a somewhat precarious procedure.)

SLIDE 6

Development of Both Positions Down Through History

READ--Thus the battle lines were drawn, and in succeeding ages there would be a tendency to identify all views on the subject in terms of their relation to the early views of Augustine on the one side or Pelagius on the other, calling them Augustinian, Pelagian, Semi-Augustinian or Semi-Pelagian.

For purposes of classification historians have generally referred to the position of the Eastern church as Pelagian, the position of the medieval Western church as Semi-Pelagian (or Semi-Augustinian), and the Reformation churches of Calvin and Luther as truly Augustinian.

There had been a gradual retreat from the extreme views of Augustine in the Western church as they were modified to various degrees by John Cassian of Gaul (360-395), Peter Abelard (1079-1142), Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), Duns Scotus (1266-1308), and finally the all important Council of Trent (1545-1563).

Semi-Pelagian views were thus definitely adopted and stated in exact form by the Council of Trent, and they held full sway until the Reformation, when the Protestants revived the Augustinian anthropology

and reinstated Augustinianism in the churches of the west.¹³

SLIDE 6A

Pelagian Views Modified

READ--These "Semi-Pelagian" views consisted of such changes as more emphasis on the freedom of man's will, a modification of the tortures of infants, and a tendency to define original sin more in terms of weakness than in terms of guilt.

SLIDE 6B

Calvin, Luther Essentially Augustinian

READ--It is generally agreed that Calvin and Luther elevated the doctrines of Augustine to a height far above their place in the Catholic theology of Reformation times.

SLIDE 6C

Speaking generally, the Reformers were in agreement with Augustine.¹⁵

Calvin was essentially Augustinian.¹⁴

The Reformers fall back on Augustine's theory.¹⁶

~~in the Reformed section (Augustinian influence) rushes steeply and suddenly upwards~~¹⁷

SLIDE 7

Other Protestants Disagreed With Them

READ--But the Reformers' grim emphasis upon the extreme views of Augustine brought about a reaction among Protestants, as it had earlier among Catholics.

SLIDE 7A

Zwingli of Switzerland (1484-1531) refused to endorse Augustine's doctrine of predestination, and defined the doctrine of original sin more in terms of weakness than of guilt.

Arminius of Holland (1560-1609) followed the example of Zwingli, as did

John Wesley of England (1703-1769).

READ--Until about 1750 the stern Puritans of New England held to strict Calvinistic (Augustinian) views regarding the inherited guilt of original sin, but reactions against it eventually launched a prolonged controversy that lasted over a hundred years in the Calvinistic Congregational, Reformed, and Presbyterian churches of America.¹⁸

SLIDE 8

Certain General Observations can be Made

READ--So through the centuries since Augustine launched his doctrine a vast repository of literature has been accumulated in the recording of the conflicting views of its defenders on the one side and its opponents on the other. It has been without question one of the most intensely debated issues in the history of Christianity.

Certain general observations are possible.

SLIDE 8B

First, the arguments tend to be philosophical rather than scriptural

READ--due to the scarcity of scriptural evidence on the subject of original sin, the arguments tend to be philosophical rather than scriptural, consisting of page after page of desperately labored human reasoning which makes rather tedious reading.

SLIDE 8C

Second, the awareness of enormous problems pervades this literature

READ-- the awareness of enormous problems pervades this literature, much of which is devoted to elaborate explanations intended to defend the character of God against the implications of injustice and cruelty. It is apparent that these explanations have taxed the ingenuity of their authors to the utmost.

SLIDE 8D

Third, Some of the arguments advanced are simply incredible

READ--the dissatisfaction of each group of theorists with arguments advanced by other followers of Augustine is likely to remind the Seventh-day Adventist of the confusion and disagreement which exists among the defenders of Sunday worship. Some of the arguments advanced are simply incredible and speak eloquently of the desperate plight of their authors.

SLIDE 9

Problems Facing Augustine Supporters

The problems facing those who wish to support Augustine are indeed formidable.

How can men be involved in the wrong doing of a man who died thousands of years before they were born?

How can a just God impute the guilt of an adult to an innocent infant?

How can a just God consign that infant to the agonies of a fire that will never stop burning?

And if men acquire guilt simply by being born into the human race, what happens when that guilt rests upon Jesus at His birth?

SLIDE 10

Pros and Cons

Regarding our involvement in Adam's sin,

SLIDE 10a--pros have argued that we were all present in Adam's body when he sinned, to which

SLIDE 10B--cons have replied that if this were true we would inherit the sins of all of our ancestors, and not only Adam's, since we were equally present in all of their bodies.

SLIDE 10C--Pros have argued that Adam had a covenant with God which involved us, and that he broke it, thus implicating us.

SLIDE 10D--Cons have replied that scripture knows nothing of such a covenant, and there can be no covenant without agreement, which we neither entered into nor authorized Adam to negotiate for us.

SLIDE 10E

-Pros have argued that Adam represented us as our head or ruler.

-Cons have replied that subjects of a ruler are not responsible for his personal crimes, and in any case Adam ceased to be ruler long before we were born.

SLIDE 11

What Some SDA's Argue-Pros

SLIDE 11A--Pros, including many in our own church, are arguing that men are born into a state or condition (as yet undefined) that causes them to receive something that is equivalent to guilt without inheriting it. A systematic statement of this argument would be:

SLIDE 11B--Because of the sin of Adam, all men are born into (but do not inherit) a state or condition (undefined) which causes them to fall under the judgment and condemnation of God (but it is not guilt).

READ-Unbelievable! To be born into something is to inherit it, and that which places men under the judgment and condemnation of God is guilt, despite the word-games.

SLIDE 12

How do the 'Pros' Reply to Those Who Say it is Blasphemous?

SLIDE 12A--In response to the many horrified protests that the doctrine of original sin is a blasphemous indictment of the character of God, the pathetic rejoinder has often been made that what is unjust for men may be just for God, so we should not expect God to abide by principles of justice as understood by men. But has not God invited us to evaluate His justice?¹⁹

SLIDE 12B-- Calvin and Luther both sought refuge in the plea that it is not proper for created beings to ask any questions about the justice of their Creator.

SLIDE 13

Two Ingenious Schemes to Keep Jesus From Contamination

READ--And in order to keep Christ, the child of Mary, from being contaminated by original sin, two ingenious schemes have been devised.

SLIDE 13A

Catholic theologians proclaimed a doctrine of the immaculate conception which called for a special miracle that kept Mary free from original sin, so that she would not pass it on to Christ.

SLIDE 13B

Protestants, not to be outdone, invented a slightly different doctrine of the immaculate conception which called for a special miracle that made it possible for Christ to be born as the son of Mary, yet not inherit her human nature but rather the nature of Adam before the fall.

SLIDE 14

Arguments against these schemes

SLIDE 14A

Objectors have pointed out that both of these schemes are extra-Biblical, since scripture knows nothing of either miracle, and the humanity of Christ, the hope of our salvation, is effectively destroyed by either of them.

SLIDE 14B

It was primarily for this reason that our pioneers firmly rejected the doctrine that Christ came to earth in the nature of the unfallen Adam. They spared us involvement in this enormous controversy by following Wesley, Arminius, and Zwingli rather than Calvin, Luther, and Augustine.

SLIDE 15

Scriptures advanced in support of original sin do not bear up under investigation.

Romans 5:12

READ--The scriptures advanced in support of the doctrine of original sin do not bear up well under investigation. Exhibit A has been Romans 5:12:

SLIDE 15A

“Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men.”

SLIDE 15B

Let us observe that at this point we have a statement of fact with no explanation offered. The explanation comes in the next clause:

SLIDE 15C

“for that all have sinned.”

SLIDE 15D

"For that" means because. The verse does not say because all have inherited guilt from Adam. It says because all have sinned. They therefore have guilt of their own and have no need to borrow any from Adam.

SLIDE 16

1 Corinthians 15:22

“For as in Adam all die, in Christ shall all be made alive.”

SLIDE 16A

Proponents of the doctrine of original sin are required to break up the natural parallelism between *in Adam* and *in Christ* and give these two phrases altogether different meaning. *In Adam* is taken to mean an organic relationship of nature which man has of necessity and about which he has no choice at all. But the phrase *in Christ*, instead of being ascribed a similar meaning as natural parallelism would require, is given an altogether different meaning.

SLIDE 16B

We all know that we are not *in Christ* by a natural or organic relationship without any choice or decision of our own. We are *in Christ* because we have deliberately chosen to follow Him and make Him our leader,

model, and guide. This is the only thing that *in Christ* can mean.

READ--Surely it is an unwarranted wresting of scripture that takes two phrases that are set up by a writer in a parallel construction and gives them altogether different meanings. The purpose of the writer is best preserved when both phrases are read alike. *In Christ* means to follow and imitate Christ. *In Adam* means to follow and imitate Adam. There is no reason to say that *in Adam* means a natural un-chosen relationship and *in Christ* means the opposite.

And finally, consider Psalms 51:5:

SLIDE 17

Psalms 51:5

“Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.”

Augustine seized upon this as evidence that the very act of procreating a child is sinful, but Paul writes in Hebrews 13:4:

“Marriage is honorable in all, and the bed undefiled.”

And if we take Psalms 51:5 as a statement of original sin, this contradicts David's words in Psalms 71:5-6:

“For thou art my hope, O Lord God, thou art my trust from my youth. By thee have I been holden up from the womb: thou art He that took me out of my mother's bowels. . . . “

READ—Here we go with something exciting. Hang on to your seats!!

SLIDE 18[Thru Item 7] and 19[Item 8-14] and 20 to cover whole chart.

| An Exegetical Exercise on Psalms 51:5 Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me. | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| QUESTIONS | ANSWER BY EXEGESIS (Getting meaning out of text) | ANSWER BY EISEGESIS (Putting meaning into a text) |
| 1. Who is speaking? | 1. David. | 1. All men. |
| 2. Who is he talking about? | 2. His mother and himself . | 2. All mothers and all men. |
| 3. What act is he talking about? | 3. His own conception . | 3. The conception of all men. |
| 4. What does he say about it? | 4. It was done in sin. | 4. It is always done in sin. |
| 5. Whose sin was it? | 5. His mother's. | 5. All mothers. |
| 6. What was its nature? | 6. We are not told. | 6. Original sin and guilt. |
| 7. What are the possibilities? | 7. Adultery, concubinage, an evil mother, the condition of the race. | 7. Original sin and guilt. |
| 8. Who was his mother? | 8. We are not told. | 8. The wife of Jesse. |
| 9. Was she Jesse's lawful wife? | 9. We are not told. | 9. Yes, she was. |
| 10. Was she a concubine? | 10. We are not told. | 10. No, she was not. |
| 11. Was she an adulteress? | 11. We are not told. | 11. No, she was not. |
| 12. Was her union with Jesse lawful? | 12. We are not told. | 12. Yes, it was. |
| 13. What can we conclude? | 13. Any of #7 would be possible. | 13. This proves the doctrine of original sin and guilt. |
| 14. How does exegesis compare with eisegesis? | 14. <i>Every statement above is a fact.</i> | 14. <i>Every statement above is an assumption.</i> |

Eisegesis--An interpretation, especially of Scripture, that expresses the interpreter's own ideas, bias, or the like, rather than the meaning of the text.

SLIDE 20

-So the conclusion that Psalms 51:5 proves the doctrine of original sin and guilt is based on thirteen assumptions, and not a single fact.

READ--And in any case, as has been pointed out, if David were speaking of a personal sin, it was his mother's, not his. So we had best see this verse as a more poetic way of expressing David's thought that all have a sinful nature. Then we force no contradictions on scripture.

SLIDE 21

Ellen White's Position on Original Sin

READ--I have not been able to find any use of the term *original sin* in reference to guilt or weakness imputed to us for the sin of Adam in the writings of Ellen White, but I did find clear evidence that she was familiar with the concept and the uses made of it:

SLIDE 21A

“There are many who in their hearts murmur against God. They say, "We inherit the fallen nature of Adam, and are not responsible for our natural imperfections." They find fault with God's requirements, and complain that He demands what they have no power to give. Satan made the same complaint in heaven, but such thoughts dishonor God.”²⁰ *Signs of the Times*, August 29, 1892.

READ--One of the major emphases in Ellen White's writings is her understanding that the claim that God's law could not be obeyed by His creatures was Satan's first, greatest, and most persistent attack against the character of God.

You will find references to it in DA 29, DA 69, DA 117, DA 308-9, DA 311-13, DA 618, ST 1/16/96, and ST 7/23/02, to mention only a few. I have listed these in your handout.

SLIDE 22

READ--Her own response to this claim is best given in her own words:

“Therefore he (Satan) is constantly seeking to deceive the followers of Christ with his FATAL SOPHISTRY that it is impossible for them to overcome.”²¹ (Emphasis mine) *The Great Controversy* p. 489.

“Let no one say, I cannot remedy my defects of character. If you come to this decision, you will certainly fail of obtaining everlasting life.”²² *Christ's Object Lessons*, p. 331.

SLIDE 23

SDA's Traditionally Preached Against Original Sin

READ--Seventh-day Adventists have historically preached a doctrine of inherited weakness, but not a doctrine of inherited guilt. As we consider this subject, we need to remember that theological systems may be compared to a chain-mesh, that is, a net formed of metal chain links that connect with other links around them. Few doctrines exist in isolation with no connection with other doctrines.

SLIDE 23A

Accepting Original Sin Doctrine Affects Other Doctrine

SLIDE 23B

Those who accept the doctrine of original sin defined as inherited guilt are required to develop some sort of the immaculate conception doctrine in order to keep that guilt from reaching Jesus.

Having done this, they are required to define Christ's role as our example in harmony with this separation of His experience from ours, which leads to the conclusion that we cannot overcome temptation as He did.

This in turn leads to the conclusion that man is saved by justification only, since it is not possible for him to stop sinning.

And this leads to a doctrine of salvation by manipulation, whereby God will perform a mechanical adjustment to man's brain in order to eliminate sin from his experience when He takes man into the heavenly kingdom.

READ--All of this is contrary to the platform of truth developed by our pioneers under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and **was** foreign to Seventh-day Adventist theology.

SLIDE 24

Now for a discussion of the Topic of Guilt—**[THIS WOULD BE A GOOD TIME TO PAUSE THIS PRESENTATION AND TAKE A BREAK]**

READ--At the beginning of the history of sin in human experience, we see a woman looking at a forbidden fruit, taking it into her hand, and eating it.

SLIDE 24A Which, may we ask, was most guilty, the eye for looking, the hand for taking, or the mouth for eating the fruit?

READ--We pose the question only to demonstrate its lack of appeal to the reason. No intelligent person would assign any of the burdens of guilt to the eye, the hand, or the mouth of Eve. These fleshly instruments were all under the control of Eve's will, and could not do other than obey. The option of making other choices was not theirs; indeed, they possessed no equipment for the making of choices. The choice and the decision were acts of Eve's will, and her will must therefore carry the burden of responsibility, the guilt.

SLIDE 24B

There is Never any Guilt in the Flesh

There was never any guilt in the flesh of Eve.

The human will, that had set itself in opposition to the will of its Creator God, was guilty.

Ellen White, writes:

“. . . the flesh of itself cannot act contrary to the will of God. -*Adventist Home*, p. 127.”

If the flesh cannot act contrary to the will of God, then it is certain that the flesh cannot be guilty.

READ--In the next scene of this cosmic tragedy we see Adam looking at the fruit, taking it, and eating it. Shall we ascribe guilt to the eye, the hand, the mouth, or any other part of the flesh of Adam, such as the genes or chromosomes?

The answer can only be, No. It was the will of Adam that sinned, and it is the will of Adam that must carry the burden of responsibility, the guilt.

There was never any guilt in the flesh of Adam.

READ--The flesh of my stomach desires food. The moral distinction between eating the food in my neighbor's lunch and eating the food in my own lunch is not meaningful to my flesh. The *will* must direct the flesh to not eat my neighbor's lunch and to be content with my own. With every need, appetite, or desire of the

flesh the same principle holds.

SLIDE 25

All voluntary actions of the flesh are controlled by the choices and decisions of the will. All involuntary actions are controlled by mechanical relationships. The flesh makes no choices and no decisions, either voluntary or involuntary actions, hence has no responsibility, and no guilt.

There is never any guilt in the flesh of any human being.

SLIDE 25A

How unsuccessful, then, to endeavor to discover by what means guilt is transferred from flesh to flesh; from the flesh of Adam to the flesh of his descendants, or from the flesh of any parent to the flesh of any child.

“The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father.” - Ezekiel 18:20

Flesh cannot transmit to flesh that which flesh does not and cannot possess.

SLIDE 26

What Then is the Will?

What, then, of the will? Is it not also flesh? Apparently not.

SLIDE 26A

--This is one of the major mysteries of human existence.

The flesh (of the brain) produces the will, and then the will stands apart from and controls the flesh, even including the flesh of the brain.

Inspiration has not revealed to us how this can be, and scientific investigation has not yet been able to explain it. Yet it is clearly and demonstrably true. Don't you agree?

READ--That the flesh of the brain produces the will we cannot doubt. Many examples have proven that damage to the flesh of the brain can impair, or even destroy, the function of the will. These examples would also indicate that the "production" of the will by the flesh of the brain is a continuous process. The will does not outlast the brain, or survive the destruction of the brain. So the brain continuously produces the will, which in turn continuously controls (or should control) the brain.

This, again is observable in our own experience, and in the experiences of all around us. Thought control is to some extent practiced by everyone. And in every experience wherein the will instructs the brain to start thinking along a certain line, or to stop thinking along a certain line, or to accept certain ideas, or to reject and dismiss them, we see that mysterious phenomenon, the will giving instruction to the flesh of the brain which is producing it.

SLIDE 26B

“I decided to stop thinking about that.”

That simple and often heard statement reflects one of the major mysteries of human existence, the control of the flesh of the brain by the will that is itself produced by the flesh of the brain.

No, the will is not flesh.

To define the will in terms of its essence or nature does not seem to be possible at the present time, but to define it in terms of its function is both possible and instructive.

SLIDE 27

Ellen White Assigns Responsibility to the Will For Sinning

This is Ellen White's approach to the subject. She tells us what the will is by telling us what it does.

“The will is the *governing* power in the nature of man, *bringing all the other faculties under its sway*. . . It is the deciding power” 5T 513 (Emphasis mine.)

“ . . . it is the *choice* . . . the *Kingly power*”-MH 318 (Emphasis mine.)

“But while Satan can solicit, he cannot compel to sin . . . the tempter can never compel us to do evil . . . *The will must consent*”. . . . DA 125 (Emphasis mine.)

READ--Logically and consistently, therefore, Ellen White assigns the responsibility for sinning exclusively to WHAT? the will.

SLIDE 27A

VERY IMPORTANT--The flesh of man, then, has never known guilt, has never carried guilt, and can never transmit guilt from flesh to flesh. The transmission of guilt has always been and must always be from will to will, and only by the consent to sin of the receiving will.

SLIDE 28

What Then is a Good Definition of Guilt?

Which leads us, at length, to a definition: What, precisely, is guilt?

SLIDE 28A

Guilt is an assignment of responsibility by the will of a lawmaker to the will of a lawbreaker.

This Definition Avoids Assigning Responsibility to God

This definition carefully avoids ascribing to guilt any mechanical, organic, or intrinsically legal qualities.

READ--Those who would ascribe to guilt mechanical or organic qualities, which would make it possible for the guilt to reside in the flesh and be transmitted from flesh to flesh by biological inheritance, must struggle to answer the questions about the transmission of guilt to innocent infants, the transmission of guilt to the infant Jesus, etc.,

SLIDE 28C

And the larger question lying behind them: If that is the way it is, who made it that way? Thus the responsibility inevitably goes back to God.

READ--Those who seek to avoid these difficulties by discussing the problem in quasi-legal terms (some even avoid using the word guilt, but refer to a state or condition that produces the same result) fail to deal adequately with the larger underlying question, If that is man's state or condition, who made it that way? Who established those conditions? Again the responsibility inevitably goes back to God.

READ--The problem shared by both groups is that their concept of guilt and its transmission contains so many gross inequities even cruelties, that it simply will not do to let the responsibility for it go back to God. Yet until now no effective way has been found to prevent this result.

Why not lay aside these futile endeavors to prevent responsibility for a cruel and unjust concept of guilt being traced back to the Creator of the universe, and rather resolve the problem by accepting a concept of guilt in which there are no cruelties or inequities? We will then have no need to endeavor to deny reality by pretending that God is not responsible for the assignment of guilt to His created beings.

SLIDE 29

If our will is in control of all our faculties, and if Satan cannot compel that will to sin, it follows that sinning is always a free choice or decision of a free will, **which may be expressed by either an inward attitude or by an outward act, or by both.**

READ--There can never, then, be anything unjust or cruel in holding the free will of man responsible for its choices and decisions, particularly if human inabilities to perform the good that is willed are matched or exceeded by the enabling grace of God.

SLIDE 30

Scriptural Truths About the Nature of Guilt

As we reflect about the nature of guilt, let us keep in mind these basic scriptural truths:

Sin is the transgression of the law. - 1 John 3:4

Where there is no law, there is no sin. - Romans 4:15

The times of this ignorance God winked at. - Acts 17:31

SLIDE 30A

Are There Extenuating Circumstances in Assigning Guilt?

Guilt is not *automatically* incurred by a violation of God's law. There can be wrong-doing without guilt, if the act is ignorant rather than *willful*. The deciding factor is the attitude of the *will* of the law breaker. Did he *will* to violate the law of his Creator God? Or did he violate an unknown or misunderstood precept of God's law while *willing* to serve and obey God? The Creator-God takes into account these extenuating circumstances in deciding whether or not to assign guilt.

READ--And it is the will of the law-maker, the Creator God, that decides whether to hold the will of the lawbreaker responsible, i.e., guilty.

READ-- Remove from this equation either the decision of the lawbreaker's will to sin or the decision of the lawmaker's will to assign responsibility for sinning, and guilt cannot exist. The action of both wills must be present.

SLIDE 30B

READ--This definition of guilt, then, is accurate, fair, and reasonable:

On SLIDE--Guilt is an assignment of responsibility by the will of a lawmaker to the will of a lawbreaker.

READ--With this definition of guilt there is no need for elaborate defenses of the character of God.

READ--We need not struggle to explain how a God of love and justice can hold babies responsible for the sin of someone who died long before they were born, and punish them for the sin that they did not commit.

There is no need to explain God's condemnation and destruction of persons in heathen lands who followed all the moral light that shone upon their pathways.

And there is no need to construct elaborate schemes for the purpose of keeping the guilt of Adam from resting upon the infant Jesus.

SLIDE 31

Ellen White on Inheritance of Guilt

READ--There can be no sin without an act of the will of the law-breaker. There can be no guilt without an act of the will of the law-maker. When Ellen White makes reference to a reception of guilt, or an inheritance of guilt from Adam, she does not leave the will-factor out of the picture.

SLIDE 31A

“It is inevitable that children should suffer from the consequences of parental wrongdoing, but they are not punished for the parents' guilt, *except as they participate in their sins*. It is usually the case, however, that children walk in the steps of their parents. By inheritance and example the sons become partakers of the father's sin. Wrong tendencies, perverted appetites, and debased morals, as well as physical disease and degeneracy, are transmitted as a legacy from father to son, to the third and fourth generation. This fearful truth should have a solemn power to restrain men from following a course of sin.” PP 306 (Emphasis mine.)

SLIDE 31B

“These dear children received from Adam an inheritance of *disobedience*, of guilt, and death. “
Baker Letter, p. 1 (Emphasis mine.)

Ellen White wrote in careful conformity to dictionary definitions, and according to the dictionaries an inheritance is something that can be retained, rejected, divided, bought, sold, or lost, according to the choices of the recipient's will.

SLIDE 31C

Calvinistic concepts of inherited guilt as something that no human can avoid or escape would need to be described as a *biological*, or flesh to flesh, inheritance of guilt. In that case the inheritance could not be rejected or disposed of by any means since it would be in the flesh.

No such expression and no such thought can be found in the writings of Ellen White. She never describes guilt or its transmission in terms of flesh, nor in terms of an unavoidable state or condition.

SLIDE 32

What has been the Traditional SDA, EGW, View

SLIDE 32A

According to the teaching of Ellen White, and of the Seventh-day Adventist church in general until recent years, all earth-born children, including Jesus, inherit the fallen nature of Adam as weakness, not as guilt. At the point in time when the will of the child chooses to sin, guilt enters the picture. (Ellen White attributes the death of infants to separation from the tree of life, not to inherited guilt.)

SLIDE 33

The will of the child Jesus never chose to sin, therefore never experienced guilt. According to Ellen White, this possibility is open to all:

“He has demonstrated that a *lifelong* obedience is possible.” Ms. 1, 1892 (Emphasis mine.)

“There is no excuse for sinning.” DA 311-312

“Let the children bear in mind that the child Jesus had upon Himself human nature, and was in the likeness of sinful flesh, and was tempted of Satan like all children are tempted.” YI 8/23/94

READ--Just as firmly as Ellen White rejects the concept that we unavoidably inherit guilt from Adam, she also rejects the concept that we inherit such a severe weakness from Adam that sinning is unavoidable.

SLIDE 33A

“Since the sin of Adam, men in every age have excused themselves from sinning, charging God with their sin, saying that they could not keep His commandments.” AST 9/14/03

“There are many who in their hearts murmur against God. They say, "We inherit the fallen nature of Adam, and are not responsible for our natural imperfections." They find fault with God's requirements, and complain that He demands what they have no power to give. Satan made the same complaint in heaven, but such thoughts dishonor God.” ST 8/29/92

READ--Finally, let us consider this question:

SLIDE 34

Do you know of any *unavoidable* inheritance other than *biological* inheritance?

Read--Give time to respond..Since this is a supremely important question, let us carefully define our terms.

SLIDE 34A

Definition of Terms

By biological-

we mean something that resides in our flesh in such a way that it can be transmitted from flesh to flesh, as from the flesh of the parent to the flesh of the child.

By inheritance-

we mean something that we receive from our ancestors by reason of being born.

By unavoidable-

we mean something that no human being on earth can escape, since it is an ever-present consequence of being born, with no exceptions (except by the miraculous intervention of God).

SLIDE 35

With our definitions established, let us return to our question:

Do we know of any unavoidable inheritance other than biological inheritance?

GIVE TIME TO RESPOND

SLIDE 35A

First, is biological, flesh-to-flesh inheritance actually unavoidable?

We must concede that it is. There is no way that we can reject the chromosomal conditions that in our very conception set us up for blue or brown eyes, black or blond hair, white or brown skin, etc. Biological inheritance is altogether, unconditionally unavoidable, it would seem.

SLIDE 35B

Second, are there other types of inheritance that are equally unavoidable?

READ—I don't know of any, do you?

SLIDE 36

List of Other Types of Inheritance-All Avoidable

READ--Let's test this proposition by making a list of all of the types of inheritance that we can call to mind. It will be immediately apparent that each and every one of them can be avoided.

SLIDE 36A

An inheritance of money? We don't have to accept it, or keep it.

An inheritance of land or property? We can reject it, or dispose of it. An inheritance of citizenship in a certain country? We can renounce it.

We are forced to the conclusion that *there is no universally unavoidable inheritance other than biological inheritance.*

SLIDE 37

Therefore—This creates a monumental contradiction

Therefore for us to say that man's inheritance of guilt from Adam is *unavoidable*, and in the same sentence say that it is not *biological*, is to contradict ourselves in a single sentence. *An unavoidable, non-biological inheritance simply does not and cannot exist.*

SLIDE 37A

If A Baby Inherits Guilt From Adam—Only one of two Reasons How:

1. The inheritance is biological and therefore unavoidable. In this case, it is generally conceded that the responsibility traces back to the Creator of human biology, who made the flesh of man in such a way that it can and does carry and transmit guilt.
2. The so-called inheritance is by the direct will of God, reflecting an administrative attitude on the part of the Ruler of the universe, and is therefore unavoidable. In this case the responsibility is obviously and unquestionably God's, but the word *inheritance* must be redefined, since the guilt comes from God, and not from the parents. Thus it is not a genuine inheritance.

SLIDE 38

Some Have Tried to Invent a Third Reason

Those who have tried to invent a third arrangement by which man is born into (but does not inherit) a state or condition (undefined) which unavoidably places him under the judgment and condemnation of God (but is not guilt) have only muddied the waters. This is an attempt to describe something as *unavoidable*, yet neither biological nor the applied will of God, and this is impossible. No such thing exists. Hence to follow this argument requires us to depart from reason and reality, and take a flight into the realm of sheer fantasy.

SLIDE 39

Consider the unusual use of the terms, 'state and condition' in the Original Sin Doctrine.

READ--At the risk of being tedious, we must pause to consider this unusual use of the terms, *state* and *condition*.

These, we recognize, are both *appositional* terms, that have no specific meaning unless they are used in connection with other words.

[*Appositional --Grammar.* a syntactic relation between expressions, usually consecutive, that have the same function and the same relation to other elements in the sentence, the second expression identifying or supplementing the first. In *Washington, our first president*, the phrase *our first president* is in apposition with *Washington*.]

READ--We may speak of a state of health, or a condition of the weather or of a condition of the economy, but it is meaningless to speak of a state or of a condition, period. These words *must* modify something, and they cannot modify themselves. This may appear to be absurdly technical, but the level on which the arguments are now being presented forces us to point out that there is no state of state, there is no state of condition, there is no condition of state, there is no condition of condition.

READ--Yet when I have sought carefully to find in those arguments an answer to the essential question.

SLIDE 39A

State of what? Condition of what? I have found nothing that goes beyond this:
Original sin is a state or condition of original sin.

READ--That doesn't explain, answer or define anything.

SLIDE 40

Conclusion:

Describe guilt or define guilt however we may, I see no way that we can escape the conclusion that if it is neither a biological inheritance nor the applied will of God, it is not unavoidable.

There is no unavoidable non-biological inheritance. And if it is the applied will of God, the word inheritance is hardly applicable. Judgment would be the more appropriate term.

READ--This is no problem for us Adventists, who do not visualize the Lord applying a judgment of guilt to tiny infants, including the infant Jesus. It is a problem to the Calvinist, and has required him to invent an altogether extra-Biblical theory that the Lord Jesus Christ came to this earth in the human nature of the unfallen Adam, in order to keep the guilt of Adam from resting upon the infant Jesus.

May I submit to you that this is the Calvinist's problem, and not ours? I believe we should reject it.

SLIDE 41

We have lost much by accepting into our theology an artificial problem:

The unavoidable transmission of guilt from Adam to all of his descendants, including Jesus; a problem that can only be remedied by an equally artificial solution:

The doctrine that Christ came to the earth in the human nature of the unfallen Adam.

SLIDE 42

Our position that all men inherit weakness from Adam but do not inherit guilt is, I am convinced, by far the best understanding of scripture, and is the only possible understanding of the inspired counsels that have come to us through Ellen White, such as this, one of her most simple and clear and yet most meaningful statements:

Just that which you may be, He was in human nature. - Letter 106, 1896

NOTES

- ¹L. Berkhof, *Systematic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976).
- ¹William G. T. Shedd, *Dogmatic Theology* (Grand Rapids, Zondervan Publishing House).
- ¹Augustus Hopkins Strong, *Systematic Theology (Old Tappan)*, Fleming H. Revell, 1975).
- ²N. P. Williams, *The Ideas Of The Fall And Of Original Sin* (New York, Longman, Green & Co., 1927), p. 320.
- ³Eugene Portalie, *A Guide To The Thought Of St. Augustine* (Chicago, Henry Regnery & Co., 1960), p. 7.
- ⁴Ibid.
- ⁵Portalie, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
- ⁶J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (New York, Harper & Bros., 1960), p. 365.
- ⁷Reginald Steward Moxon, *The Doctrine Of Sin* (New York, George H. Doran Co., 1920), p. 138.
- ⁸Ibid.
- ⁹Kelly, *op. cit.*, pp. 361-369.
- ¹⁰Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 376.
- ¹¹Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 370.
- ¹²Henri Rondet, *Original Sin* (New York, Alba House, 1972), pp. 123-132.
- ¹³Moxon, *op. cit.*, p. 135.
- ¹⁴Strong, *op. cit.*, p. 621.
- ¹⁵Berkhof, *op. cit.*, p. 245. 350
- ¹⁶Moxon, *op. cit.*, p. 165.
- ¹⁷Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 424.
- ¹⁸H. Shelton Smith, *Changing Conceptions Of Original Sin* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955).
- ¹⁹Ellen G. White, *Patriarchs and Prophets* (Mountain View, Pacific Press, 1958), p. 42.
- ²⁰White, "They That Have Done Good," *Signs of the Times*, August 29, 1892.
- ²¹White, *The Great Controversy* (Mountain View, Pacific Press, 1950), p. 489.
- ²²White, *Christ's Object Lessons* (Washington, Review and Herald Publishing Co., 1941), p. 331.

APPENDIX A:

Wikipedia

Augustine of Hippo

(/ˈɔːɡɑːstɪn/^[1]? or /ˈɔːɡæstɪn/^[2] **Latin:** *Aurelius Augustinus Hipponensis*;^[3] 13 November 354 – 28 August 430), also known as **Saint Augustine** or **Saint Austin**,^[4] was an early Christian **theologian** and **philosopher**^[5] whose writings were very influential in the development of **Western Christianity** and **Western philosophy**. He was **bishop** of **Hippo Regius** (present-day **Annaba**, Algeria) located in the **Roman province** of **Africa**. Writing during the **Patristic Era**, he is viewed as one of the most important **Church Fathers** in the **West**. Among his most important works are *City of God* and *Confessions*, which continue to be read widely today.

According to his contemporary, **Jerome**, Augustine "established anew the ancient Faith."^[6] In his early years, he was heavily influenced by **Manichaeism** and afterward by the **Neo-Platonism** of **Plotinus**.^[7] After his conversion to Christianity and his baptism in 387, Augustine developed his own approach to philosophy and theology, accommodating a variety of methods and different perspectives.^[8] Believing that the **grace of Christ** was indispensable to human freedom, he helped to formulate the doctrine of **original sin** and made seminal contributions to the development of **just war theory**.

When the **Western Roman Empire** began to disintegrate, Augustine developed the concept of the **Catholic Church** as a spiritual **City of God** (in **a book of the same name**), distinct from the material Earthly City.^[9] His thoughts profoundly influenced the medieval worldview. Augustine's *City of God* was closely identified with the segment of the Church that adhered to the concept of the **Trinity** as defined by the **Council of Nicaea** and the **Council of Constantinople**.^[10]

In the Catholic Church and the **Anglican Communion**, he is a saint, a pre-eminent **Doctor of the Church**, and the patron of the **Augustinians**. His memorial is celebrated on 28 August, the day of his death. He is the **patron saint** of brewers, printers, theologians, the alleviation of sore eyes, and a number of cities and dioceses.^[11] Many **Protestants**, especially **Calvinists**, consider him to be one of the theological fathers of the **Protestant Reformation** due to his teachings on **salvation** and **divine grace**.

In the **East**, many of his teachings are not accepted. The most important doctrinal controversy surrounding his name is the **filioque**.^[12] Other doctrines that are sometimes unacceptable are his view of **original sin**, the doctrine of grace, and **predestination**.^[13] Nonetheless, though considered to be mistaken on some points, he is still considered a saint, and his feast day is celebrated on 15 June.^[14] He carries the additional title of *Blessed* among the Orthodox, either as "Blessed Augustine" or "St. Augustine the Blessed."^[15]

+++++

Pelagius

(fl. c. 390-418)^[1] was a probably British-born Roman **ascetic** who opposed the idea of **predestination** and asserted a strong version of the doctrine of **free will**.^[2] He was accused by **Augustine of Hippo** and others of denying the need for divine aid in performing **good works**. For him (according to them), the only grace necessary was the declaration of the law; humans were not wounded by Adam's sin and were perfectly able to fulfill the law apart from any divine aid. His supporters cite Deuteronomy 24:16 to deny original sin. He denied the more specific doctrine of **original sin** as developed by Augustine. Pelagius was declared a **heretic** by the **Council of Carthage**. His interpretation of a doctrine of **free will** became known as **Pelagianism**.

He was well educated, fluent in both **Greek** and **Latin**, and learned in **theology**. He spent time as an ascetic, focusing on practical **asceticism**, which his teachings clearly reflect. He was certainly well known in **Rome**, both for the harsh asceticism of his public life as well as the power and persuasiveness of his speech. His reputation in Rome earned him praise early in his career even from such pillars of the Church as Augustine, who referred to him as a "saintly man." However, he was later accused of lying about his own teachings in order to avoid public condemnation. Most of his later life was spent defending his doctrine against Catholic theologians who held that Pelagius was spreading novelties in the Faith unknown to the apostolic tradition. Many people counter by pointing out Augustine's Manichean Gnostic past which involves a doctrine called original evil that is very close to original sin. Due to some calling him a heretic, little of his work has come down to the present day except in the quotes of his opponents. However, more recently some have defended Pelagius as a misunderstood orthodox.^[3]

Recent analysis of his thinking suggests that it was, in fact, highly orthodox, following in the tradition established by the early fathers and in keeping with the teaching of the church in both the East and the West. ... From what we are able to piece together from the few

sources available... it seems that the Celtic monk held to an orthodox view of the prevenience of God's grace, and did not assert that individuals could achieve salvation purely by their own efforts..

+++++

Jacobus Arminius

Jacobus Arminius^[a] (October 10, 1560 – October 19, 1609), the Latinized name of the Dutch theologian **Jakob Hermanszoon** from the Protestant Reformation period, served from 1603 as professor in theology at the University of Leiden. He wrote many books and treatises on theology, and his views became the basis of Arminianism and the Dutch Remonstrant movement.

In attempting to defend Calvinistic predestination against the teachings of Dirck Volckertszoon Coornhert, Arminius began to doubt aspects of Calvinism and modified some parts of his own view.^[23] He attempted to reform Calvinism, and lent his name to a movement—Arminianism—which resisted some of the Calvinist tenets (unconditional election, the nature of the limitation of the atonement, and irresistible grace). The early Dutch followers of his teaching became known as Remonstrants after they issued a document containing five points of disagreement with mainstream Calvinism, entitled *Remonstrantie* (1610).

Arminius wrote that he sought to teach only those things which could be proved from the Scriptures and that tended toward edification among Christians (with the exception of Roman Catholics, with whom he said there could be no spiritual accord).^[24] His motto was reputed to be "*Bona conscientia paradus*", meaning, "A good conscience is a paradise."^[25]

Arminius taught of a "preventing" (or prevenient) grace that has been conferred upon all by the Holy Spirit and this grace is "sufficient for belief, in spite of our sinful corruption, and thus for salvation."^[26] Arminius stated that "the grace sufficient for salvation is conferred on the Elect, and on the Non-elect; that, if they will, they may believe or not believe, may be saved or not be saved."^[27] William Witt states that "Arminius has a very high theology of grace. He insists emphatically that grace is gratuitous because it is obtained through God's redemption in Christ, not through human effort."^[28] Arminius referred to even faith as being received from God as a gift.

The theology of Arminianism did not become fully developed during Arminius' lifetime, but after his death (1609) the Five articles of the Remonstrants (1610) systematized and formalized the ideas. But the Calvinist Synod of Dort (1618–19), convening for the purpose of condemning Arminius' theology, declared it and its adherents anathemas, defined the five points of Calvinism, and persecuted Arminian pastors who remained in the Netherlands. But in spite of persecution, "the Remonstrants continued in Holland as a distinct church and again and again where Calvinism was taught Arminianism raised its head."^[29]

+++++

John Wesley

John Wesley (1703–91), the founder of the Methodist movement, embraced Arminian theology and became its most prominent champion.^[30] Today, the majority of Methodists remain committed to Arminian theology, and Arminianism itself has become one of the dominant theological systems in the United States, thanks in large part to the influence of John and Charles Wesley.^[31]

+++++

John Calvin

John Calvin (French: *Jean Calvin* French pronunciation: [ʒɑ̃ kalvɛ̃], born *Jehan Cauvin*: 10 July 1509 – 27 May 1564) was an influential French theologian and pastor during the Protestant Reformation. He was a principal figure in the development of the system of Christian theology later called Calvinism. Originally trained as a humanist lawyer, he broke from the Roman Catholic Church around 1530. After religious tensions provoked a violent uprising against Protestants in France, Calvin fled to Basel, Switzerland, where he published the first edition of his seminal work Institutes of the Christian Religion in 1536.

Calvin was a tireless polemic and apologetic writer who generated much controversy. He also exchanged cordial and supportive letters with many reformers, including Philipp Melancthon and Heinrich Bullinger. In addition to the *Institutes*, he wrote commentaries on most books of the Bible, as well as theological treatises and confessional documents. He regularly preached sermons throughout the week in Geneva. Calvin was influenced by the Augustinian tradition, which led him to expound the doctrine of predestination and the absolute sovereignty of God in salvation of the human soul from death and eternal damnation.

Calvin's writing and preachings provided the seeds for the branch of theology that bears his name. The Reformed, Congregational,

and [Presbyterian](#) churches, which look to Calvin as the chief expositor of their beliefs, have spread throughout the world.

Zwingli

Huldrych (or **Ulrich/Ulrich**^[a]) **Zwingli**^[b] (1 January 1484 – 11 October 1531) was a leader of the [Reformation in Switzerland](#).

The impact of Luther on Zwingli's theological development has long been a source of interest and discussion among Zwinglian scholars. Zwingli himself asserted vigorously his independence of Luther. The most recent studies have lent credibility to this claim, although some scholars still claim his theology was dependent upon Luther's. Zwingli appears to have read Luther's books in search of confirmation from Luther for his own views. Zwingli did, however, admire Luther greatly for the stand he took against the pope. This, more than Luther's theology, was a key influence on Zwingli's convictions as a reformer.^[88] What Zwingli considered Luther's courageous stance at the [Leipzig Disputation](#) had a decisive impact on Zwingli during his earliest years as a priest, and during this time Zwingli praised and promoted Luther's writings to support his own similar ideas. Like Luther, Zwingli was also a student and admirer of [Augustine](#).^[89] His later writings continued to show characteristic differences from Luther such as the inclusion of non-Christians in heaven as described in *An Exposition of the Faith*.^[90]

Outside of Switzerland, no church counts Zwingli as its founder. Scholars speculate as to why Zwinglianism has not diffused more widely,^[107] even though Zwingli's theology is considered the first expression of [Reformed theology](#).^[108] Although his name is not widely recognised, Zwingli's legacy lives on in the basic confessions of the [Reformed churches](#) of today.^[109] He is often called, after [Martin Luther](#) and [John Calvin](#), the "Third Man of the Reformation".^[110]

| Topic | Calvinism | Lutheranism | Arminianism |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Human will | Total depravity : the will is affected by sin as is every other spiritual capacity, so that people are not able by their own will to conform in all things to the will of God. ^[168] | Total depravity without free will until spiritual regeneration | Depravity does not prevent free will |
| Election | Unconditional election to salvation with those outside the elect foreordained to damnation (double-predestination) ^[169] | Unconditional predestination to salvation for the elect | Conditional election in view of foreseen faith or unbelief |
| Justification | Justification is limited to those predestined to salvation, completed at Christ's death | Justification by faith alone, completed at Christ's death. | Justification made possible for all through Christ's death, but only completed upon choosing faith in Jesus |
| Conversion | Monergistic, through the inner calling of the Holy Spirit, irresistible | Monergistic , through the means of grace , resistible | Synergistic , resistible due to the common grace of free will |
| Preservation and apostasy | Perseverance of the saints : the eternally elect in Christ will necessarily persevere in faith | Falling away is possible, but God gives assurance of preservation. | Preservation is conditional upon continued faith in Christ; with the possibility of a final apostasy . |

Original Sin –wikipedia

Original sin, also called [ancestral sin](#),^[1] is the [Christian](#) doctrine of humanity's state of [sin](#) resulting from the [fall of man](#),^[2] stemming from Adam's rebellion in [Eden](#). This condition has been characterized in many ways, ranging from something as insignificant as a slight deficiency, or a tendency toward sin yet without collective guilt, referred to as a "sin nature", to something as drastic as [total depravity](#) or automatic guilt of all humans through [collective guilt](#).^[3]

The concept of original sin was first alluded to in the 2nd century by [Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons](#) in his controversy with certain [dualist Gnostics](#). Other church fathers such as [Augustine](#) also developed the doctrine,^[2] seeing it as based on the [New Testament](#) teaching of [Paul the Apostle](#) ([Romans 5:12–21](#) and [1 Corinthians 15:22](#)) and the Old Testament verse of [Psalm](#)

51:5.^{[4][5][6][7][8]} [Tertullian](#), [Cyprian](#), [Ambrose](#) and [Ambrosiaster](#) considered that humanity shares in Adam's sin, transmitted by human generation. [Augustine's](#) formulation of original sin was popular among [Protestant reformers](#), such as [Martin Luther](#) and [John Calvin](#), who equated original sin with [concupiscence](#), affirming that it persisted even after [baptism](#) and completely destroyed freedom.^[2] Within Roman Catholicism, the [Jansenist](#) movement, which the Church then declared heretical, also maintained that original sin destroyed [freedom of will](#).^[9] On the other hand, some modern Protestants deny that the doctrine has a basis in Scripture.^[10]

Jewish theologians have taught that in Genesis 8:21 and 6:5-8, God recognized that Adam's sins are his alone. Instead Adam is recognized, by some, as having brought death into the world by eating the [forbidden fruit](#). Because of his sin, his descendants will live a mortal life, which will end in death of their bodies.^[11] The doctrine of "inherited sin" is not found in most of mainstream [Judaism](#). Although some in [Orthodox Judaism](#) place blame on Adam for overall corruption of the world, and though there were some Jewish teachers in [Talmudic times](#) who believed that death was a punishment brought upon humanity on account of Adam's sin, that is not the dominant view in most of Judaism today. Modern Judaism generally teaches that humans are born sin-free and untainted, and choose to sin later and bring suffering to themselves.^{[12][13]} The concept of inherited sin is also not found in any real form in [Islam](#).^{[14][15]} Some interpretations of original sin are rejected by other Christian theologies.

Augustine

[Augustine of Hippo](#) wrote that original sin is transmitted by concupiscence and enfeebles freedom of the will without destroying it.^[2]

[Augustine of Hippo](#) (354–430) taught that Adam's sin^[24] is transmitted by [concupiscence](#), or "hurtful desire",^[citation needed] resulting in humanity becoming a *massa damnata* (mass of perdition, condemned crowd), with much enfeebled, though not destroyed, freedom of will.^[2] When Adam sinned, human nature was thenceforth transformed. Adam and Eve, via sexual reproduction, recreated human nature. Their descendants now live in sin, in the form of concupiscence, a term Augustine used in a [metaphysical](#), not a [psychological](#) sense.^[25] Augustine insisted that concupiscence was not a *being* but a *bad quality*, the [privation of good](#) or a wound.^[26] He admitted that sexual concupiscence (*libido*) might have been present in the perfect human nature in [paradise](#), and that only later it became disobedient to human will as a result of the first couple's disobedience to God's will in the original sin.^[27] In Augustine's view (termed "Realism"), all of humanity was really present in Adam when he sinned, and therefore all have sinned. Original sin, according to Augustine, consists of the guilt of Adam which all humans inherit. As sinners, humans are utterly depraved in nature, lack the freedom to do good, and cannot respond to the will of God without [divine grace](#). Grace is [irresistible](#), results in conversion, and leads to [perseverance](#).^[28]

Augustine articulated his explanation in reaction to [Pelagianism](#), which insisted that humans have of themselves, without the necessary help of God's grace, the ability to lead a morally good life, and thus denied both the importance of baptism and the teaching that God is the giver of all that is good. Pelagius claimed that the influence of Adam on other humans was merely that of bad example. Augustine held that the effects of Adam's sin are transmitted to his descendants not by example but by the very fact of generation from that ancestor. A wounded nature comes to the soul and body of the new person from his/her parents, who experience *libido* (or *concupiscence*). Augustine's view was that human procreation was the way the transmission was being effected. He did not blame, however, the sexual passion itself, but the spiritual *concupiscence* present in human nature, soul and body, even after baptismal regeneration.^[29] Christian parents transmit their wounded nature to children, because they give them birth, not the "re-birth".^[30] Augustine used [Ciceronian Stoic](#) concept of passions, to interpret [St. Paul's](#) doctrine of universal sin and redemption. In that view, also sexual desire itself as well as other bodily passions were consequence of the original sin, in which pure affections were wounded by vice and became disobedient to human reason and will. As long as they carry a threat to the dominion of reason over the soul they constitute moral evil, but since they do not presuppose consent, one cannot call them sins. Humanity will be liberated from passions, and pure affections will be restored only when all sin has been washed away and ended, that is in the [resurrection of the dead](#).^{[31][32]}

Augustine believed that the only definitive destinations of [souls](#) are [heaven](#) and [hell](#). He concluded that unbaptized infants go to hell as a consequence of original sin.^{[33][34]} The Latin [Church Fathers](#) who followed Augustine adopted his position, which became a point of

reference for Latin theologians in the Middle Ages.^[35] In the later medieval period, some theologians continued to hold Augustine's view, others held that unbaptized infants suffered no pain at all: unaware of being deprived of the [beatific vision](#), they enjoyed a state of natural, not supernatural happiness. Starting around 1300, unbaptized infants were often said to inhabit the "[limbo of infants](#)".^[36] The [Catechism of the Catholic Church, 1261](#) declares: "As regards children who have died without Baptism, the Church can only entrust them to the mercy of God, as she does in her funeral rites for them. Indeed, the great mercy of God who desires that all men should be saved, and Jesus' tenderness toward children which caused him to say: 'Let the children come to me, do not hinder them,'^[37] allow us to hope that there is a way of salvation for children who have died without Baptism. All the more urgent is the Church's call not to prevent little children coming to Christ through the gift of holy Baptism." But the theory of Limbo, while it "never entered into the dogmatic definitions of the Magisterium ... remains ... a possible theological hypothesis".^[38]

Cassian

In the works of [John Cassian](#) (ca. 360 – 435), *Conference XIII* recounts how the wise monk [Chaeremon](#), of whom he is writing, responded to puzzlement caused by his own statement that "man even though he strive with all his might for a good result, yet cannot become master of what is good unless he has acquired it simply by the gift of Divine bounty and not by the efforts of his own toil" (chapter 1). In chapter 11, Cassian presents Chaeremon as speaking of the cases of Paul the persecutor and Matthew the publican as difficulties for those who say "the beginning of free will is in our own power", and the cases of Zaccheus and the [good thief on the cross](#) as difficulties for those who say "the beginning of our free will is always due to the inspiration of the grace of God", and as concluding: "These two then; viz., the grace of God and free will seem opposed to each other, but really are in harmony, and we gather from the system of goodness that we ought to have both alike, lest if we withdraw one of them from man, we may seem to have broken the rule of the Church's faith: for when God sees us inclined to will what is good, He meets, guides, and strengthens us: for 'At the voice of thy cry, as soon as He shall hear, He will answer thee'; and: 'Call upon Me', He says, 'in the day of tribulation and I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify Me'. And again, if He finds that we are unwilling or have grown cold, He stirs our hearts with salutary exhortations, by which a good will is either renewed or formed in us."^[39]

Cassian did not accept the idea of [total depravity](#), on which [Martin Luther](#) was to insist.^[40] He taught that human nature is fallen or depraved, but not totally. Augustine Casiday states that, at the same time, Cassian "baldly asserts that God's grace, not human free will, is responsible for 'everything which pertains to salvation' – even faith."^[41] Cassian pointed out that people still have moral freedom and one has the option to choose to follow God. [Colm Luibhéid](#) says that, according to Cassian, there are cases where the soul makes the first little turn,^[42] but in Cassian's view, according to Casiday, any sparks of goodwill that may exist, not *directly* caused by God, are totally inadequate and only *direct* divine intervention ensures spiritual progress.^[43] and Lauren Pristas says that "for Cassian, salvation is, from beginning to end, the effect of God's grace."^[44]

Church reaction

Opposition to Augustine's ideas about original sin, which he had developed in reaction to Pelagianism, arose rapidly.^[45] After a long and bitter struggle the general principles of Augustine's teaching were confirmed within Western Christianity by many councils, especially the Second Council of Orange in 529.^[2] However, while the Church condemned Pelagius, it did not endorse Augustine entirely^[46] and, while Augustine's authority was accepted, he was interpreted in the light of writers such as Cassian.^[47] Some of the followers of Augustine identified original sin with concupiscence^[48] in the psychological sense, but this identification was challenged by the 11th-century Saint Anselm of Canterbury, who defined original sin as "privation of the righteousness that every man ought to possess", thus separating it from concupiscence. In the 12th century the identification of original sin with concupiscence was supported by Peter Lombard and others, but was rejected by the leading theologians in the next century, chief of whom was Thomas Aquinas. He distinguished the supernatural gifts of Adam before the Fall from what was merely natural, and said that it was the former that were lost, privileges that enabled man to keep his inferior powers in submission to reason and directed to his supernatural end. Even after the fall, man thus kept his natural abilities of reason, will and passions. Rigorous Augustine-inspired views persisted among the Franciscans, though the most prominent Franciscan theologians, such as Duns Scotus and William of Ockham, eliminated the element of concupiscence.

Protestant reformation

[Martin Luther](#) (1483–1546) asserted that humans inherit Adamic guilt and are in a state of sin from the moment of conception. The second article in [Lutheranism's Augsburg Confession](#) presents its doctrine of original sin in summary form:

It is also taught among us that since the fall of Adam all men who are born according to the course of nature are conceived and born in sin. That is, all men are full of evil lust and inclinations from their mothers' wombs and are unable by nature to have true fear of God and true faith in God. Moreover, this inborn sickness and hereditary sin is truly sin and condemns to the eternal wrath of God all those who are not born again through Baptism and the Holy Spirit. Rejected in this connection are the [Pelagians](#) and others who deny that original sin is sin, for they hold that natural man is made righteous by his own powers, thus disparaging the sufferings and merit of Christ.^[49]

Luther, however, also agreed with the Roman Catholic doctrine of the [Immaculate Conception](#) (that Mary was conceived free from original sin) by saying:

[Mary] is full of grace, proclaimed to be entirely without sin. God's grace fills her with everything good and makes her devoid of all evil. God is with her, meaning that all she did or left undone is divine and the action of God in her. Moreover, God guarded and protected her from all that might be hurtful to her.^[50]

Protestant [Reformer John Calvin](#) (1509–1564) developed a [systematic theology](#) of Augustinian Protestantism by interpretation of [Augustine of Hippo's](#) notion of original sin. Calvin believed that humans inherit Adamic guilt and are in a state of sin from the moment of conception. This inherently sinful nature (the basis for the [Calvinistic](#) doctrine of "[total depravity](#)") results in a complete alienation from God and the total inability of humans to achieve reconciliation with God based on their own abilities. Not only do individuals inherit a sinful nature due to Adam's fall, but since he was the federal head and representative of the human race, all whom he represented inherit the guilt of his sin by imputation. [Redemption](#) by Jesus Christ is the only remedy.

[John Calvin](#) defined original sin in his [Institutes of the Christian Religion](#) as follows:

Original sin, therefore, seems to be a hereditary depravity and corruption of our nature, diffused into all parts of the soul, which first makes us liable to God's wrath, then also brings forth in us those works which Scripture calls "works of the flesh" (Gal 5:19). And that is properly what Paul often calls sin. The works that come forth from it – such as adulteries, fornications, thefts, hatreds, murders, carousings – he accordingly calls "fruits of sin" (Gal 5:19–21), although they are also commonly called "sins" in Scripture, and even by Paul himself.^[51]

Council of Trent

The [Council of Trent](#) (1545–1563), while not pronouncing on points disputed among Catholic theologians, condemned the teaching that in baptism the whole of what belongs to the essence of sin is not taken away, but is only cancelled or not imputed, and declared the concupiscence that remains after baptism not truly and properly "sin" in the baptized, but only to be called sin in the sense that it is of sin and inclines to sin.^[52]

In 1567, soon after the close of the Council of Trent, [Pope Pius V](#) went beyond Trent by sanctioning Aquinas's distinction between nature and supernature in Adam's state before the Fall, condemned the identification of original sin with concupiscence, and approved the view that the unbaptized could have right use of will.^[2]

Denominational views

Roman Catholicism

The [Catechism of the Catholic Church](#) says:

By his sin Adam, as the first man, lost the original holiness and justice he had received from God, not only for himself but for all humans.

Adam and Eve transmitted to their descendants human nature wounded by their own first sin and hence deprived of original holiness and justice; this deprivation is called "original sin".

As a result of original sin, human nature is weakened in its powers, subject to ignorance, suffering and the domination of death, and inclined to sin (this inclination is called "concupiscence").^[53]

The Catholic Church teaches that every human person born on this earth is made in the image of God.^{[54][55]} Within man "is both the powerful surge toward the good because we are made in the image of God, and the darker impulses toward evil because of the effects of Original Sin."^[56] Furthermore, it explicitly denies that we inherit *guilt* from anyone, maintaining that instead we inherit our fallen nature. In this it differs from the Calvinism/Protestant position that each person actually inherits Adam's guilt, and teaches instead that "original sin does not have the character of a personal fault in any of Adam's descendants ... but the consequences for nature, weakened and inclined to evil, persist in man".^[57] "In other words, human beings do not bear any 'original guilt' from Adam and Eve's particular sin."^[58]

The Church has always held baptism to be "for the remission of sins", and, as mentioned in *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 403, infants too have traditionally been baptized, though not guilty of any actual personal sin. The sin that through baptism was remitted for them could only be original sin, with which they were connected by the very fact of being a human. The first comprehensive theological explanation of this practice of baptizing infants, guilty of no actual personal sin, was given by Saint [Augustine of Hippo](#), not all of whose ideas on original sin have been adopted by the Catholic Church. Indeed the Church has condemned the interpretation of some of his ideas by certain leaders of the [Protestant Reformation](#).

The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* explains that in "yielding to the tempter, Adam and Eve committed a *personal sin*, but this sin affected *the human nature* that they would then transmit in a *fallen state* ... original sin is called "sin" only in an analogical sense: it is a sin "contracted" and not "committed"—a state and not an act" (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 404). This "state of deprivation of the original holiness and justice ... transmitted to the descendants of Adam along with human nature" (*Compendium of the Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 76) involves no personal responsibility or personal guilt on their part (cf. *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 405). Personal responsibility and guilt were Adam's, who because of his sin, was unable to pass on to his descendants a human nature with the holiness with which it would otherwise have been endowed, in this way implicating them in his sin. The doctrine of original sin thus does not impute the sin of the father to his children, but merely states that they inherit from him a "human nature deprived of original holiness and justice", which is "transmitted by propagation to all mankind".^[59]

In the theology of the [Catholic Church](#), original sin is regarded as the general condition of [sinfulness](#), that is (the absence of holiness and perfect charity) into which humans are born, distinct from the [actual sins](#) that a person commits. This teaching explicitly states that "original sin does not have the character of a personal fault in any of Adam's descendants".^[57] In other words, human beings do not bear any "original guilt" from Adam's particular sin, which is his alone. The prevailing view, also held in Eastern Orthodoxy, is that human beings bear no guilt for the sin of Adam. The Catholic Church teaches: "By our first parents' sin, the devil has acquired a certain domination over man, even though *man remains free*."^[60]

The Catholic doctrine of the [Immaculate Conception](#) of [Mary](#) is that Mary was conceived free from original sin: "the most Blessed Virgin Mary was, from the first moment of her conception, by a singular grace and privilege of almighty God and by virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, Savior of the human race, preserved immune from all stain of original sin."^[61] The doctrine sees her as an exception to the general rule that human beings are not immune from the reality of original sin.

Eastern Orthodoxy

The [Eastern Orthodox](#)'s version of *original sin* is the view that sin originates with the Devil, "for the devil sinneth from the beginning. (1 John iii. 8)".^[62] They acknowledge that the introduction of [ancestral sin](#)^[63] into the human race affected the subsequent environment for humanity (see also [traducianism](#)). However, they never accepted Augustine of Hippo's notions of original sin and hereditary guilt.^[64]

Orthodox Churches accept the teachings of [John Cassian](#), as do Catholic Churches eastern and western,^[40] in rejecting the doctrine of [Total Depravity](#), by teaching that human nature is "fallen", that is, depraved, but not totally. Augustine Casiday states that Cassian "baldly asserts that God's grace, not human free will, is responsible for 'everything which pertains to salvation' – even faith."^[41] Cassian points out that people still have moral freedom and one has the option to choose to follow God. [Colm Luibhéid](#) says that, according to Cassian, there are cases where the soul makes the first little turn,^[42] while Augustine Casiday says that, in Cassian's view, any sparks of goodwill that may exist, not *directly* caused by God, are totally inadequate and only *direct* divine intervention ensures spiritual progress.^[43] and Lauren Pristas says that "for Cassian, salvation is, from beginning to end, the effect of God's grace."^[44]

Eastern Orthodoxy accepts the doctrine of ancestral sin: "Original sin is hereditary. It did not remain only Adam and Eve's. As life passes from them to all of their descendants, so does original sin."^[65] "As from an infected source there naturally flows an infected stream, so from a father infected with sin, and consequently mortal, there naturally proceeds a posterity infected like him with sin, and like him mortal."^[66]

The Orthodox Church in America makes clear the distinction between "fallen nature" and "fallen man" and this is affirmed in the early teaching of the Church whose role it is to act as the catalyst that leads to true or inner redemption. Every human person born on this earth bears the image of God undistorted within themselves.^[67] In the Orthodox Christian understanding, they explicitly deny that humanity inherited *guilt* from anyone. Rather, they maintain that we inherit our fallen nature. While humanity does bear the consequences of the original, or first, sin, humanity does not bear the personal guilt associated with this sin. Adam and Eve are guilty of their willful action; we bear the consequences, chief of which is death."^[68]

Classical Anglicanism

The original formularies of the Church of England also continue in the Reformation understanding of Original Sin. In the [Thirty-Nine Articles](#), Article IX "Of Original or Birth-sin" states:

Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that naturally is ingendered of the offspring of Adam; whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh, called in the Greek, Φρονημα σαρκος, which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire, of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess, that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.^[69]

However, more recent doctrinal statements (e.g. the 1938 report *Doctrine in the Church of England*) permit a greater variety of understandings of this doctrine. The 1938 report summarizes:

Man is by nature capable of communion with God, and only through such communion can he become what he was created to be. "Original sin" stands for the fact that from a time apparently prior to any responsible act of choice man is lacking in this communion, and if left to his own resources and to the influence of his natural environment cannot attain to his destiny as a child of God.^[70]

Methodism

The [Methodist Church](#), founded by [John Wesley](#), upholds Article VII in the [Articles of Religion](#) in the [Book of Discipline of the United Methodist Church](#):

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as the Pelagians do vainly talk), but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.^[71]

Here is a direct comment on original sin by Wesley. "The Scripture does not, that I remember, anywhere say, in express words, that the sin of Adam is imputed to his children; or, that the sins of believers are imputed to Christ; or, that the righteousness of Christ is imputed to believers: but the true meaning of these expressions is sufficiently found in several places of Scripture." Further, he stated: "Yet since these express words and phrases, of the imputation of Adam's sin to us, of our sins to Christ, and of Christ's righteousness to us, are not plainly written in Scripture we should not impose it on every Christian, to use these very expressions. Let every one take his liberty, either of confining himself to strictly Scriptural language, or manifesting his sense of these plain Scriptural doctrines, in words and phrases of his own."^[72]

Wesley also stated that strictly speaking, nothing is sin but a willful transgression of a known commandment of God: "One thing we should all agree on is that all have sinned and come short of the glory of God, and are in need of a Savior. I personally feel that the only Scriptural definition of sin is; sin is the willful transgression of a known commandment of God."^[73]

Seventh-day Adventism

[Seventh-day Adventists](#) believe that humans are inherently sinful due to the fall of Adam,^[74] but they do not totally accept the [Augustinian/Calvinistic](#) understanding of original sin, taught in terms of original guilt, but hold more to what could be termed the "[total depravity](#)" tradition.^[75] Seventh-day Adventists have historically preached a doctrine of inherited weakness, but not a doctrine of inherited guilt.^[76] According to Augustine and Calvin, humanity inherits not only Adam's depraved nature but also the actual guilt of his transgression, and Adventists look more toward the [Wesleyan](#) model.^[77]

In part, the Adventist position on original sin reads:

"The nature of the penalty for original sin, i.e.,

Page 32 of 34 ORIGINAL SIN

Adam's sin, is to be seen as literal, physical, temporal, or actual death – the opposite of life, i.e., the cessation of being. By no stretch of the scriptural facts can death be spiritualised as depravity. God did not punish Adam by making him a sinner. That was Adam's own doing. All die the first death because of Adam's sin regardless of their moral character – children included."^[77]

Early Adventists Pioneers (such as George Storrs and [Uriah Smith](#)) tended to de-emphasise the morally corrupt nature inherited from Adam, while stressing the importance of actual, personal sins committed by the individual. They thought of the "sinful nature" in terms of physical mortality rather than moral depravity.^[77] Traditionally, Adventists look at sin in terms of willful transgressions, and that Christ triumphed over sin. Adventism believes that Christ is both our Substitute and our Example.^[78] They base their belief on texts such as "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law: for sin is the transgression of the law." (1 John 3:4)^[79]

Though believing in the concept of inherited sin from Adam, there is no dogmatic Adventist position on original sin. Related articles dealing with the subject are publicly available on the [General Conference of the Seventh-day Adventist Church](#)'s official website on theological doctrine, the [Biblical Research Institute](#).^[80] An article commenting on a progressive opinion of original sin can be found [here](#).

Jehovah's Witnesses

According to the teachings and theology of the [Christian Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses](#), all humans are born sinners, because of inheriting sin, corruption, and death from Adam. They teach that Adam was originally created perfect and sinless, but with free will; that [the Devil](#), who was originally a perfect [angel](#), but later developed feelings of pride and self-importance, seduced [Eve](#), and then through her, persuaded Adam to disobey God, and to obey the Devil instead, rebelling against God's sovereignty, thereby making themselves sinners, and because of that, transmitting a sinful nature to all of their future offspring.^{[81][82]} Instead of destroying the Devil right away, as well as destroying the disobedient couple, God decided to allow time, test the loyalty of the rest of humankind, and to prove to the rest of the universe that man cannot be independent of God successfully, that man is lost without God's laws and standards, and can never bring peace to the earth, and that Satan was a deceiver, murderer, and liar.^[83]

The Witnesses believe that all men possess "inherited sin" from the "one man" Adam. And they teach that Verses such as Psalm 51:5, Job 14:4, Romans 5:12–22, and 1st Corinthians 15:22 show that man is born corrupt, unclean, and crooked, and dies because of inherited sin and imperfection. They teach that inherited sin is the reason and cause for sickness and suffering, made worse by the Devil's wicked influence. They teach that Jesus is the "[second Adam](#)", being the sinless [Son of God](#) made Flesh, and the [Messiah](#), and that He came to undo what the first Adam did in Eden; and that salvation and everlasting life can only be obtained through faith and obedience to the Second Adam.^{[81][82][83][84][85][86]} They believe that "sin" is "missing the mark" of God's standard of perfection, and that everyone is born a sinner, due to being the offspring of sinner Adam.^[87]

Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints

In the theology of the [Latter Day Saint movement](#), because of the Fall of Adam and Eve, all people live in a fallen condition, separated from God and subject to physical death.^[88] However, according to their official article of faith on the subject, humans are not condemned by what many call the "original sin." In other words, men are not accountable for Adam's transgression in the Garden of Eden. According to Mormon belief, the [Prophet Joseph Smith](#) said, "We believe that men will be punished for their own sins, and not for Adam's transgression." (Articles of Faith 1:2)^[88]

According to LDS theology, the [fall of Adam](#) is viewed as a necessary transgression, needed both to fulfill the commandment to "multiply, and replenish the earth" ([Genesis 1:28](#)),^{[89][90]} as well as to usher in the rigors and opposition found in mortality—which is considered the only way that man can truly learn to appreciate and choose the good, and forsake evil. The ultimate goal of this process of learning and growth is to gain a fulness of joy. The LDS Church's view is that people could not have [gained physical bodies](#) or learned to use [agency](#) well without the fall of Adam.^[91] Mormons also do not believe that children come into the world with any guilt,^[92] because Jesus Christ atoned for original sin.^{[93][94]}

Islam

The concept of original sin is not recognized in [Islam](#). [Muslims](#) believe that Adam and Eve were forgiven by [God](#), and use the following [Koranic suras](#) to support this belief:

"O Adam, dwell with your wife in the Garden and enjoy as you wish but approach not this tree or you run into harm and transgression. Then Satan whispered to them in order to reveal to them their shame that was hidden from them and he said: 'Your Lord only forbade you this tree lest you become angels or such beings as live forever.' And he swore to them both that he was their sincere adviser. So by deceit he brought them to their fall: when they tasted the tree their shame became manifest to them and they began to sew together the

leaves of the Garden over their bodies. And their Lord called unto them: 'Did I not forbid you that tree and tell you that Satan was your avowed enemy?'" [Sūrat al-A'raf](#):19–22.

"They said: 'Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves souls. If You forgive us not and bestow not upon us Your mercy, we shall certainly be of the losers'" Surat al-A'raf :23

".. Thus did Adam disobey his Lord, so he went astray. Then his Lord chose him, and turned to him with forgiveness, and gave him guidance." Surat [Tā Hā'](#):121–122

"(God) said: 'Get down (from the Garden), one of you an enemy to the other [i.e. Adam, Eve, and Satan]. On earth will be a dwelling-place for you and an enjoyment – for a short time'. He (God) said: 'Therein you shall live, and therein you shall die, and from it you shall be brought out [i.e. resurrected].'" Surat al-A'raf:24–25.

"That no burdened person (with sins) shall bear the burden (sins) of another. And that man can have nothing but what he does (of good and bad). And that his deeds will be seen, Then he will be recompensed with a full and the best [fair] recompense." Surat [an-Najm](#):38–41

APPENDIX B

Louis Berkof

Identifies Augustine as the originator of the concept of original sin: "The early Church Fathers contained nothing very definite about original sin. . . . It is especially in Augustine that the doctrine of original sin comes to fuller development. According to him, the nature of man, both physical and moral, is totally corrupted by Adam's sin, so that he cannot do otherwise than sin. This inherited corruption of original sin is a moral punishment for the sin of Adam." *Systematic Theology*, 244-245.

Justo L. Gonzalez

The concept of original sin has gone so far, that Justo L. Gonzalez wrote, "Natural man has true freedom to choose between several alternatives, although, given his condition as a sinner subject to concupiscence, and as a member of this 'mass of damnation,' all the alternatives open to him are sin. The option not to sin does not exist." *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. 2, 44.

Dr. Peter de Rosa,

A Jesuit professor, has recorded that, "In this, Gregory [Pope Gregory VI] took St. Paul literally: 'In Adam all have sinned.' This means from the first moment of a person's existence there is guilt. This is not a personal taint, but a taint of nature and so unavoidable. The nature derives from the parents. From the beginning the baby's soul is polluted by this original, this inherited sin. Gregory was not blind to the problems this raised. For example, parents were cleansed from original sin in baptism. How could they hand on original sin to their babies? He answers: Though holy themselves, they handed on corrupt nature by sex, desire galvanized by lust. Babies are born as the damned fruit of the lust of their redeemed parents. From the first, they are the offspring of Gehenna or Hell; they are justly children of wrath because they are sinners. If they die unbaptized, they are condemned to everlasting torments for the guilt of their birth alone. Existence is itself a state of sin; to be born is to be qualified for eternal punishment." *Vicars of Christ*, 452.