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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mathematicians state that for one to comprehend the Einstein theory of relativity a good knowledge of mathematics and mathematical symbols is necessary. It is impossible to put into words many of the thoughts and concepts expressed, but Einstein communicated through the use of certain symbols and formulas. When a student in any field begins his study he is soon aware that the amount of mastery he will gain in the area will depend upon his grasp and comprehension of the terminology peculiar to that field of study. It must be discovered what certain terms and thought patterns mean to those who are expert in their use.

Statement of the problem. In the study of the doctrine of original sin the student is soon confronted with such Biblical terms as, "the body of sin," "the old man," "the carnal mind," and others of a similar nature. The present problem is to try to determine the meaning of these Biblical terms as they relate to the Christian doctrine of original sin as understood by Roman Catholics, John Calvin, James Arminius, Robert Barclay and John Wesley.

Importance of the study.
A. Personal

1. This study holds a personal interest for this writer.

For a number of years after his conversion the writer was confused in his own personal experience with Christ because of an apparent
misunderstanding of the doctrine of original sin. Many times temptations came and it was mistakenly believed that original sin as a thing in itself had not been taken out. Every temptation was thought to be original sin at work even though the temptation was successfully warded off.

2. Justification for this study goes beyond the experience of the author. It has been observed that many people seem to have at least a partial misconception of what is involved in this doctrine as it relates to their own experience.

B. General Christian views.

1. Eminent men have been thought to teach that original sin has a metaphysical or quasi-physical existence. This can be seen in the writings of Mr. Sangster as he quotes Sugden in regard to the teaching of Wesley. He says that, "Wesley never quite shook off the fallacious notion that sin is a thing which has to be taken out of a man, like a cancer or a rotten tooth."\(^1\)

Basic Assumptions.

Original sin has reality.

1. Scripture teaches the reality of original sin.

2. The Church has taught the reality of original sin through its history.

---

3. Ample empirical evidence, in the lives of men and women today, testifies to the reality of original sin.

**Method of study.** In Chapter two these terms, "the old man" and "the body of sin" from Romans 6 were examined in this study to determine the intended meaning of the Scripture writers. These terms were also noted briefly in Ephesians and Colossians for their contribution. The term the "carnal" or "fleshly mind" from Romans 8 was studied. These are the terms that lend themselves to the metaphysical concept as they have apparently been understood to mean by some.

This was followed in Chapter three by a discussion taken from information gathered from the writings of Roman Catholic theologians, John Calvin, James Arminius, Robert Barclay and John Wesley as these men wrote on the doctrine of original sin. In a subsequent chapter these findings were analyzed in the light of the Scriptural teaching of Romans 6 and Romans 8.

A fifth chapter was included on the nature of sin and its relationship to man.

**Limitations.** The study of Scriptural terms was limited to "the old man," "the body of sin," and "the carnal mind." These were chosen because they come from the heart of Pauline teaching on the subject of original sin. Secondly, they were chosen because they lend themselves to the concept that original sin might be
metaphysical in nature.

The terms, root of bitterness, ἁμαρτία, ἀμαρτία, ἀμάρτωσις, ἀμαρτία, and ἀνομία, are representative of others that might have been selected.

In the study of the theologians the source material was limited mainly to the original writings of Calvin, Arminius, Barclay and Wesley. In the study of the Roman Catholic position, Smith was selected as one who is widely recognized by leaders of that church.

The analysis of the theologians was limited to their teaching on the personal relationship between God and man, as this relates to the terms "the old man," "the body of sin," and "the carnal mind."

Definition of terms. 1. Relationship. This word is used in reference to the harmonious fellowship, or utter lack of it, that exists between God and man, or between man and his fellow man. 2. Entity. This term describes an element that has reality in and of itself. There is existence apart from God or any of His created beings. 3. Nature. This refers to human personality as God created it. In the fall away from God this personality is no longer holy and good, but becomes corrupt.
CHAPTER II

A STUDY OF THE TERMS
"OLD MAN," "BODY OF SIN," AND "CARNAL MIND"

There have been few individuals in the history of Christianity who have held seriously to the teaching that sin inheres in or is the result of matter. Gnostics have taught that matter was evil, some saying that matter and Satan were the same. The only means of escaping sin to this group of people was through practice of extreme aceticism, or very loose living. They thought it did not matter how one lived, for one could not escape matter, and therefore sin, in this life. These heresies have had little hearing among thinking Christians.

There have been, however, those among sound, evangelical denominations who have taught that original sin has an entity within itself; original sin being a dark mass, or substance that must be removed before a life of holiness can be enjoyed. Scriptural terms that lend themselves to the idea that original sin is an existing entity are the "old man" and "the body of sin" in Romans 6, or "carnal mind" in Romans 8. Surely these chapters and terms teach the reality of original sin. This doctrine has never been seriously doubted by Christian people.

These terms will be examined in more detail in this chapter as a basis for the continued study of the nature of original sin. The material is divided into two major sections,
one dealing with the two terms "the old man" and "the body of sin"; and the other discussing the nature of the life in the flesh.

The "old man" and "the body of sin."

In Romans 5:12 the apostle Paul tells how sin came into the world. "Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." (Romans 5:12) The apostle uses the term "sin" in the greatest general way. He is not speaking specially of sin either as a tendency or an act, either individually or collectively; but of the principle of revolt whereby the human will rises against the divine in all its different forms and manifestations.

From the Bible standpoint sin has no existence outside the creature. Romans 5:12 explains the introduction of this principle into the world. One man carries the responsibility of the event which, as it were, was the piercing of the dike through which the irruption took place.

At the suggestion of an already existing power of revolt, man exercised his liberty and decided to adhere to the inclination rather than to the divine will. "This created in his whole race, still identified with his person, the permanent proclivity to prefer inclination to obligation."1

As all the race would have perished with him if he had perished, it was seized with him in the spirit of revolt to which he gave himself. This spirit of revolt, Godet says, is in all man, but "we are nowhere told, however, that his descendants are individually responsible for this diseased tendency." The responsibility results from man voluntarily resigning himself to the inclination.

This condition of sin is described by the phrase "our old man." Regarding this phrase Godet says,

the expression: our old man, denotes human nature such as it has been made by the sin of him in whom originally it was wholly concentrated, fallen Adam reappearing in every human ego that comes into the world under the sway of the preponderance of self-love, which was determined by primitive transgression. This corrupted nature bears the name of old only from the viewpoint of the believer who already possesses a renewed nature.—This old man has been crucified so far as the believer is concerned in the very person of Christ crucified.

Godet is in harmony with Thayer, who comments, "our old man, i.e. we, as we were before our mode of thought, feeling, action, had been changed." This comment refers to the phrase as it is found in Romans 6:6; Ephesians 4:22; and Colossians 3:9. The old, ἐπαλαίς, is opposed to the new, ἐνέος, of the new

---

1 Godet., p. 204.
2 Ibid., p. 244.
life of the regenerated man.

In the same vein of thought Griffith Thomas makes the statement, "'our old man,' means 'our old self'; what we were as the unregenerate sons of Adam."

The apostle's use of the phrase "the body of sin," (Romans 6:6) is different from the use of the phrase "our old man," in the same verse. Some would understand the body in the strict sense of the word, understanding the apostle to mean that in it lies the principle of evil in our human nature.

"But the sequel proves that he does not at all regard sin as inherent in the body and inseparable from it; for in ver. 13 he claims the body and its members for the service of God, and represents them as under obligation to become *instruments of righteousness."\(^2\)

Some have taught that the body is itself sinful. This position has never been considered seriously by the church. The fact that Paul teaches in Romans 8:3 the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, gives sufficient evidence that He was not teaching that the body is the principle of sin.

These considerations have led several commentators to understand the word *body* here in a figurative sense.

According to Godet sin itself is denoted

---


\(^2\) Godet. op. cit., p. 245.
as a heavy mass, or even as an organism, a system of evil dispositions, which keeps the soul under its yoke. One can easily understand in this sense how Paul should demand the destruction of this body of sin, that is to say, of sin itself. But it is impossible to harmonize this meaning with vv. 12 and 13, in which Paul applying our passage, evidently speaks of the holy consecration of the body, taking the term in its strict sense.

There remains another explanation.

It regards the genitive of sin as a complement of property or quality: the body so far as it serves as an instrument of sin in human life. This meaning is certainly the one which corresponds best with the thought of the apostle. Only to understand the genitive of sin, we must add the idea: that from our birth there exists between our body and our sinful will that intimate relation whereby the two elements are placed in mutual dependence. This relation is not a simple accident; it belongs to the fallen state into which our soul itself has come.—The verb καταργεῖν, which we translate by destroy, strictly signifies: to deprive of the power of action; and hence to make needless or useless.

This destruction of the body, its being rendered inactive, or annihilation can not be applied to the fleshly body, but to the wrong usage of the body and all its members.

The apostle has no thought here of recommending bodily asceticism to believers. It is not of the body as such that he is speaking; it is of the body so far as it is an instrument in the service of sin. Of the body in this special relation, he declares that it should be reduced to inaction, or even destroyed. . . A body, that of sin, is destroyed that another may take its place, the body which is an instrument of righteousness (ver. 13).  

1 Godet., p. 245.  
2 Ibid., p. 245.  
3 Ibid., p. 245.
Again the writing of Griffith Thomas concurs with Godet when he writes, "'the body of sin' does not mean in our modern terminology, 'the mass of sin' or that sin has its source in the body. It simply means that the body is the seat or instrument of sin."¹

The physical body is the instrument of the soul. It can be used either as an instrument of righteousness or of unrighteousness. With this thought in mind Thayer says the phrase σῶμα τῆς ἁμαρτίας, the body of sin, (Romans 6:6), means "the body subject to, the thrall of, sin."² In similar vein the phrase τὸ σῶμα τῆς σαρκὸς, the body of flesh, (Colossians 2:11), means the body "subject to the incitements of the flesh."³ The usage of the word flesh here is meant to include the entire nature without the enlightenment and power of the Holy Spirit.⁴

If Christians are united to Christ and partake of His life and His resurrection, they live as He lives. As a prerequisite to this, necessarily, they are also vitally connected to Him in His death. Their unregenerate self "old man" was crucified with Christ on the Cross "in order that the body, in

¹Thom., op. cit., p. 10.
²Thayer., op. cit., p. 611.
³Ibid., p. 611.
⁴Ibid., p. 611.
so far as it is the servant or instrument of sin, might be rendered powerless with regard to sin, and prevented from serving it any more.¹

The Christians breaking with sin is absolute and conclusive in its principle. When one breaks really with an old friend who has exerted evil influences, half measures are insufficient and the only satisfactory means is a complete rupture which remains like a barrier raised beforehand against every new attempt by the old friend to reestablish the friendship. We are to reckon ourselves dead to sin. It is to have no existence as far as we are concerned. Adam Clark speaks of this broken relationship with a life of sin.

Before, while sinners, we were in a state of enmity with God, which was sufficiently proved by our rebellion against his authority, and our transgression of his laws; but now being reconciled, we have peace with God. Before, while under a sense of the guilt of sin, we had nothing but terror and dismay in our own consciences; now, having our sin forgiven, we have peace in our hearts, feeling that all our guilt is taken away. Peace is generally the firstfruits of our justification.²

Clark continues, pointing out that the way of establishing a new relationship with God is through Christ.

It was only through Christ that we could at first approach God; and it is only through Him that the

¹Thomas., op. cit., p. 10.
privilege is continued to us. . . We are not brought to God for the purpose of an interview, but to remain with Him; to be His household; and, by faith to behold His face and walk in the light of His countenance.¹

The Christian is united to Christ in a very intimate way. The believer's union with Christ is governed by the nature and purposes of His life and death. The Interpreter's Bible shows this relationship of the believer to Christ.

We have been united with Him in a death like His, and Paul explains this by adding (vs. 10) that the death He died He died to sin. His life, though surrounded by the forces of sin, was marked by complete moral antipathy to them, and His death was a final expression of that opposition on His part to everything that was evil. It was a conclusive breach with sin, decisive in its nature and its effect—it was once for all. This meant that He died from under its jurisdiction, into a realm where sin had no sway. The same thing happened in the believer's case. We too have decisively repudiated the old allegiance which was the mark of our servitude to sin. The language presses as far as possible the identity of our case with Christ's. Our old self was crucified.²

In discussing the repudiation of the old allegiance to sin, and the old self being crucified, the Interpreter's Bible says,

the old personality, organized around a certain set of interests and values, was as truly put to death by association with Christ's crucifixion as were the thieves who died in the same manner as He did and at the same

¹Clark., p. 66.

time. As a result our sinful body was destroyed.¹

In this last sentence the authors of the Interpreter's Bible intimate that the destruction of the sinful body is reorganization of the personality around a new set of principles. Their comment continues on the usage of the word "body".

To avoid misunderstanding it is necessary to remember that Paul does not use "body" in the way we would. It is not the physical organism as such to which he refers; rather it is the self as the organization of the sinful impulses inherent in the flesh. Christ's physical crucifixion has its moral equivalent in our death to sin. . . Clearly Paul's purpose is to stress the moral consequences which follow from our union with Christ. His death is not only relevant to our situation; in a true sense our identification with Christ; made possible by faith, is so real that we share in his death. But since it was a death to sin, our risen life will be within an order where sin no longer reigns supreme. Paul's argument is from the one assured experience to what he believes will certainly be its consequence.²

If we become vitally connected to Christ by experiencing His death we will also be vitally connected with Him in the likeness of His resurrection.

The authors of the Expositors Bible, on the phrase, our old man, write:

This knowing that our old man, our old state, as out of Christ and under Adam's headship, under guilt and in moral bondage, was crucified with Christ, was as it were, nailed to His atoning Cross, where He

¹Interpreter's Bible., p. 475.
²Ibid., p. 475.
represented us.¹

The "old man" is here identified as our old state which is out of Christ and under the headship of Adam. Going on, the same authors write on the phrase, "the body of sin."

He on the Cross, our Head and Sacrifice, so dealt with our fallen state for us, that the body of sin, this our body viewed as sin's stronghold, medium, vehicle, might be cancelled, might be in abeyance, put down, deposed, so as to be no more the fatal door to admit temptation to a powerless soul within.²

Again it is seen that the body of sin refers to the usage of the body, or the entire self.

Briefly, it can be concluded from the evidence gathered this far, that the phrase "our old man" refers to the former state of man. That state which finds man outside the will of God, with the personality oriented away from God and Godly principles. The crucifixion of the "old man" means a repudiation of the former way of living. Along with this complete break there is a union with Christ which takes place.

The phrase, "the body of sin," refers to the body, and its members, which is used as an instrument for sin. When a repudiation of sin is made the body and its members becomes an instrument for righteousness.

² Ibid., p. 164-165.
The carnal mind.

Originally the Greek word ὄργα, seemed to carry the thought of drawing off, signifying that which can be stripped off. It was used to describe that soft part of the living body which covers the bones of both men and beasts.¹ "To follow after the flesh, is used of those who are on the search for persons with whom they can gratify their lust."² When ὄργα is used in opposition to ὑμεν, either tacitly or expressly, Thayer says,

it has an ethical sense and denotes mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God; accordingly it includes whatever in the soul is weak, low, debased, tending to ungodliness and vice.³

Flesh, therefore means more than just the body and that which is related to unchastity. Paul uses "flesh" of the whole man; his body, soul, mind, and all his faculties because all that is in him strives after the flesh.⁴

Flesh signifies the entire nature, the entire personality with all its sense and reason, without the Holy Spirit.

There are two classes of men described in Romans 8; those that are after the flesh, and those that are after the Spirit.

Those that are after the flesh are also called the carnally

¹ Thayer., op.cit., p. 569.
² Ibid., p. 569-570.
³ Ibid., p. 571.
⁴ Ibid., p. 571.
minded. The two terms are synonymous, and are used interchangeably.

"The 'flesh' when used, as here, with a moral meaning is always to be understood as referring to the old, unrenewed, sinful nature, according to which the unregenerate man lives. It implies the entire unrenewed life lived apart from God."¹

The life of the flesh does not necessarily mean a life that is filled with gross and vicious sin, for the fleshly life might be refined, educated and cultured. There are indeed religions of the flesh which consist in outward ceremonial observances, asceticism, and self-denial. These, however, do not touch the heart nor provide acceptable worship of the living God in the Spirit and the truth.

Griffith Thomas has the following to say,

"There are many things described as being 'according to the flesh,' which are altogether unacceptable to God. It was this to which our Lord referred when He spoke of 'that which is born of the flesh is flesh.' Herein lies the explanation why righteousness is not, and cannot be, fulfilled in the man who is not in Christ. In marked contrast to this is the reference to those who are 'after the Spirit.' They have been born from above and in the power of that spiritual life they live 'after the Spirit.'"²

Thus they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.

A man necessarily lives according to his nature. If he is a man after the flesh, he will mind the things of the flesh. His whole bent,

¹Thomas., op.cit., p. 68.
²Ibid., p. 68.
tendency and drive will be toward that which is naturally his—
either to flesh or to Spirit. As is the life within, so will be
the character and conduct, for fruit always comes according to its
kind.

The kind of fruit a person bears depends upon where he
derives the power for his living. The Interpreter's Bible says,

because we rely on human resources, we never break out of an
order in which we are limited to human factors. But if we
start from God, the values which derive from him and the
power of which he is the source will bring us progressively
into that liberation of spirit which is his gift. This
difference determines the character of our moral and spirit-
ual life. It decides whether we are free men or slaves,
and it profoundly affects the quality which we impart to
things which are neutral in themselves... It is wholly
a matter of the kind of impulses which rule our lives.
If we are under the tyranny of physical appetite, we shall
live in the flesh; if we are governed by the purposes of
God, we shall live in the Spirit.1

The mind that strives or aspires after the things of the
flesh, not only has the inability to be subject to God, it is hostile
toward God. Thus there are very good reasons why the unrenewed
man cannot fulfill the will of God. As long as a man is unrenewed,
he may be religious after sorts, but it is impossible for him to be

1Interpreter's Bible., op.cit. p. 510-511.
pleasing to God.

The fact that these two groups of men live differently is the burden of the apostle: natural men are absorbed in the interests of the flesh (do mind the things of the flesh); men who have received the Spirit are dominated by the interests of the Spirit. The Interpreter’s Bible points this out in its comment on the Greek terms. It says, "the Greek terms here, and in the following verses—φρονεῖν and ἀποφανεῖν—refer to a directing of emotion and will as well as thought, toward an object."¹

In commenting on Ephesians 2:3; ἐνέποιησεν τὸν σώματα, and Colossians 2:18; ἔκακος τὸν σώματα, Thayer says this is "a body given up to the control of the flesh, i.e. a body whose members our nature, estranged from God, used as its instruments (cf. Ro. vi. 19), Col. ii, 11. . . τὰ τῶν σώματα (opp. to τὰ τῶν πνεύματος), the things which please the flesh, which the flesh craves."²

The apostle Paul uses the phrase σώμα τῆς συνέλευσιν in Romans 8:5. This is to devote one’s self to the gratification of the desire of the flesh. This act is an end purpose in life. This purpose supersedes any purpose which would bring yieldedness to the Holy Spirit and He is crowded out of the life, and the life comes under control of the flesh.³ The Interpreter’s Bible says, to set the mind on the flesh means death for the reason

¹Interpreter’s Bible., p. 509.
²Thayer., p. 571.
³Ibid., p. 571.
that such an attitude or state of mind constitutes enmity against God--an enmity which issues in death. The mind that is set on the flesh, . . . does not submit to God's law, indeed it cannot. . . Those who are in the flesh are those who belong merely to the natural order. But, Paul says, you do not belong to this natural order of the flesh; you belong to the new, supernatural, eschatological order of the Spirit.¹

The work just cited points out that Paul goes farther than just showing the contrast.

To state the contrast might seem sufficient, but Paul underlines the enmity which enters in to separate from God the man whose life is dominated by physical appetite. For the mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God (vss 7-8). Paul is stating a basic incompatibility; the life which limits its interests to the satisfactions of the flesh cannot submit to God's Law, and those who chose that kind of life cannot please God.²

These cannot please God for they are the unchanged children of the self-life. Those who are flesh-wise, "think," "mind," have "moral affinity," and "converse," with the things of the flesh. They are opposite of those who are Spirit-wise, for the spiritual man thinks the things of the Spirit.

The minding of the flesh, the moral affinity of the self life, is death. This involves the ruin of the soul, its condemnation and separation from God. The minding of the Spirit, which is the affinity given to the believer by the indwelling Holy One, is

¹Interpreter's Bible., p. 509.
²Ibid., p. 509.
life and peace; it implies spiritual union with Christ. He is realized in this state of the soul. The Expositor's Bible discusses at length the hostility toward God which is involved in the mind of flesh.

But this absolute antagonism of the two "minds" is such because—the "mind" of the flesh is personal hostility (ἐγκαταλαμβάνω) towards God; for to God's Law it is not subject. For indeed it cannot be subject to it; those who are in flesh, surrendered to the life of self as their law, cannot please God, "cannot meet the wish" (διηρκεία) of Him whose loving but absolute claim is to be Lord of the whole man.¹

Continuing the idea of this impossibility the same source says:

"they cannot"; it is a moral impossibility. "The Law of God" is, "Thou shalt love Me with all thy heart, and thy neighbour as thyself"; the mind of the flesh is, "I will love myself and its will first and most." Let this be disguised as it may, even from the man himself; it is always the same thing in its essence. It may mean a defiant choice of open evil. It may mean a subtle and almost evanescent preference of literature, or art, or work, or home, to God's will as such. It is in either case "the mind of the flesh:" a thing which cannot be refined and educated into holiness, but must be surrendered at discretion, as its eternal enemy.²

Contrasted with this is the life in the Spirit.

But you (there is a glad emphasis on "you") are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, surrendered to the indwelling Presence as your law and secret, on the assumption that . . . God's Spirit dwells in you; has His home in your

¹ Expositor's Bible, p. 164.
² Ibid., p. 164-165.
hearts, humbly welcomed into a continuous residence.¹

To live in the Spirit does not mean the annihilation of every form of physical satisfaction. The flesh, as the material part of man's life is not evil as the gnostic would say. On this the Interpreter's Bible says:

The attitude which frowns on every form of physical satisfaction is derived from the Pauline position, but is a distortion of it. Paul repeatedly implies that the flesh, as the material basis of man's life, is not in itself an evil thing. By its nature it is neutral: it may be good or it may be bad, and which it is depends on the choice made by man's spirit.²

The Interpreter's Bible goes on to say that it is this choice which creates the problem for man. The choice sets up an imbalance in man's entire personality, the choice between flesh and Spirit.

It is this fact which creates the problem. Once evil enters, the delicate balance of man's life is disturbed, and physical impulse acquires a power which wins for it a role which it should not have. Instead of being a servant, it becomes a master, and the whole personality is changed for the worse. Even the mind is affected, and its interests are imprisoned within the narrow circle which appetite permits. The picture shows us the steady corruption of a life in which the proper equipoise of body and mind is destroyed and the whole nature becomes gross.³

From this it can be seen that not only is man's personality in a state of imbalance, he also becomes a servant to this imbalanced

¹ Expositor's Bible. op.cit., p 165.
² Interpreter's Bible. op.cit., p. 510-511.
³ Ibid., p. 510-511.
condition. This condition is the state of being in the flesh.

The "spiritual" life is not an immaterial existence, nor one in which the body is denied its proper part. The decisive question really concerns the source of the motives which actually govern life. Where we start from will determine where we end; our interests will decide the kind of persons we will be. This seems reasonably obvious as long as we restrict our discussion to "the spiritual" and "the carnal"; but the whole trend of Paul's argument is to show that the gospel sets our life in a different order not merely on a different plane.\(^1\)

Summary.

Sin exists only in man. It has no objective existence outside of the creature. The term "the old man" refers to the unregenerate man, influenced and contaminated by his first parent. The "body of sin" does not mean that there is a body or an entity which consists of sin, either in man or out of him, but the body which is his fleshly body is used for the purposes of sin.

This body is not sinful in itself. It is very good, for it is a body like that given to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The "old man" or the old unregenerate self was crucified with Christ on the cross in order that the body which was previously used as an instrument for sin, might be made usable as an instrument for righteousness.

The "old man" and the "body of sin" are not synonymous terms. The "old man" describes the former life, a condition or state,

\(^1\)Expositor's Bible op.cit., p. 164-165.
resulting from the sin of Adam, the first parent. This condition or state can be described as a state of war or condition of hostility directed against God. This old, unregenerate way of living is abandoned, done away with, or crucified. The "body of sin" refers to the body which is viewed as sin's stronghold, medium or vehicle.

The apostle teaches in Romans that man's conditions results, not from an evil entity within the soul or body, but from a very improper relationship with God. This improper relationship leaves man at his own ends entirely and he is not capable of guiding his own life.

Probably the most concentrated Scriptural teaching, ethical or moral in nature, on the subject of "flesh" is in the first thirteen verses of chapter 8.

Paul uses the term "sinful flesh" in Romans 8:3 but he does not mean that flesh as such is sinful. This would be the gnostic teaching. Instead he teaches that those who mind the things of the flesh inevitably must die. Those who center their lives in things of the life of flesh, those who aspire after, desire much, try to gain, or are overly concerned with the flesh are those who are wrong in their way of life.

The mind of the flesh is death; the mind of the flesh is enmity against God. The mind of flesh cannot please God—it cannot please God because it never aspires after God and the things of the Spirit.
The life of flesh or mind of flesh is dead to God. Through the provisions of Christ it is possible, however, to be made free from sinful flesh. One can be in the Spirit, and not in the flesh, if the Spirit dwells in him. When the Spirit indwells it is not necessary to any longer live after the flesh, but one becomes obligated to live after the Spirit. The one way destines the individual to eternal death, the other to eternal life.

The terms, "the old man," "the body of sin," and "the carnal mind" are very closely related in meaning, but they are not synonymous.

The term, "the old man" denotes human nature as it was made by Adam. It is as if fallen Adam were reappearing in every human ego, coming into the world under the preponderance of self love. The fallen nature is referred to as the old man because the believer possesses a new nature. "the old man," i. e. we, as we were before our mode of thought, feeling and action had been changed. "old man" means our old self, what we were as the unregenerate sons of Adam. "The old man" is crucified when the old friendship to the way of sin is broken with sharply. "The body of sin" does not mean that there is a chunk, or an entity of sin. The "of sin" of this phrase describes the kind of body that is under discussion. The "body" includes the flesh, will, emotions—the entire personality. The entire person is to leave sin and consecrate his body to God. "The body of sin" then becomes a "body of righteousness."
CHAPTER III

THE TEACHING OF CERTAIN THEOLOGIANS ON ORIGINAL SIN

In this chapter statements are obtained from the teachings of Roman Catholics, John Calvin, James Arminius, Robert Barclay and John Wesley. The statements deal with the various positions of these men on the subject of original sin. Major analysis and comment is reserved until the next chapter.

The Catholic doctrine of the fall of man and fallen man.

There is a tradition throughout nearly all civilizations that man once enjoyed a golden age. The fact that this tradition is so very widespread might add support to the Biblical account since historians tend to believe that a tradition such as this must have its roots in fact. If this were not true the belief could not have such a wide hearing.

The accounts of the golden age are in many secular traditions as well as the Genesis account in the Bible. The present interest lies in the Genesis story.

According to the authority of the church the account given in Genesis must be interpreted literally. The church teaches that man once enjoyed a perfect state of justice, integrity, and immortality.

Justice, as here used, means first and principally the supernatural gift of sanctifying grace, which raised Adam to a higher state and nobler dignity, which put him
into a relationship of real friendship with God in this life, and gave him the pledge of eternal happiness in the closest union with him in the next.¹

The other two, integrity and immortality, were not necessary to Adam to make him any more human, nor put him on a higher order of existence as grace did. They were a pure benevolent gift of God over and above the pure human faculties. Regarding immortality it says,

... 'for dust thou art and into dust thou shalt return,' Gen. 3:19. Whence it is clear that death was positively the penalty of Adam's sin, and that if he had not sinned he would not have had to die.²

Man could have eaten of the tree of life had he not sinned and he would have been immortal.

In connection with his immortality it may also be deduced that Adam would have been free from pain and illness. It would not be correct to say that he could not feel pain, except those pains which are the result of sin.

The matter of Adam's sin goes beyond an insurgence of concupiscence for he did not have concupiscence. It also goes beyond simple morality for with the clear spirituality he enjoyed it does not seem likely the fall could have been so simple. Adam was lord over the earth but God permitted Satan to tempt Adam.


²Ibid. p.
The argument came to Adam,

Why should so noble a being as you suffer such a restriction upon your liberty? Eat of the tree, break through the bonds imposed upon you, let your freedom be unfettered. Become as God yourself, knowing all things and daring all; be subject to no one, have no master; be lord of yourself serving none other.¹

In some such form the temptation came into the mind and when Adam submitted to the suggestion he openly rebelled against God with His supernatural rights and claims.

The Council of Trent sums up under one canon the Catholic teaching about the immediate effects produced in Adam by his sin, to wit, that he lost the sanctity and justice in which he had been established, that he incurred the wrath and indignation of God, and thereby death, likewise captivity under the power of the devil, and that both as to soul and body he was changed for the worse.²

Clearly, Adam lost his holiness and justice. There can be no oneness of life between God and man when there is a disunion of wills. The higher life on earth and the perfection in the next life is dependent upon conformity between the will and mind of man and that of God. Adam,

... by putting his will in opposition to God's deprived himself necessarily of this union with and sharing in the divine life, which is sanctifying grace. By his sin he also lost his preternatural gifts of immortality and integrity.³

Adam did not lose anything that belonged to his human nature

² Ibid. p. 331.
³ Ibid. p. 334.
when he sinned. All of the elements that constituted humanity remained intact and unspoiled. The human nature passed on to his children was perfect in its kind, having in it no natural defect or infection or evil inclination that can be looked on as a direct result of his sin. However, the loss of the gifts, though not making Adam less human, were an adornment and grace that would have so penetrated his nature that their loss affected Adam greatly. The loss of the gift wounds man and leaves him open to the attacks of the devil. He is defenseless.

**Original Sin in Adam's Children.** When original sin in man is discussed it must always be remembered that Jesus and His immaculate Mother, Mary are excepted. The church's teaching on original sin in Adam's posterity is found in Canons 2 through 5 of the Fifth Session of the Council of Trent. The second Canon decrees,

> . . . That they declare anathema who assert "that Adam's sin wrought injury to himself only and not upon us also the loss of sanctity and justice which he had received from God; or that he . . . transmitted to the whole human race death and bodily sufferings alone, and not sin which is the death of the soul."

We must see the difference between actual sin and a state of sin. Actual sin is the act whereby man in word, thought, or

---

1Smith. I, p.334.
2Ibid. p. 333.
3Ibid. p.338.
deed violates God's will and command. He turns his back upon God. This act may be over in a moment of time, but the result of the act remains. The state of the soul is affected for the grace is expelled from the sinner's soul. It is deprived of supernatural life and he is spiritually dead. He is in a condition of moral disorder.¹ Because Adam lost the gifts of sanctifying grace, integrity and immortality, all men, too, are born without these gifts.

"This condition in which we are born is contrary to God's primary intention with regard to man, it is a state of privation, and considered in its totality, is called the state of fallen nature or of original sin.²

What Is Original Sin. The first theologian to be confronted with the nature of original sin was St. Augustine. He, however, was not systematic in his teachings on this subject and there has been a great deal of debate as to what he actually did teach. Likewise there has been a great deal of difference among the Catholic theologians about the nature of original sin.

In the decrees of the Council of Trent the following points are made clear: Man's primitive holiness and justice have been lost, and to all of Adam's descendants have been transmitted both bodily death and sin, which is the

¹Smith. I. p. 338.
²Ibid. p. 339.
death of the soul; original sin is not caused by our imitation of Adam's sin, but is produced by natural propagation—that is, it is not actual sin, yet it is proper or personal to each soul; it is heretical to say that through baptism it is merely covered up or not imputed, for it is utterly taken away.¹

St. Thomas says that,

... nothing can be included under the concept of original sin except what is derived from the sin committed by Adam as head of the human race. But in his sin, as in every other, there are two elements to be taken into account: the first is the turning away from God, our last end, and the direct result of this is the loss of sanctifying grace; the second element is the undue and inordinate cleaving to some created, lesser good in place of God, and to this element corresponds the introduction of concupiscence. Hence we find both of these elements existing in all Adam's posterity.²

When Adam sinned, he did so as the moral head and the spiritual representative of the whole race. In Adam the whole race rebelled and was disobedient to God. The whole race was dependent upon Adam and since the head of the whole sinned, the whole became sinners.

The Vatican Council of 1870 was preparing a definition on original sin when the council was cut short because of the Italian invasion of Rome. The teachings had been drawn up, examined, revised and edited and were ready for submission to the council fathers when the council ended. Had the work been completed it is likely the decrees would have been accepted.

²Ibid. p. 344.
This is assumed because other decrees prepared at the same time were accepted. For example the Pope was declared to be infallible as a result of the work of this council.

The Canons are as follows: Canon 4: If anyone shall say that original sin is not truly and properly a sin in Adam's descendents, unless they, by sinning, actually consent to it, let him be anathema; Canon 5: If any one shall say that original sin is formally (precisely identical with) concupiscence itself, or some physical or substantial disease of human nature, and shall deny that the privation of sanctifying grace is an essential constituent of it, let him be anathema.¹

Roman Catholic theologians have different ways of describing original sin but the essential thing is the loss of sanctifying grace.

The original justice that Adam possessed was not for him to have alone, but it was something that he could have passed on to all men had he not lost it in his own act of rebellion. Justice was semi-nally in Adam for all men and it would have been passed on through natural generation.

Adam was the representative for all of mankind in his testing. All of mankind was seen to be weighed and found wanting. The rebellious will of Adam was the "family" will which was wanting.

St. Paul said, "for all sinned", this can refer only to the sin that all committed in Adam; again he writes,

¹Smith. I. p. 346.
"For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive", where he invokes the same principal to explain the whole dispensation of the fall and the redemption.¹

The theologians who framed the decrees and definitions of the Vatican Council wrote, regarding original sin, these things.

(a) What is said to belong to the essence of original sin is not a mere negation, the absence of sanctifying grace, but is the privation of grace, that is, the absence of the sanctity which, according to God's ordinance, ought to have been found in all Adam's descendants, inasmuch as God raised the whole human race to the supernatural order of grace, in its source and head, whereas now all are deprived of grace. But this privation (b) neither does nor can exist without a fault committed by free will; this free will, however, is not that which is personal to each individual, but the free will of the head of the whole human race, of Adam himself, who, sinning, lost not only that grace which belonged to him personally, but also that which, according to God's plan would have been passed on to all his children. Hence Adam's sin was the sin of human nature and becomes the habitual sin inhering in all who, by carnal generation, share in the nature derived from Adam. (Acta Conc. Vaticani, Collectio Lacensis, vol. vii. Col. 549).²

Original sin is not actual sin but a state of sin; the free will concerned is not of the individual but of Adam who was the representative head of the race; the individual is not responsible for the sin because he had no choice regarding his birth into the race. The Catholics refer to the Pelagian controversy to explain the passing of original sin from father to son.

¹Smith. I. p. 348.
²Ibid. p. 348-349.
Original sin is passed through natural generation from father to son. The Pelagians insisted that the soul was spiritual and could not be generated by natural means. This meant God created each new soul individually and to say God created it in a state of sin was blasphemy. They felt it was necessary to give up the dogma of original sin as a blasphemous dogma.

St. Augustine felt the attack of this controversy full force and he could hardly bring himself to accept the teaching that each soul is immediately created by God. He hoped there would be some clarification on the teaching of traducianism, each father exerts a causative and productive influence on the soul of the son. Augustine, too, had an imperfect knowledge of original sin, for the teaching had not yet been worked out.

Everything derived from Adam comes through human generations. Original sin, just as every other human inheritance, comes this way.

This is not to say that the act of generation is the efficient cause of the existence of original sin in the individual. That act is not the efficient or productive cause even of the existence of the child's soul. All it does is so to dispose the material body, to put it into such a condition that, according to the divinely established laws of nature, it calls for and, if we may be allowed a word, necessitates the creation of the soul by God. But this soul, good and, indeed, a perfect thing in the natural order, is deprived of that sanctifying grace which it ought to have had, according to God's original but conditional design; instead of being supernaturalized, as it ought to have been, it is a purely natural thing;
at the same time, and owing to the same cause, the whole
human being, body and soul, is deprived of the gift of
integrity, which it ought to have possessed, and, therefore,
subject to consupiscence. But all this comes into effect
when, and only when, the complete human being comes into
existence, which is the result of the act of generation.
This act, then, is the vehicle of the transmission of
original sin.¹

Original sin is not the deprivation of something that God
owes to man, but something man has no claim to. God chose to
give man supernatural grace but he could keep it only upon the
condition of obedience.

Effects Of The Fall Of Man. The first effect of the fall
of man, is original sin, the loss of sanctifying grace and all
that is involved in this. In one sense this loss may be considered
the very essence of original sin, while in another it may be
considered an effect.

The second effect of original sin is the loss of the
preternatural gifts. These are integrity, immortality and freedom
from pain and suffering. The Council of Trent clearly teaches
that death is a direct consequence of original sin. Theologians
of the Catholic church are generally agreed that loss of integrity
is also a consequence, however, this teaching has not been as
clearly defined.

¹Smith. I. p. 351.
The third effect is the wounded nature of man. A wounded nature causes disunion and disharmony among the parts and prevents proper functioning. The higher power, especially reasoning and intellect are particularly impaired and limited.

A fourth effect on mankind wrought by original sin as taught by the Council of Trent is a captivity under the devil. Many do not like to accept the idea of a personal devil and even some Catholics do not fully realize the significance of the New Testament teachings on the personal devil.

God, in creating the world, established it as a vast hierarchy of beings, according to a plan of an ascending scale of natural dignity and perfection. From inanimate beings we rise through the different degrees of living things to man, who is supreme among angels, who according to Catholic teaching, are divided into choirs according to the varying degrees of their natural dignity. Above all, infinitely transcending all, is God.

In the world it is true that members in higher order of beings exert authority over those of lower orders and use them for their own ends. Man uses animate and inanimate beings. St. Thomas teaches that angels of higher rank also have authority over the lower. It may be also assumed that since angels are in a higher station than man, angels exert some power over man. To what degree is unknown.

When Lucifer, one of the mightiest of angels, rebelled

---

1 Smith. I. p. 353.
against God he lost the place of pre-eminence he had enjoyed. When Adam rebelled against God, too, he lost the supernatural status he had once enjoyed and was placed, by his own choice, at the disposal of Satan. Both are acting according to the laws of nature and Lucifer has the upper hand because he is created on a higher plane. Adam can be freed from this captivity through Christ.

The effects of original sin on the life to come are loss of the beautific vision by unbaptized infants; and entrance into hell by adults who have actually committed sin.

Summary. Adam was created so that he enjoyed a perfect state of justice, integrity, and immortality. Adam, at the suggestion of Satan, rebelled against God. This resulted in the loss of his sanctity and justice, and also brought upon him the wrath and indignation of God. Another effect of Adam's rebellion was the wounding of his nature, and likewise, of all his posterity.

John Calvin's thoughts on fallen man.

When the first man rebelled against the sovereignty of God he was ensnared by the allurements of the devil. Not only this, he despised truth and sought after falsehood. This results in a loss of reverence for God. The sense of His majesty, and purity is gone, He is no longer worshipped, and His voice is not implicitly listened for. Man in this condition finds ambition, pride and ingratitude springing forth within him.
"Adam, by coveting more than was granted, offered an indignity to the Divine goodness, which had so greatly enriched him. Now it was monstrous impiety, that a son of the earth should not be satisfied with being made after the similitude of God, unless he could also be equal to Him."

The sin of our first parents was more than simple apostasy.

They were also guilty of making vile reproaches against God by consenting to Satanic suggestion that God was guilty of falsehood, envy and malignity. Adam would never have dared to resist the authority of God if he had not doubted His word. Being seduced by the devil he did all that he could to annihilate the glory of God.

As the spiritual life of Adam consisted in a union to his Maker, so an alienation from him was the death of his soul. Nor is it surprising that he ruined his posterity by his defection which has perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth. "The creatures groan," says Paul, "being made subject to vanity not willingly;" (Romans 8:20, 22) If the cause be inquired, it is undoubtedly that they sustain part of the punishment due to the demerits of man, for whose use they were created. .. when the divine image in him was obliterated, and he was punished with the loss of wisdom, strength, sanctity, truth, and righteousness, with which he had been adorned, but which were succeeded by the dreadful pests of ignorance, impotence, impurity, vanity, and iniquity, he suffered not alone, but involved all his posterity with him, and plunged them into the same miseries.2

This condition of man is what is called original sin,

---


2Ibid., p. 226.
"meaning by sin, the depravation of a nature previously good and pure."  

Calvin cites the words of David, who is clear in his statement, that he was shapen in iniquity and in sin his mother conceived him. (Psalm 51:5) In this statement he is not exposing the sins of his father and mother; "but to enhance his commendations of the Divine goodness towards him, he commences the confession of his depravity from the time of his conception."  

It is evident that this condition was not peculiar to David, but is the common condition of mankind. "Every descendant, therefore, from the impure source, is born infected with the contagion of sin; and even before we behold the light of life, we are in the sight of God defiled and polluted." The book of Job (Job 4:4) tells us that no one can bring a clean thing out of an unclean.

We have heard that the impurity of the parents is so transmitted to the children, that all, without a single exception, are polluted as soon as they exist. But we shall not find the origin of this pollution, unless we ascend to the first parent of us all, as to the fountain which sends forth all the streams. Thus it is certain that Adam was not only the progenitor, but as it were the root of mankind, and therefore that all the race were necessarily vitiated by his corruption.  

Original sin is an hereditary depravity, and corruption of human nature which is diffused through all parts of the soul.

---

1 Calvin, p. 226.
2 Ibid., p. 226.
3 Ibid., p. 226.
This renders man obnoxious to the Divine wrath and produces in man the works of flesh. This is what Paul calls sin. The works which proceed from it "such as adulteries, fornications, thefts, hatreds, murders, revellings, he calls in the same manner 'fruits of sin;' although they are also called 'sins ' in many passages of Scripture, and even by himself."¹ These two things should be observed:

first, that our nature being so totally vitiated and depraved we are on account of this very corruption, considered as convicted and justly condemned in the sight of God, to whom nothing is acceptable but righteousness, innocence and purity. And this Liableness to punishment arises not from the delinquency of another; for when it is said that the sin of Adam renders us obnoxious to the divine judgement it is not to be understood as if we, though innocent, were undeservedly loaded with the guilt of his transgression, he is therefore said to have involved us in guilt. Nevertheless we derive from him, not only the punishment, but also the pollution to which the punishment is justly due.²

Calvin appeals to Augustine for support who calls this sin the sin of another, yet he asserts also that the sin properly belongs to the individual. "The Apostle himself expressly declares, that 'death has therefore passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;' (Romans 5: 12) that is, have been involved in original sin, and defiled with its blemishes."³ Infants bring their condemnation into the world with them and are obnoxious to

¹Calvin., p. 229.
²Ibid., p. 229.
³Ibid., p. 229.
God by their own sinfulness, not that of another. They have not yet produced the fruits of iniquity, but they have the seed of sin within them. Their whole nature is as a seed of iniquity and because of it they can be nothing but abominable in the sight of God. It must logically follow that it is properly accounted sin in the sight of God, because there could be no guilt without crime.

The other thing to be remarked is, that this depravity never ceases in us, but is perpetually producing new fruits, those works of the flesh, which we have before described, like the emission of flame and sparks from a heated furnace, or like the streams of water from a never failing spring.¹

Those who have defined original sin as merely a privation of original righteousness which we ought to possess, do not adequately describe the operation and influence of original sin. The human nature is "not only destitute of all good, but is so fertile in all evils that it cannot remain inactive."² Those who call original sin concupiscence are not improper in their use of this term, if they would but add that "everything in man, the understanding and will, the soul and body, is polluted and engrossed by this concupiscence; or, to express it more briefly,

¹Calvin., p. 230.
²Ibid., p. 230.
that man is of himself nothing else but concupiscence."¹

Sin has possessed all the powers of the soul since Adam departed from the way of righteousness. Man is not only captured by inferior appetites, but also has allowed abominable impiety to seize his mind. Pride has penetrated to the innermost recesses of the heart. This has gone far beyond that which is merely sensual. Paul informs that the corruption is not only in one part, that is the flesh, but there is nothing that is pure and uncontaminated. He speaks of the blindness of the mind, and the depravity of the heart. (Ephesians 4:17,18).

Summary. The first man rebelled against the sovereignty of God and was ensnared by the allurements of the devil. He despised truth and lost his sense of reverence for God. Man no longer listened implicitly for the voice of God, but allowed ambition, pride and ingratitude to spring forth within him. Adam's alienation from God resulted not only in his own spiritual death, but in that of all his posterity as well.

Original sin is an hereditary depravity, and corruption of human nature which is diffused through all parts of the soul. This depravity never ceases to work in man, but is ever producing new fruits, which are the works of the flesh.

¹Calvin, p. 230.
James Arminius' thoughts on fallen man.

Arminius begins by saying that the creation of things out of nothing is the first external act done by God and it is impossible that there could be anything prior to this and it is not possible to conceive anything prior to this. Out of the things that God has created are two creatures which are rational and capable of partaking of that which is divine. The first of these beings is that of the angels, beings completely spiritual and invisible. The other class of beings is that of man who is "partly corporeal and partly spiritual, visible and invisible."1 The universe to be perfect seems to require that these two beings be created.

When God created these two classes of beings it seems possible that God might have chosen different ways in which these beings might obtain eternal life. Two methods are conceivable by man and these are that eternal life might be obtained by strict observance of the law which God gives and the other that remission of sins might be obtained through a means provided by God in the event that transgression of His law might take place.

The image and likeness of God, after which man was created, belongs partly to the very nature of man; but it partly consists in those things which concern supernatural, heavenly and spiritual things. The former class comprises the understanding,

---

the affections, and the will, which is free; but the latter, the knowledge of God and of things divine, righteousness, true holiness, etc.¹

The liberty of the will involves a situation where all requisites for willing or not willing are laid down and man is still indifferent to will or not to will this or that. The indifference is removed by a previous determination that circumscribes the will and causes it to do one thing or another of the choices that are supposedly given. This necessity can not be either an internal or an external cause or there is no liberty.

Adam either possessed, or had ready and prepared for him, sufficient grace, whether it were habitual or assisting, to obey the command imposed on him both that command which was symbolical and ceremonial, and that which was moral.²

After the creation God made a covenant with man and it was the part of man to maintain perpetually his conditions in the covenant and then he would receive the benefits or rewards that God promised for obedience to the covenant. Should man disobey the commands given by God then man also must be ready to receive the punishment which would be his for disobedience. We do not know for how long a time man fulfilled his part and enjoyed the fellowship of the Holy Spirit for the Scripture has nothing to

¹Arminius., p. 486.
²Ibid., p. 487.
say about this, but the Scripture does say that Adam eventually did disobey.

In man there was a two-fold inclination when the choice came to him whether he should partake of the forbidden fruit offered him by the devil. The superior inclination was the likeness of God and the inferior one the desirableness of the fruit, which seemed pleasant to the sight, and good for food. Both of these inclinations were implanted by God in the creation but they were to be used in a certain method and way. The immediate cause for the sin was the will of man. Neither God through the manner of creation, nor the devil through force determined that Adam should disobey, but against the resistance of the image of God Adam chose to do so upon his own volition.

It was not God; for since he is the chief good, he does nothing but what is good; and, therefore, he can be called neither the efficient cause of sin, nor the deficient cause since he has employed whatever things were sufficient and necessary to avoid his sin... Nor was the devil the cause; for he only infused counsel; he did not impel, or force by necessity. Eve was not the cause; for she was only able to precede by her example, and to entice by some argument, but not to compel. It was not an internal cause—whether you consider the common or general nature of man, which was inclined only to one good, or his particular nature, which exactly corresponded with that which is general; nor was it any thing in his particular nature, for this would have been the understanding; but it could act by persuasion and advice, not by necessity. Man, therefore, sinned by his free will, his own proper motion being allowed by God, and himself persuaded by the devil.¹

¹Arminius., p. 75-76.
The sin of man was a terrible thing. It was a transgression of the law that was imposed to try whether man would be obedient to the law of God. God had loaded man with many wonderful gifts and then man had the audacity to perpetrate this sin. To have resisted the devil would have been the easier thing to do for he could have satisfied his desires and inclinations in all of the abundance of things that God had provided. The sin was committed almost under the eyes of God in a sanctified place and in doing this was man contemptful.

There were many effects of the first sin upon the first parents of the human race. They offended deity and from this the wrath of God arose on account of the violated commandment.

"In this violation, occur three causes of just anger; (1) the (derogatio) disparagement of his power or right, (2) A denial of that towards which God had an inclination, (3) A contempt of the divine will intimated by the command."

Before God in His wrath, punished man, man was afraid of God. He had a wounded conscience. This is exhibited by his attempted flight to hide from God. He was ashamed where once he had not been ashamed.

The Spirit of grace, whose abode was within man, could not consist with a consciousness of having offended God; and, therefore, on the perpetration of sin and the condemnation of their own hearts, the Holy Spirit departed. Wherefore,

---

1Arminius., p. 77.
the Spirit of God likewise ceased to lead and direct man, and to bear inward testimony to his heart of the favor of God. This circumstance must be considered in the place of a heavy punishment, when the law, with a depraved conscience, accused, bore its testimony against them, convicted and condemned them.¹

The covenant which God made with Adam and Eve promised gifts to them for keeping His commandments. These gifts would also have been bestowed upon Adam's posterity if Adam had obeyed God. "But, if by disobedience they rendered themselves unworthy of those blessings, their posterity, likewise, should not possess them, and should be liable to contrary evils."² This then is the reason that the natural propagation from Adam is cursed with temporal death and the inclination to evil, in addition to not having the fellowship of the Holy Spirit. "This punishment usually receives the appellation of 'a privation of the image of God,' and 'original sin.'"³

Summary. God created all things out of nothing. His creation is good. Adam either possessed, or had ready and prepared for him, sufficient grace to obey the command that God gave him. Adam had a two-fold inclination when the choice came to him whether he should partake of the forbidden fruit. The superior inclination was to obey the will of God, however, Adam chose to follow the

¹Arminius., p.77-78.  
²Ibid., p. 79.  
³Ibid., p. 79.
lower inclination and disobey God.

This resulted in the Holy Spirit's withdrawal of His presence. This left Adam and his posterity with a depraved conscience.

Robert Barclay's thought on fallen man.

All of Adam's posterity, both Jew and Gentile, is fallen, degenerated and dead. It is deprived of all sense of the inward feeling or testimony of the seed of God.¹

Since man has lost the sense of the seed of God in his life he becomes subject to the seed of the serpent. Barclay says regarding this that man

is subject unto the power, nature, and seed of the serpent, which he soweth in men's hearts, while they abide in this natural and corrupted estate: from whence it comes that not only their words and deeds, but all their imaginations, are evil perpetually in the sight of God, as proceeding from this depraved and wicked seed. Man therefore, as he is in this state, can know nothing aright; yea, his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and things spiritual, until he be disjoined from this evil seed, and united to the Divine Light, are unprofitable both to himself and others. . . Nevertheless, this seed is not, imputed to infants, until by transgression they actually join themselves therewith.²

In rejecting the extreme of the Pelagians, Augustine went so far to say that a child becomes contaminated with guilt while still in the mother's womb and is deserving of the torments


²Ibid., p. 97.
of hell even from this time forth.\(^1\)

The loss Adam sustained came about because of his disobedience in the Garden of Eden. Adam was told not the eat of a certain tree with the penalty, "For in the day thou eatest therof, thou shalt surely die" (Genesis 2:17). The death that is signified here is not physical death because Adam continued to live several hundred years; therefore it is taken that God meant a spiritual death and the communion with God.

We do not ascribe any whit of Adam's guilt to men until they make it theirs by the like acts of disobedience; yet we cannot suppose that men, who are come of Adam naturally, can have any good thing in their nature, as belonging to it; which he, from whom they derive their nature, had not himself to communicate unto them.\(^2\)

Therefore any bit of light that be in man must be from God as a new gift from God that he might be brought out of his darkened, natural condition. In darkened man's thoughts there is only evil continually—"... he saw that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually" (Gen. 6:5). Again in Genesis 8:21, "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Later in history Jeremiah spoke very similar words when he wrote, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked" (Jeremiah 17:9). Because the heart of man

\(^1\)Barclay, p. 98.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 99.
is so desperately wicked in itself it can not of itself lead a
man upward with such a definite downward inclination.

In the New Testament the Apostle Paul quotes from the
Psalms telling of the lack of righteousness and lack of seeking
after God among mankind. "They are all gone out of the way, they
are altogether become unprofitable: there is none that doth good,
no not one" (Romans 3:11-12). The text given in the context of
these words indicates that not just a certain few men are described
but all men everywhere have the same general tendancy to shun
God and seek their own ways no matter what evil may result.

Infants are not held responsible for any transgression of
their parents. Paul said: "Where no law is, there is no trans-
gression" (Romans 4:15). To infants there is no law, therefore
no imputation of guilt for sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall
die: the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father" (Ezekiel 28:20)

Adam is a public person and through him the seed of sin
is propagated to all men, which in its own nature is sinful,
and inclines men to iniquity. Paul states in Romans 5:12
"Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death
by sin; and so death passed upon all men for that all have
sinned."

As for these words in the Romans, the reason of the
guilt there alleged is, "For that all have sinned." Now
no man is said to sin, unless he actually sin in his own
person; for the Greek words ἐγκαταστάσεις may very well relate
to ἐκκατάτισεως, which is the nearest antecedent; so that
they hold forth, how that Adam, by his sin, gave an
entrance to sin in the world: and so death entered by sin, \( \phi \), i.e., upon which (viz. occasion) or in which (viz. death) all others have sinned; that is actually in their own persons; to wit, all that were capable of sinning.\(^1\)

**Summary.** All Adam's posterity, both Jew and Gentile, is fallen, degenerated and dead. It is deprived of the sensation or feeling of the inward testimony or seed of God. Being subject to the power and the nature of the seed of the serpent, all man's imaginations are evil perpetually in the sight of God. Man can know nothing aright in this state, nevertheless, this seed is not imputed to infants until they make it their own. Because the heart of man is so desperately wicked it in itself cannot lead a man upward.

**John Wesley's thought on fallen man.**

Wesley claims that there are examples of the extreme depravity of humanity throughout the world. These show that mankind almost universally has gone into horrid sin, wrongly using their own bodies, in their sin. Men have even given up their children to torture because of their own lusts or evil religion. Mankind also has used almost unimaginable tortures in times of war.

\(^1\)Barclay., p. 107.
The question then comes, are men guided by example, and granting that they are beings of reason, that they are led to vice rather than to virtue, as has been the custom of all ages? If the vice is a result of bad education, then there must have been a time when bad education was not, and it should have been true in that day that people trained their children up in virtue rather than in vice.

Concluding that there is no explanation of the evil of mankind either in example or education it is necessary to go to the Bible for the answer.

Wesley, speaking on the first transgression of Adam, says, "Adam violated the precept, and, as the nervous original expresses it, 'died the death.'"1 Prior to this act of transgression, Wesley continues,

He possessed a life incomparable, more excellent than that which the beasts enjoy. He possessed a divine life, consisting, according to the Apostle, "in knowledge, in righteousness, and true holiness." This, which was the distinguishing glory of his nature, in the day that he ate the forbidden fruit was extinct.2

When the act of transgression took place

his understanding, originally enlightened with wisdom, was clouded with ignorance. His heart, once warmed with heavenly love, became alienated from God his maker.

---

2Ibid., p. 525.
His passions and appetites, rational and regular before, shook off the government of order and reason. In a word, the whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed, broken.1

Wesley describes the foolishness of the act of transgression and the absurdity of Adam's later action. He writes,

the ignorance of fallen Adam was palpable. Witness that absurd attempt to hide himself from the eye of Omniscience among the trees of the garden. His aversion to the all gracious God was equally plain; otherwise, he would never have fled from his Maker, but rather have hastened on the wings of desire, into the place of the Divine manifestation. A strange variety of the disorderly passions were evidently predominant in his breast. Pride: for he refuses to acknowledge his guilt, though he cannot but own the fact. Ingratitude; for he obliquely upbraids the Creator with his gift, as though it had been a snare rather than a blessing: "The woman thou gavest me". The female criminal acts the same unhumbled part. She neither takes shame to herself, nor gives glory to God, nor puts up a single petition for pardon.2

It is plain that all men must suffer death; and this suffering is consequent upon Adam's sin. This suffering is punishment for his sin. Others would not be conscious of it being their own sin in the same sense as Adam and Eve were but they may charge it to themselves so as to judge themselves "children of wrath" on that account.3

To sum up this point in Dr. Jenning's words: if there be anything in this argument, that Adam's posterity could not

---

1Wesley., p. 525.
2Ibid., p. 525.
3Ibid., p. 526.
be justly punishable for his transgression, because it was his personal act and not theirs, it must prove universally, that is unjust to punish the posterity of any man for his personal crimes. And yet most certain it is, that God has in other cases actually punished men's sins on their posterity. Thus the posterity of Canaan, the son of Ham, is punished with slavery for his sin: Gen. ix, 25,27. Noah pronounced the curse under a divine afflatus, and God confirmed it by his providence. So we do in fact suffer for Adam's sin, and that too by the sentence inflicted on our first parents. We suffer death in consequence of their transgression. Therefore we are, in some sense, guilty of their sin.

The posterity of Adam is affected in a number of ways:

1. By one man sin entered into the world; and the whole world is in some way affected by this one event.

2. Death, which is the wages of sin and the very punishment threatened to Adam's first transgression entered by sin and is actually inflicted on all mankind.

3. All men then are deemed sinners in the eye of God, on account of that one sin.

4. Sin is not imputed where there is no law; nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses; plainly showing, that all mankind, during that whole period, had sinned in Adam and so died in virtue of the death threatened to him; and death could not then be inflicted on mankind for any actual sin, because it was inflicted on so many infants, who had neither eaten of the forbidden fruit, nor committed any actual sin whatever, and

---

1Wesley., p. 526.
therefore had not sinned in any sense, "after the similitude of Adam's transgressions." ¹

Between Adam and Christ there is a similitude.
1. Through the offence of one many are dead; by one, the gift of grace hath abounded to many. (Romans 5:15)
2. The death of Christ removes many sins, besides that one sin of Adam, which so affected all his posterity.
3. Christ raised believers to a far happier state than that which Adam enjoyed in paradise: "Much more they who receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." (Romans 5:17)²

From the infection of man's nature comes many if not all actual sins. This infection is called original sin. This evil tendency is of the heart and it is "out of the heart that proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies" (Matthew 15:19). "Every man is overcome by temptation when he is drawn away by his own lust" (James 1:14). These texts do not prove that actual sin proceeds from Adam's sin but outward wickedness comes from inner. All actual sin can not be blamed upon Adam for if he were the only one responsible for our sin he would alone be charged with them.

Natural man.

The state of the natural man is presented in Scripture as a state of sleep: "the voice of God to him is, 'Awake, thou

¹Wesley., p. 535.
²Ibid., p. 535-536.
that sleepest.¹ The spirit of the natural man is dead to the understanding of spiritual knowledge of good and evil. The spiritual eyes are closed. This man is utterly ignorant of God and His demands having no care to come to God. He has no conception of the danger of being ignorant of God, either totally, or relegating God to a place of unimportance in eternity and the universe.

Some will say God is merciful, confounding and swallowing up all at once in that unwieldy idea of mercy all His holiness and essential hatred of sin; all His justice, wisdom, and truth. He is in no dread of the vengeance denounced against those who obey not the blessed law of God, because he understands it not, because he understands it not. He imagines the main point is, to do thus, to be outwardly blameless; and sees not that it extends to every temper, desire, thought, motion of the heart. Or he fancies that the obligation hereeto is ceased; that Christ came to "destroy the Law and the Prophets"; to save His people in, not from, their sins; to bring them to heaven without holiness—notwithstanding His own words, "Not one jot or tittle of the law shall pass away, till all things are fulfilled"; and, "Not every one that saith unto Me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heavens but he that doeth the will of My Father which is in heaven."²

This man is secure because he is utterly ignorant of himself, therefore he talks of repenting someday, not knowing exactly when, but sometime before he dies. Man may find joy in his own wisdom and goodness, and his own achievements. He may have pleasure in gratifying the desires of the flesh, the eyes,

²Ibid., p. 126.
or the pride of life. Especially, if the man is wealthy.

... how easily may he persuade himself, that he is at liberty from all vulgar errors, and from the prejudice of education; judging exactly right, and keeping clear of all extremes. "I am free," may he say, "from all the enthusiasm of weak and narrow souls; from superstition, and disease of fools and cowards, always righteous over much; and from bigotry, continually incident to those who have not a free and generous way of thinking."

His cry is why should I fear, since God is merciful and Christ died for sinners? In this condition he remains a sinner as does every natural man whether he is a gross transgressor, or one who is more decent and reputable, having a form of godliness though denying the power of it.

Summary. There are examples of the extreme depravity of mankind throughout the world, thus, there is ample empirical evidence of the fall of man. The Bible, however, contains the only satisfactory explanation of the evil of mankind.

When Adam violated the command given to him by God he "died the death." His enlightenment was clouded with ignorance. His heart became alienated from God. His passions and appetites shook off the government of order and reason. The sin of Adam brought death to all his posterity; all men are deemed sinners because of that one sin. From the infection of man's nature came actual sins.

---

1Burtner, & Chiles, ed., p. 127.
Summary.

That hostilities exist between God and man is clearly taught by Catholicism. As long as these hostilities are present there can be no personal fellowship between God and man. The weakness of the Catholic teaching lies in its emphasis upon the legal aspects of original sin. It says original sin is erased through water baptism.

Calvin recognized the personal involvement that occurred when Adam disobeyed God. He taught that men are totally deprived from all personal relationship with God. This leaves man utterly to his own wicked devices. Calvin's weakness lies in the extreme emphasis which he placed upon the depravity of man. He seems to indicate that even the Christian will produce fruits of unrighteousness.

Arminius believed that Adam had a dual inclination to good and to evil. It would have been possible for Adam to have obeyed the inclination to obey God. He did not do this, but instead chose to follow the lesser and ignoble inclination as suggested by the devil. The Holy Spirit withdrew His presence from Adam and all his posterity according to the forewarned promise. This left Adam and his children with only the aspiration to evil.

Barclay saw man as an individual completely separated from God. He no longer has the clear sense of God which Adam once enjoyed. In this state all of man's thoughts and concepts of God and spiritual things are unprofitable to himself and to others. Adam's children are children of the flesh and they will produce fruits of the flesh.
Wesley recognized that man had fallen away from God. Adam was willing to give up his high place with God for the desires of the flesh. The war that exists between God and man is the result of man's action, not that of God. God desires that the hostilities come to an end. Wesley pictures man as being asleep and insensible to God. The message to man is to awaken.
CHAPTER IV

AN ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHINGS OF CERTAIN THEOLOGIANS

This chapter contains criticism and comment upon the theology of the individuals or groups discussed in the preceding chapter. The criticism is not an attempt to analyze completely all that each individual has to say on the subject of original sin; but rather comment upon those elements which involve the personal nature of original sin. By "personal nature" is meant the separation of the personalities of God and man which separation leaves man in a state of spiritual death, wandering in a world of temptation at the disposal of the devil and his own misguided lower passions.

Roman Catholicism.

The Catholic church teaches that man once enjoyed a golden age. This is in harmony with the Genesis account of the first history of man, as well as being in harmony with extra-Biblical traditions handed down from earliest antiquity. Catholic theologians continue, saying, Man, in his golden state, enjoyed gifts from God which he no longer possesses because of his sin. These gifts were supernatural gifts added to Adam, the gifts being justice, integrity and immortality. Justice was the supernatural gift of sanctifying grace. This "raised Adam to a higher state and nobler dignity, which put him into a relationship of real friendship with God in this life, and
gave him the pledge of eternal happiness in the closest union with him in the next." As Catholic theologians discuss this addition to Adam it appears that these gifts make him almost a superhuman being. Without them it is impossible for him to live a holy life, and without them man still can't live a holy life. It is granted that man can not live a holy life without a holy God to center his life in, and to fellowship with daily. Man should be able, however, to do this as an ordinary human being; not a fallen human being, but a human being as God created him.

In reading the teaching of the Catholic theologians one comes to ask the question, do the Catholics regard man as having personal relationship with God at all? The answer seems to be that there is some indication that they do. They speak of man in rebellion against God and the impossibility of a oneness of life between God and man when there is a disunion of wills. They remark, that while Adam enjoyed the gift of sanctifying grace he enjoyed a higher state which permitted him to have a relationship of real friendship with God in this life. The higher life on earth and the perfection in the next life is dependent upon conformity between the will and mind of man and that of God. For there to be a oneness of life between the will of man and of God it would seem there must be a certain amount of personal relationship and interplay of personality between the two.

It seems to this author that the error of Catholicism lies in its teaching which says God must add the gift of sanctifying grace to man before there can be an interplay of personality. God should be able to fellowship with man just as he was created.

Man was created for fellowship with God. Man's personality is jagged like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, and the only other piece that will fit properly into the personality of man is the personality of God. This joining together should be possible between God and the man Adam just as he was created. Man, as created, was holy and good, every drive, every thought, every element of life being directed toward God. He did not need the addition of a supernatural gift to make him capable of fellowship with a holy God, for he had this as he was made.

Adam, in his first state, had the ability to see God as he truly was, and his act of sin was all the more heinous because he could see the seriousness of the act he was committing. This act plunged him into the condition of sin or the state of sin.

Catholicism makes a proper distinction between the act of sin and the state of sin which is termed original sin. In actual sin man violates God's will and command either in word, thought or deed. Regarding original sin it is stated:

nothing can be included under the concept of original sin except what is derived from the sin committed by Adam as head of the human race. But in his sin, as in every other, there are two elements to be taken into account: the first is the turning away from God, our last end, and the direct result of this is the loss of sanctifying grace; the second element
is the undue and inordinate cleaving to some created, lesser
good in place of God, and to this element corresponds the
introduction of concupiscence. Hence we find both of these
elements existing in all Adam's posterity.¹

Much of the description given here of the action of man in sinning
is correct. Surely there is a turning away from God, who is man's
last end. When man turns from God his nature necessitates the replace-
ment of God's place in the life with something lesser, something created.

When man turns from God, God also turns from man. God with-
draws His holy presence, leaving man to his own ends and devices.
Man left in this condition finds himself at the disposal of his own
lower nature, without proper guide for life, and without the strength
in himself to live as he ought to live. Man finds himself more than
a match for himself as he lives a life in the flesh. This fleshly
life is not the result of God's withdrawal of sanctifying grace,
however, but it is the result of God's withdrawal of Himself.
It is God Himself that man needs in order to live a holy life.
When God takes away His presence man, if he is to live at all,
must live on the fleshly plane.

Catholicism teaches that the withdrawal of sanctifying grace
left a void in man, a void that was filled with concupiscence. Before
man sinned concupiscence did not exist, but with sin came the introduc-
tion of concupiscence. The body and soul instead of being supernatur-
alized is deprived of the gift of integrity which it would have

¹Smith, p.344.
possessed had not sanctifying grace been lost. Surely the Catholic is correct when he says integrity has been lost as a result of sin. Soul and body do not have proper relationship to each other; likewise they do not have proper relationship to God. The Catholic says when integrity is lost concupiscence enters.

In regard to the matter of original sin and baptism the Catholic says "it is heretical to say that through baptism it (original sin) is merely covered up or not imputed, for it is utterly taken away."

This author can see no Scriptural basis for this teaching whatever. To care for the original sin matter through baptism seems to make the whole question a judicial one. The God who imposed the sentence of original sin, by withdrawing sanctifying grace, is satisfied through the ritual of water baptism. To look at original sin in this light is to forget, entirely, the personal nature of original sin. Neither original sin, nor its consequences, is erased and forgotten by God through a ritual of man, but through man becoming reconciled to God and being quickened by the Spirit of God who raised Jesus from the dead.

It is difficult to see how baptism could solve the problem of the fleshly life spoken of in Romans 8, or the problem of the "old man" and the "body of sin" which is discussed in Romans 6. These

---

1Smith., p. 344.
matters relate to a life that places self at its center and is completely hostile to a holy God. The proper balance between body and soul has been lost, God is forced out of the picture completely and the fleshly life is bent upon its own ends, leading to total destruction of itself. The solution to such a situation is the complete end or crucifixion of such living and in the self submitting itself to God. This is a moral matter which involves the reordering of the person around a new life center which is God. The Interpreter's Bible says, in this vein,

the old personality, organized around a certain set of interests and values, was as truly put to death by association with Christ's crucifixion as were the thieves who died in the same manner as he did and at the same time. As a result our sinful body was destroyed.¹

Without God man would be hopelessly lost and could not perform the thing that is required of him. Thus, it is God who deals with original sin through His own indwelling presence, rather than the state of sin being ended through the sacramental rite of water baptism.

When God invades the personality of man, through the faith of man in the atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ, man again is filled with the holy presence of God, the end for which he was created. The jagged pieces of the jigsaw again fit together and man enjoys the estate for which he was created. This is not to say that man finds

Again the high level of living which Adam enjoyed. That high level of living has been marred forever in this life, because of the environment in which man lives as well as through the scars of sin in man's own nature. However, the work of redemption is indeed well begun.

To conclude the critical remarks on the Roman Catholic teaching on the subject of original sin, it is evident that Catholicism does recognize the personal nature of original sin. It recognizes the hostilities which exist and with these hostilities present there can be no unity of will between God and man, no personal relationship. There, are also elements in Catholicism which indicate the high importance placed upon the legal aspects of original sin. The weakness of this legal aspect can be seen in the Catholic claim to cleansing from original sin through the sacrament of water baptism. Even a baby, who has not had time to develop his powers of reasoning, is supposedly purged from original sin through water baptism.

John Calvin.

Calvin joins the throngs of orthodox Christians who have spoken on the subject of the fall of mankind. The teaching of Calvin is that Adam rebelled against the sovereignty of God when he was ensnared by the allurement of the devil. One sees in Calvin that he understood this to be a deliberate act of an innocent intelligent creature choosing between two separate personalities, God and the devil. The nature of this particular choice caused Adam either to
continue to enthrone God as the Lord and Master of his life or to enthrone himself as god as the devil had suggested. Man chose to expel God from the center of his life and to put in that place the thing the devil suggested that he put there, self enthronement.

Calvin saw that the turning involved a new set of values; once there had been truth, but this was despised as Adam sought after falsehood. The false thinking which dominated Adam's mind added to the severity of his separation from God and spiritual death. Not only was Adam and his posterity separated from God, they also became involved in wrong concepts of God. There was a loss of reverence, the sense of the majesty and purity of God was lost. Adam no longer listened for the voice of God, but substituted a new voice coming from his own ambition and pride. This is the drive of the flesh life of Romans 8. It is the condition of the "old man" (Romans 6).

Calvin harmonizes well with the phrase from Paul which says "the carnal mind is enmity against God," (Romans 8:7), when he says,

Adam, by coveting more than was granted, offered an indignity to the Divine goodness, which had so greatly enriched him. Now it was monstrous impiety, that a son of the earth should not be satisfied with being made after the similitude of God, unless he could also be equal to Him.1

Calvin additionally pictures the hostilities of the fleshly mind when he accuses Adam of being guilty of the same sins as Satan.

He says this is the case when Adam consented to the Satanic suggestion that God was guilty of falsehood, envy, and malignity. Being further seduced by the devil he did all that he could do to annihilate the glory of God.

These elements in Calvin indicate that he had a concept of the personal nature of the sin of Adam. Adam was in direct rebellion against the holy will of God.

The spiritual life of Adam consisted in a union to his maker, so an alienation from Him was the death of his soul. Nor is it surprising that he ruined his posterity by his defection which has perverted the whole order of nature in heaven and earth.¹

Calvin shows in this statement that Adam's rebellion from God not only resulted in his own perversion, with extreme damage to himself; but also it extended to all of Adam's posterity. The loss of personal union between Adam and God resulted in loss of union between Adam's posterity and God. Adam's spiritual death was passed on to the race. God withdrew not only from the presence of Adam, but also from the presence of every one of his descendants.

Calvin describes the fallen state into which Adam plunged, a plunge which carried down all of Adam's descendants and which is called, by him, original sin. He says,

¹Calvin., p. 226.
When the divine image in him was obliterated, and he was punished with the loss of wisdom, strength, sanctity, truth, and righteousness with which he had been adorned, but which were succeeded by the dreadful pests of ignorance, impotence, impurity, vanity, and iniquity, he suffered not alone, but involved all his posterity with him, and plunged them into the same miseries.¹

This state, as described by Calvin, in which man finds himself is not the picture of a static condition nor of stagnation. But instead it is the picture of a dynamic creature, full of life and energies which compel him to act. His great problem is that all of his energy is channelled away from God and toward the satisfaction of self, a perversion of true humanity. This is the mind which aspires after the flesh; it is the carnal mind.

Thayer says it

denotes mere human nature, the earthly nature of man apart from divine influence, and therefore prone to sin and opposed to God; accordingly it includes whatever in the soul is weak, low, debased, tending to ungodliness and vice.²

Calvin is very strong in his statements regarding the depravity of human kind. He proclaims that "the impurity of the parents is so transmitted to the children, that all, without a single exception, are polluted as soon as they exist."³ He further says, that, "our nature being so totally vitiated and depraved, we are on account of this very corruption, considered as convicted and justly condemned

¹Calvin., p. 226.
³Calvin., op.cit., p. 227.
in the sight of God."\(^1\) He continues, saying, "We derive from him, (Adam) not only the punishment, but also the pollution to which the punishment is justly due."\(^2\)

Among those who are considered vile and polluted are all infants, they being very obnoxious in the sight of a holy God. The infants have not yet produced the fruits of iniquity, but they are obnoxious to God because of their own sinfulness and are not held responsible for that which Adam did. Calvin considers the whole nature of the infant as the seed of iniquity, and abominable in the sight of God. It seems to this writer that Calvin is extreme at this point, with little Scriptural evidence for what he claims to be the attitudes of God toward the newborn child who has never exercised the powers of decision either for good or for evil.

When the child is born into the world he does have within himself all of the potential for dynamic living that all men have. When the child is born into a sin-polluted world he comes to his sensibilities without a personal relationship with God, thus every potential is developed toward evil, and away from God. Calvin calls this potential the seed of iniquity within the child. One could almost say that the child itself is a seed of iniquity, for it is the child who contains the many drives, energies and who has the dynamic

\(^1\)Calvin, p. 229.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 229.
for good or evil, rather than there being within the child an added something which controls him and makes him do evil. It is the child as a whole person who must become subject to every command of God, having fellowship with Him. There are many forces brought to play upon the person which would prevent his ever establishing a relationship with God. These include perversions of his own nature resulting from heredity, the influence of environment and Satanic influences. These forces work upon the dynamic forces in the life of the individual and tend, with great power, to produce in him the fruits of the flesh. In order for the child to enter into fellowship with God, he must hear the personal call of God and obey the call, yielding his life in its entirety to the living God. This is called crucifixion of the old man in Romans 6. It is yielding the body, which was once an instrument of sin, to the purposes of righteousness.

Calvin states that "depravity never ceases in us, but is perpetually producing new fruits, those works of the flesh. ...like the emission of flame and sparks from a heated furnace, or like the streams of water from a never failing spring." In these words Calvin certainly expresses well the tendency and drive that is within the natural man that drives him toward evil. The question arises, though, as to whether Calvin includes the Christian among those who produces the works of the flesh. Evidently he does from the use of

---

1Calvin., p. 230
the pronoun "us". It is granted that the Christian will not advance to the state of perfection enjoyed by Adam while the Christian is in this life. However, in the light of the Scripture which says, "that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin," (Romans 6:6), the question is asked, "Why should the Christian serve sin?" The old life is brought to a close; the body, the drives, the energies which were once directed away from God are now presented to Him for His disposal. All hostilities cease and man who was once compelled by hatred of God to evil is now compelled by love of God to serve Him instead of sin.

The Expositor's Bible makes pertinent comment to this, pointing out the superiority of the life of the Spirit over the life in the flesh. It says:

But you... are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, surrendered to the indwelling Presence as your law and secret, on the assumption that... God's Spirit dwells in you; has His home in your hearts, humbly welcomed into a continuous residence.1

In drawing conclusions from this partial analysis of the teaching of John Calvin on this subject it seems evident that Calvin recognized the great personal involvement that occurred when Adam sinned against God. It can be concluded from Calvin's teaching that he

believed man to be deprived totally from all personal relationship with God and this left man utterly to his own wicked devices. It seems that Calvin is extreme on his statements regarding infants, i.e. the extreme wrath God holds against the child who has not yet come to the age of accountability. Calvin continues this strong emphasis on the total depravity of all mankind.

Calvin is evidently in error when he says, "depravity never ceases in us, but is perpetually producing, new fruits, those works of the flesh."\(^1\) This, in effect, would say that God's indwelling presence does not make it possible for man to produce fruits of the Spirit in his total personality.

**James Arminius.**

James Arminius says that the image and likeness of God in man belongs to the very nature of man. This is the way God created man. The image and likeness of God in man consists in two classes. One of these is in the area of the understanding, the affections, and the will, while the other is in the area of the knowledge of God, of righteousness and true holiness. Arminius says the first of these is the very nature of man while the second contains an element of the supernatural. That part which concerns the supernatural, the heavenly, and the spiritual should also be considered as a natural part of man. By natural here is meant man as he was first created

\(^1\)Calvin., op.cit. p. 230.
and intended to be by God. It is man's ability to have a degree of clear comprehension of spiritual matters; his capacity to freely enter the spiritual realm. It was this that was severely injured when he renounced the will of God in his life and enthroned self as god.

Adam did not have to disobey the command of God. Arminius is correct when he says, Adam either possessed or had prepared for him sufficient grace to obey the command imposed upon him.¹ It is likely that Adam did obey God and fellowship with Him for a time. Just how long a time it is unknown for the Scripture is silent on the matter, but the Scripture is clear in teaching that Adam eventually did disobey. This disobedience brought with it the punishments that God had given forewarning about. One of these, and the most serious, being the separation from the living God.

Arminius speaks of the two-fold inclination that was in man when the choice came as to whether he should partake of the forbidden fruit. The superior inclination was to obey God and cherish His likeness and the lesser was the desire of the fruit, the leaving of the will of God. Arminius uses the term inclination. As this word is understood today it ordinarily does not carry the idea of a strong urge to either commit or refrain from committing a certain act. In

the case of Adam, however, it would seem that every urge, every pressure
every desire would have been to do the thing he knew to be right.
The superior inclination was very strong, while the lesser one was
slight and hardly more than a thought flashing through the mind.
This makes the sin all the more heinous, for he did the thing that
would have been so very easy to avoid. In the face of strong
compulsion to do right Adam did wrong.

Adam was wounded in his conscience, he became afraid of an
angry God, and he attempted flight from God after he sinned. Man
was ashamed where once he had not been ashamed. Arminius says the
"Spirit of God, whose abode was within man, could not consist with
a consciousness of having offended God; and, therefore on the
perpetration of sin and the condemnation of their own hearts,
the Holy Spirit departed."1 When the Spirit of God left His
guidance left with Him. This left man a poor helpless creature
at the disposal of his own lower nature. The inclination that had
been present to do good, the inclination with all its strength and
power, its driving desire to serve God became reversed and every
inclination was turned away from God and toward evil. The punishment
or judgment that was pronounced upon Adam was not for Adam alone,
but all of his posterity was included. Arminius says, "if by dis-
obedience they rendered themselves unworthy of those blessings,

---
1Arminius., p. 77.
their posterity, likewise, should not possess them and should be liable to contrary evils. This then is the reason that the natural propagation from Adam is cursed with temporal death and the inclination to evil, in addition to not having the Holy Spirit. As God created man, man is a being guided by inclinations; those inclinations being constantly at work within man. These inclinations cause man to be motivated and to act in one way or another, either for good or for evil. Without the presence and quickening power of the Holy Spirit to channel the drive of man toward that which is good, namely God, the inclination leads man into gross and serious error. This error being the sins of the flesh.

Arminius' views harmonize with the teaching of Romans 8. The Apostle Paul speaks of them "that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh." (Romans 8:5) They that mind the flesh are those that aspire after, desire much and think upon the things of the natural life. The whole sphere of living is this life, excluding entirely the Spirit of God and spiritual matters. In Arminius' way of speaking these are the ones who are inclined to evil, the Holy Spirit having withdrawn Himself from man.

To conclude the comments and criticism on Arminius, it can be seen that he taught that when Adam had a dual inclination to good and to evil he chose to follow the lesser and ignoble inclination to seek

1Arminius., p. 79.
the suggestion of the devil. This course of action created in man a sense of shame causing him to attempt to hide from God. The Holy Spirit withdrew His presence from Adam and all his posterity according to forewarned promise. This left Adam and his children with only the aspiration to evil, attempting to satisfy his lower desires. The teaching of Arminius harmonizes well with the teaching of Romans 8.

Robert Barclay.

Robert Barclay clearly states that all mankind, whether Jew or Gentile, has fallen and is in a state of degeneration as a result of the sin of Adam. Adam's posterity is deprived of the sensation or feeling of this inward testimony or seed of God; and is subject unto the power, nature, and seed of the serpent, which he sowed in men's hearts, while they abide in this natural and corrupted estate.¹

Once Adam had a clear testimony and sensation of God, but all men have been deprived of this. This leaves man hopelessly subject to the power, nature and seed of the devil. Barclay gives a good picture of what happens when the Holy Spirit's power and influence leaves the life. Man is left to himself, but he is subject to the influences of the devil. Not only is he subject to the devil, his own estate is deprived and corrupt, being no longer used for that which God intended, but for that which is unrighteous, producing fruits of the flesh.

Barclay says that man in the depraved state can know nothing aright; yea his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and things spiritual, until he be disjoined from this evil seed, and united to the divine light, are unprofitable both to himself and to others.1

This is a good description of man in the flesh. He has the seed of Satan planted in his mind, the seed which says to unthrone God and enthrone self as god. As long as man allows this seed to grow in his life and produce fruit he will forever go astray and the end of such going is death.

The Expositor's Bible says:

the mind of the flesh is "I will love myself and its will first and most." Let this be disguised as it may, even from the man himself; it is always the same in its essence. It may mean a defiant choice of open evil. It may mean a subtle and almost evanescent preference of literature, or art, or work, or home, to God's will as such. It is in either case "the mind of the flesh;" a thing which cannot be refined and educated into holiness, but must be surrendered at discretion, as its eternal enemy.2

Man, being a dynamic creature, cannot sit still; he does not merely stagnate, but he produces actions, fruits after his kind. As long as man allows his energies to be channelled by Satan or his own lower motives he will be evil. He will attempt to bring to an end the glory of God that he himself might be god as Satan has suggested.

Barclay is not nearly as extreme in his judgment of children as John Calvin is. Barclay says, "we do not ascribe any whit of

1Barclay, p. 97.
2Expositor's Bible, op. cit. p. 164.
Adam's guilt to men until they make it theirs by like acts of disobedience.\textsuperscript{1} This seems more acceptable in the light of general Scriptural teaching and common logic than the extreme position of John Calvin. Barclay does not take the extreme position of Pelagius, on the other hand, who would say every child born into Adam's race has neither inclination to bad nor to good. Barclay says,

we cannot suppose that men, who are come of Adam naturally, can have any good thing in their nature, as belonging to it; which he from whom they derive their nature, had not himself to communicate unto them.\textsuperscript{2}

When Adam sinned God withdrew Himself from the life of Adam. This left Adam an earth-bound creature with no aspirations for the spiritual especially for God. When Adam reproduces his kind they are of the same sort. In order for the children of Adam, even unto the present generation, to live a godly life they must have the presence of God in their lives. This comes only through God's breaking into the life with new bits of light and the child of Adam responding to this light through obedience and faith in Christ. This brings man out of his darkened condition and into true light as he walks with Christ.

In darkened man's thought there is only evil continually. Because the heart of man is so desperately wicked in itself it can not of itself lead a man upward when it has a definite downward inclination of itself. The picture of man going astray is not just that of a

\textsuperscript{1}Barclay., op.cit., p. 99.

\textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. 99.
few isolated individuals seeking their own ways, but it is rather a
general picture of all men everywhere. All men have the same general
tendency to shun God and seek their own ways no matter what evil
may result. Barclay pictures well the "old man" that must be crucified,
the flesh life that must be ended before there can be righteousness.
The life lived without God is a life in the flesh no matter how
moral that life might be. It is a flesh-life until it becomes a
spiritual life through an invasion of the Holy Spirit which takes
place when man becomes obedient to Him.

To conclude, it can be seen from the teachings of Robert
Barclay that he saw man as an individual completely separated from
God. This resulted from the sin of Adam and it places man at the
disposal of Satan and man's own corrupt nature. The clear sense
of God, once enjoyed by Adam is lost. In the fallen state in which
he finds himself he knows nothing aright. The thoughts and concepts
he has of God and spiritual things are unprofitable to himself and
to others. Children coming from Adam, though not blamed for Adam's
transgression, have his nature. They will produce fruits of the
flesh for they are of the flesh and can do nothing else.

John Wesley.

John Wesley shows that it is empirically possible to determine
that the world of mankind is a world of sin. The world is full of
horrid sin, men using their bodies wrongly, giving up their own
children to torture because of their lusts or false religions.
Mankind has used almost unimagineable torture in times of war.
Surely this is a picture of a world that has lost a sense of righteousness, a world that is not empowered and guided by a holy God.

Wesley is correct in drawing the conclusion that this type of world does not exist because of bad example, but is rather the result of the malady of mankind. Adam originally possessed a life incomparably more excellent than that which is now exhibited by man in this world. Adam did not esteem that which he possessed worthy of his total and undying allegiance. He gave up that good and holy life and as a result he "died the death."

His understanding, originally enlightened with wisdom, was clouded with ignorance. His heart once warmed with heavenly love, became alienated from God his maker. His passions and appetites, rational and regular before, shook off the government of order and reason. In a word, the whole moral frame was unhinged, disjointed, broken.¹

Wesley's description of Adam given here, describes more than just the first parent of man. It also gives a picture of man in the flesh, man alienated from God, enthroning himself as lord of his life. But in shaking off the controlling hand of God, he also shook off right reason and rationality. His passions and appetites, created by God for certain uses, lost their proper balance and place in life and led man into a career in the fleshly life. The flesh life is irrational, unexplainable, bent upon destroying itself. The life of

the flesh gives ample reason for all of the sin in the world, for out of it come the sins of the flesh.

Wesley shows Adam's foolishness, and that of all men, as he stands before God in the flesh. Adam was ignorant to absurdity when he tried to hide himself in the trees of the garden from the omniscient eye of God. Adam had an aversion to God, otherwise he would not have fled from God, but would have sought Him with a heart full of desire to enjoy His delightful presence. Adam was ridiculously proud as he refused to acknowledge his guilt, thinking he could hide it from God. Adam was ungrateful "for he obliquely upbraids the Creator with his gift, as though it had been a snare rather than a blessing; 'the woman thou gavest me...'
thus indirectly blaming God for his own sin."1

All of these sins of Adam, and his posterity, as Wesley comments upon them, leads one to believe that Wesley considers man, as man, capable of such evil thought and action. Man is not compelled by some force, apart from himself, to act as he does, but he is totally responsible and must bear the consequences himself.

Wesley's analysis of man is in harmony with the treatment the Apostle Paul makes of the fleshly man in Romans 8. The Pauline "old man" is the same as the picture given by Wesley of Adam standing foolishly before God, hostile toward God, in deliberate rebellion

1Wesley, p. 525.
against His holy will.

Man and God are at odds with each other, at war, living in completely different spheres of activity with no interplay of personality and fellowship. This complete separation of God and man is not God’s will and it does not please Him. In this condition or state man expects to find liberty and happiness in the pursuit of his own desires. But he soon finds that there is no liberty and happiness for he becomes slave to his own lower nature and his body which was intended as an instrument of righteousness becomes an instrument of unholiness, a "Body of sin."

Adam’s posterity must suffer for the sin of its forefather. All men are deemed sinners on the account of the sin of one man. Death reigned from Adam to Moses, plainly showing that all mankind, during that whole period, had sinned in Adam and so died by reason of the death threatened to him. This death was both physical and spiritual, the spiritual death being separation from God. This separation from God left man with an infected nature. Wesley calls this infection original sin. This infection is an evil tendency of the heart which produces evil thoughts such as murder, adultery, fornication, false witness and blasphemies. Wesley uses the Scripture "every man is overcome by temptation when he is drawn away by his own lusts," (James 1:14), to show the drive or tendency toward evil.

Wesley declares that the Scripture presents the condition of the natural man as a state of sleep. "The voice of God to him is,
"Awake, thou that sleepest."¹ The spirit of the natural man is dead to the understanding of spiritual good or evil. The natural man is utterly ignorant of God and His demands and has no care to come to know them. The state of sleep shows a condition of insensibility to God. This is moral or personal separation—the man who is dead to God is of necessity alive to and controlled by the flesh. He is the Pauline man in the flesh. He has no fear because he does not know of the danger of being ignorant of God, either totally, or of relegating God to a place of unimportance in eternity and the universe.

He is in no dread of the vengeance denounced against those who obey not the blessed law of God, because he understands it not. He imagines the main point is, to do thus, to be outwardly blameless; and sees not that it extends to every temper, desire, thought, motion of the heart.²

These words from Wesley again portray the drive of man as toward evil, a compulsion to evil and the life of flesh rather than direction toward God.

In summarizing the partial analysis of Wesley's teaching on man it can be deduced that Wesley recognized that man has fallen away from God. This can be determined empirically as well as Scripturally. Adam did not rightly value his high place with God and was willing to give it up for the desires of the flesh. This resulted in his death and corruption for he became a creature lacking right reason

²Ibid., p. 126.
and rationality. Wesley declares the foolishness of Adam when he tried to hide from the omniscient eye of God. Wesley harmonizes well with the teaching of the Apostle Paul in Romans 6 and Romans 8 regarding the "old man" and the flesh life. Man and God are at odds, at war with each other. This is the result of man's action, not that of God, for it is God's will that the hostilities come to an end. Wesley presents the picture of the natural state of man as a state of sleep—insensible to God. The message coming from God is to awaken.
CHAPTER V

THE NATURE OF SIN AND ITS RELATION TO MAN

In this chapter the nature of sin is discussed, first negatively and then positively. The positive statements deal with the personal nature of sin as the sinner relates himself to God and his fellow man. Sin not material.

Manes, who died in 270 AD, was the man who conceived the system which bears his name, Manicheism. This man was a thinker from the East who saw much good in Christianity and who confessed Christ. He was constantly annoyed by his own philosophy as it conflicted with the logic of Christianity. He thought a reconciliation of the two would be a beautiful thing and he attempted to bridge the chasm between them. He was filled with enthusiasm for Christianity yet almost blind with his heathen philosophy; his aim was to interweave the two. He developed his system very carefully, but this led to false ideas. One of these was a materialistic concept of sin. This same materialistic concept of sin is occasionally encountered today, there being one important distinction: there are few who maintain, as Manes did, that flesh itself is evil. Instead some would say that sin, especially original sin, exists as an entity in itself. This belief is based particularly on the Scriptural phrases "old man," and "body of sin," Romans 6:6; and "the carnal mind," Romans 8:7.
Even the eminent John Wesley has been understood to teach

"that sin is a 'thing' that has to be taken out of a man like a cancer

or a rotten tooth."¹ These words come from the writing of W.E. Sangster.

Manes taught that sin is inherent in matter, flesh, and all that

is visible and tangible. His mistaken notion comes from applying the

work of the flesh only to the body:

... while Scripture uses it as referring to sin, signifying

the whole human nature, which does not love the things that are

above, but the things of the flesh. Flesh in this sense refers

more directly to the soul than to the body. The works of the

flesh are two fold: one class touching the body, are the sins

related to fornication and lust; the other, touching the soul

consist of sins connected with pride, envy and hatred. In the

sphere of visible things it finishes its image with shameless

fornication; in the realm of invisible things it ends with

stiffnecked pride.²

Thayer writes in like manner on the word flesh. He says that

Paul uses flesh of the whole man; his body, soul, mind, and all his

faculties because all that is in him strives after the flesh.³

In the East, Manes saw much more sin of the flesh (body) than of

the soul, which he either did not recognize or explain as a result of

the materialistic downward pull. The logical conclusion which he came
to in his system was that Satan was simply matter.

¹W.E. Sangster, The Path To Perfection. (New York: Abingdon-

Cokesbury, 1943), p. 72.

²Abraham Kuyper, The Work Of The Holy Spirit. (Grand Rapids:


³Joseph Henry Thayer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New

Sin not a mere negation.

The exegetical investigations of Scripture do not indicate that sin has a being of itself or that it is an entity in itself; neither that it inheres in matter. Investigations do not indicate that sin is a mere lack of something. Kuyper, approaching this thought from the reverse says, "if redemption means only that a sinner is set in the light of Christ's righteousness, then the fall can mean no more than that man stepped out of that light."1

Using parallels from physical science, this can be illustrated in the following way. Adam, upon sinning, did not become as a magnet which has lost its power to attract, becoming just a passive piece of iron. Neither was the effect of his sin like turning a light off in a room; the light leaves and the room is filled with darkness. These illustrations picture passivity, but Adam was very active in the pursuit of corruption.2 Sin, though it has no independent being, in its consequences is active and in its workings it is destructive.

Man's nature in sin does not remain unchanged but becomes very actively corrupt. Sickness or a malignant disease is not merely the loss of health but an active destructive force that destroys unless it is checked. A corpse is not merely a body that has no life left in it but it is a body that will decompose. Kuyper goes on to say,

1Kuyper., p. 260.
2Ibid., p. 259.
in like manner we are conscious that sin is not merely the deprivation of holiness, but we feel its fearful activity, corruption and dissolution which destroys. Strongest proof is the fact that we do not joyfully welcome God's grace entering the heart, but with our whole nature oppose it. There is conflict which would not be possible if that deprivation and loss had not developed evil which opposes God.¹

The Scriptures do not show Satan as a bereaved being, emptied of light and lacking in holiness, but he is active and causes corruption to proceed from him. In a like sense the soul also has become corrupt, though in a less degree than Satan.

If sin were only a loss of righteousness, all that would be needed would be to restore the righteousness and there would be no more flaw. Turn on the light and the darkness would flee. The lack would cease as soon as the supply became available. To put off the old man after the new man had been received would be all that is necessary if this were all that is involved in sin and its removal.²

Sin and human nature.

Human nature as such is never annihilated whether man is sinful or holy in his living. As God intended man to be, the effects of human nature would have been good and holy. This nature however became corrupt and evil through man's choice. Kuyper says,

man has retained the power to think, will and feel, besides many glorious talents and faculties, even genius sometimes; but this does not touch the corruption of his nature. Its corruption

¹Kuyper, p. 262.
²Ibid., p. 263.
is this; that the life which should be devoted to God and
animated by Him is devoted with downward tendencies to earthly
things. And this reversed action has changed the whole organism
of our being.¹

Divine righteousness is not necessary to human life or this could
not be so. In Scripture death is not annihilation, but one who is dead
in sin is dead to God and because he is dead to God he is at the same
time very much alive to Satan, the world, and his own desires. If the
sinner had no sinful life the Scriptures would not say, "mortify there­
fore your members which are on the earth", (Colossians 3:5) because
that which is already dead could not be put to death.

When the person pursues the will of God, the soul lives, but
if it does not conform to God's will then it is said to be dead. In
this state the body does not cease to function and exert influence,
but this is the life of the members which are on the earth which must
be mortified. Kuyper says, "hence sin does not stop our nature from
breathing, working, feeling, but it causes these activities, which under
the sway of the divine law did run well and were full of blessing, to
go wrong and be corrupt."²

Sin deprives man of the control which he needs in God to keep
from destroying himself. Man's powers remain but they run in the wrong
direction. This is similar to the thought of Barclay when he says the

¹Kuyper., p.264.
²Ibid., p. 265.
depraved man "can know nothing aright; yea his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and things spiritual... are unprofitable both to himself and to others." The whole economy becomes unruly and disorderly and leads progressively farther from God. Adam Clark points out that this progression away from God is actually rebellion and enmity against God. Writing on the unsaved man, he says:

Before, while sinners, we were in a state of enmity with God, which was sufficiently proved by our rebellion against his authority, and our transgression of his laws.  

A train destroys itself when it becomes derailed at a high speed and so does man when derailed from God's law and love. Destruction is necessarily the result because the power of human nature is given to that which destroys. The Interpreter's Bible says:

To set the mind on the flesh means death for the reason that such an attitude or state of mind constitutes enmity against God—an enmity which issues death.  

The will, feelings, emotions, desires, all become blinded and one knows not where to turn, for as Barclay says man "can know nothing aright."

The sinner may be glad to engage in that which is good and he may have high ideals, but the goodness and ideals, if not centered in

---


4Barclay, op. cit., p. 97.
God cause the whole being of the man to become evil. He is turning the power for true good away from God and in upon himself and thus the power is turned in the wrong direction. The *Expositor's Bible* speaking on the fleshly life says,

the mind of the flesh is, "I will love myself and its will first and most." Let this be disguised as it may, even from the man himself; it is always the same thing in its essence. It may mean a defiant choice of evil. It may mean a subtle and almost evanescent preference of literature, or art, or work, or home, to God's will as such. It is in either case "the mind of the flesh," a thing which cannot be refined and educated into holiness, but must be surrendered at discretion, as its eternal enemy.  

The deed may not be done but the desire or the coveting of its completion is in itself sin. Adam, in his original state, and Christ were not filled with unholy desires which they had to keep in check with a hand of iron. The first desire awakened in Adam's heart was that he might become like God.

**Personal Sin.**

John Wesley defined sin as a voluntary transgression of a known law. In such a definition it is evident that the person must know what the law is and have the intention to break it. In this a moral being is involved. Since there is a moral being involved in sin then in generic sin there is no guilt involved.

---

No man can inherit another man's personal bearing toward moral judgment. In fact, no personal act, or activity, or experience can be inherited. Strictly speaking, nothing personal can ever be passed from being to being. And inasmuch as the personal deed, or attitude, cannot be inherited, it is inconceivable that the personal responsibility for such deed or attitude can be inherited.¹

Man was intended to live in personal moral fellowship with God but this relationship was broken. Instead of an intimate communion saturated with God's blessing and presence man broke the fellowship and had to be cast from the Garden of Eden and he became alone,

Man lives under moral fear. Curtis comments that,

the human race was designed to be an organic brotherhood of moral persons, in which every member would fit into the life of all, and minister to the progress and joy of all, and receive stimulus and social companionship and positive supplement from all. But this great plan has been defeated by sin.²

The brotherhood of man is not a true brotherhood. Only here and there men in small groups try to do anything for the rest of mankind.

It is easy enough to contribute to the surface comfort of men; but to enter their life, to understand them, profoundly to enlarge them and bless them, is an extremely difficult matter. Now think of doing this for all men, and you will begin to realize the awful extent of our racial failure. The cause of this racial failure is twofold: first, every individual member of the race is born depraved, and many members of the race are living in personal sin. Thus, the racial members are not capable of racial coalescence. And, second, the race has lost its center of organism. That center was to be God in immediate personal companionship with all men. To say that

the race now exists only through the omnipresence of God is to miss the point altogether. The point is not that God is needed as a present power, but that God is needed as a present personal companion. Men need to enjoy the actual vision of God as their supreme Friend.¹

Men sin and the relation they have with God is definitely broken because God withdraws His presence. The reason God withdraws from close communion is because He hates sin. It is not a matter of God being able to have a different attitude if He so chose. If God did not hate sin He would cease to be God as He would not exist at all. It is not necessary to say that this hatred is a condemnation by an impersonal law with no personality involved. Regarding God's hatred of sin Curtis has this to say:

If in any way you drop the personal element out of the hatred, you will lose, altogether or in part, its mighty ethical stroke. In the deepest sense, no impersonal bearing or performance can be ethical. No, we are to think (and then to feel it) of the law of God's holiness as plunging eternally into His absolutely exhaustive self-consciousness, and there furnishing motive for an active, personal hatred of all sin as a violation of that fundamental holiness. Thus, God not only hates sin, but He means to hate it.²

God has an intense hatred of sin, but even greater is His love for man. God acts against sin and through the person of the Holy Spirit He also acts to redeem men from sin.

The Holy Spirit and man.

Without the Holy Spirit the Christian religion would be emptied

¹Curtis., p. 203.
²Ibid., p. 204.
of all power and life, without any means of rescuing men from sin.
Some rationalists say all we need is more truth. "We do need truth,
more and more of it; but under all that need is the paramount need
of a vitalized moral personality." The Holy Spirit deals with person-
ality itself, for the Christian religion is intensely personal.
The human person becomes empowered by the Person of the Holy Spirit.
He invigorates the self, makes the self aware of itself, sharpens the
awareness of true motives. The Holy Spirit works very much on conscience
quickening it. The awareness of right and wrong may not be changed
but there is a much more profound sense of obligation to do the right
and if right is bypassed there is a very definite and lasting sense
of guilt.

The Holy Spirit does something for every man; but he will do
more for the moral person who, in any time, or in any place,
makes his best personal response to the initiative moral
pressure; and he will do still more for men in any situation
where the Christian message is declared; and he will do still
more for men where the Christian message is declared in a
situation which is quick with the faith and love and sacrifice
belonging to actual Christian experience.

The Holy Spirit comes to men with the love of God which was
manifest in Christ. In Christ is seen infinite moral love with intense
personal interest in man—a going out of the heart to man.

Of all religions, Christianity is perhaps the most social.

1 Curtis., p. 117.
2 Ibid., p. 119.
... it is so thoroughly social that neither its doctrines nor its method nor its spirit can be understood and expressed in the terms of individualism. Every man is planned for human fellowship and can live his normal, his deepest life only in terms of such fellowship.1

Man partakes of other men's sorrows, joys and experiences until he is made up of other men. No man is an island.

The experience of loneliness is more than a gregarious instinct not being fulfilled. In animals the gregarious instinct can be fulfilled by placing the animal with another of its kind and give a little time for them to become acquainted. A man can be just as alone on the streets of New York City as if he were isolated on a desert isle. A gregarious instinct is not satisfied in man by merely placing him in a crowd. Indeed, he may be even more alone because he is conscious of himself as being completely separated. The need in man then is that of personal companionship. There needs to be an interchange of personalities, a trading and sharing of personal experiences, a knowing and a being known by another person. Thus man finds no sympathy in a faithful dog because it cannot understand to the depths.

Every man is made for other men—is purposely created jagged so as to fit into other men—is planned to be a reciprocal factor in a greater social organism. And this great social organism is the human race.2

1Curtis., p. 131.
2Ibid., p. 134.
Persons complement and supplement each other and they know other persons because as persons they have common experiences.

Man's psychological need for fellowship with others of his kind is great. Even greater is his need for fellowship with God. If this flow of fellowship is thwarted man becomes mis-directed in all his relations with other persons.

Summary.

Sin itself is not material in substance in any of its forms. Neither is the material world, including the body of mankind, sinful as such. It may be used for sinful purposes, however. Neither the Scriptures nor serious Christians have ever taught that the body, as such is sinful.

Human nature, as such is never annihilated whether man is sinful or holy in his living. The nature of man becomes very corrupt, but of itself it is not sinful. God made a holy man in the Garden. Sin deprives man of the control of his nature which he needs in God to keep from destroying himself.

Sin is a transgression of a known law. Adam's transgression of the law caused a breach in his fellowship with God. The race is racially out of joint with God as a result of this. God withdrew his presence from the race because of the sin of man, leaving it alone. God fully intended to withdraw from Adam when he sinned.
God still means to hate sin, but the love of God for man is also very great and He acts definitely and deliberately to redeem man from sin. Man is a social being and needs the fellowship of other men. Greater is man's need for fellowship and communion with God.
Chapter VI
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary.

It has been the purpose of this study to determine the meaning of the terms, "the body of sin," "the old man," and "the carnal mind" as these terms relate to the Christian doctrine of original sin.

The following is a summary of findings. These terms have a definite reference to the condition of fallen man. These terms are not meant to convey the thought that original sin has an entity within and of itself. Sin is real, but only within the creature.

The terms, "the old man," "the body of sin," and "the carnal mind" are very closely related in meaning, but they are not synonymous.

The term, "the old man" denotes human nature as it was made by Adam. It is as if fallen Adam were reappearing in every human ego, coming into the world under the preponderance of self love. The fallen nature is referred to as the old man because the believer possesses a new nature. "The old man," i. e. we, as we were before our mode of thought, feeling and action had been changed. "Old man" means our old self, what we were as the unregenerate sons of Adam. "The old man" is crucified when the old friendship to the way of sin is broken with sharply

The apostle's use of "the body of sin" is different. The principle of sin does not lie in the physical body as such. The body and its members are to become useful as instruments of righteousness. The body is to be given in holy consecration to God for His service.
"The body of sin" does not mean that there is an entity or a chunk of sin. The "of sin" of this phrase describes the kind of body that is under discussion. The "body" includes the flesh, will, emotions—the entire personality. Each of these elements or members has a mutual interdependence upon each other. The entire person is to leave sin and is to be consecrated to holiness.

Romans 6:6 says "the body of sin" is to be destroyed. This can't mean that the human body is to be destroyed. Neither can it mean that there is an entity of sin that is to be destroyed. It means that this body is to become useless, inactive, to cease all operation in regard to sin. The body, as the seat and the instrument of sin is to cease, under direction of the will and intellect, its operation or usage for sin.

If Christians are united to Christ and partake of His life and resurrection they live as He lives. As a pre-requisite to this they must be vitally connected to Him in His death. The unregenerate self, "old man" must be crucified with Christ on the cross in order that the body might be rendered powerless with respect to sin, dead to sin, and prevented from serving it anymore.

"Flesh" means more than just the physical body and that which is related to unchastity. Paul uses "flesh" as of the whole man—the body, soul, mind and all his faculties. Flesh signifies the entire nature, the entire personality, with all its sense and reason, without the Holy Spirit.
The life of flesh does not necessarily mean that the life is filled with gross and vicious sin. It may be very cultured, educated, refined—devoted to work, art, music, family and business. If these things take the place of God, they become idols.

"The carnal mind" is the one that strives or aspires after the things of the flesh. The words φρονέω and φθινω refer to a directing of emotion and will as well as thought. There is an absorption in the things of the flesh. To aspire this way is to desire to remain this way. This is hostility, μισεῖν, personal enmity toward God.

Catholicism teaches that hostilities exist between God and man. With these hostilities present there can be no unity of will between God and man. There can be no personal fellowship between God and man as long as man is bent on having his own way before God. The weakness of Catholicism lies in the emphasis placed on the legal aspects of original sin being erased through the rite of water baptism.

It seems that Calvin recognized the great personal involvement that occurred when Adam sinned against God. Calvin believed man to be deprived totally from all personal relationship with God and this left man utterly to his own wicked devices. The weakness of Calvin seems to lie in the extreme emphasis placed upon the depravity of man. Calvin seems to indicate that even the Christian will produce fruits of unrighteousness.

Arminius taught that Adam had a dual inclination to good and to evil. He chose to follow the lesser and ignoble inclination to seek the suggestion of the devil. The shame which resulted in Adam caused
him to hide from God. The Holy Spirit withdrew His presence from Adam and all his posterity according to the forewarned promise. This left Adam and his children with only the aspiration to evil.

Barclay saw man as an individual completely separated from God. The clear sense of God which Adam once enjoyed was lost. In man's fallen state he knows nothing aright. His thoughts and concepts of God and spiritual things are unprofitable to himself and to others. Children coming from Adam will produce fruits of the flesh for they are children of the flesh and they can do nothing else.

Wesley recognized that man had fallen away from God. Adam did not value his high place with God and was willing to give it up for the desires of the flesh. He says man and God are at odds, at war with each other. This is the result of man's action, not that of God. It is God's will that the hostilities come to an end. Wesley pictures man as being asleep and insensible to God. The message to man is to awake.

Sin itself is not material in nature. The material world including the body of man is not sinful, but is used for the purposes of sin. Human nature is not sinful, but is used for sinful purposes when it is taken out of the controlling power and guidance of God. In this separated condition it has the dynamic to compel man in the way of his own destruction.

Sin is not merely a negation or lack of righteousness. It has tremendous dynamic and ability to lead man to destruction.

Human nature, as such, is never annihilated whether man uses
his faculties for sinful or holy purposes. Sin deprives man of the control of his nature. He needs God to help him keep from destroying himself.

Adam's transgression of the law caused a breach in fellowship with God. The race is racially out of joint with God as a result of this. God withdrew His presence from man because of His hatred of sin, but the love of God for man is also very great. He acts definitely and deliberately to redeem man.

Conclusion.

1. The Christian doctrine of original sin harmonizes with the exegetical findings on the Biblical terms, "the body of sin," "the old man," and "the carnal mind." The fallen condition of the human race, as understood by the theologians studied is basically similar to that which is indicated by these terms.

2. These terms do not teach that original sin is physical or metaphysical in nature. It does not exist as an entity in and of itself. Its existence is within the personality of man; which includes body, soul, intellect, emotions, and will. All of these members of man are affected in the fall away from God. They are not just passively separated from God, but actively pursue their own ends.

3. There is a condition of war between God and man. This condition or state of war is the result of man's doing. Man's act of rebellion leaves him separated from God. This puts him in a condition
of being left to his own ends, without the aid and guidance of God. Man finds that in this state he becomes a slave to the "flesh." Every dynamic force of personality clamors for a hearing and pushes man in its direction. This is "the carnal mind," the aspiration or drive toward the things of the flesh; the flesh being the entire person, in its various parts, without the light of the Holy Spirit.

4. Original sin has a basic personal element in its nature. All of the theologians studied teach this to some degree. Roman Catholicism lays great stress upon the legal aspects also. The term, "the old man," pictures the person in the unregenerate state, out of fellowship with God. In this state the body is a "body of sin." The mind is a "carnal mind." Every element of the person is actively hostile toward God, bent on achieving its own ends. When "the old man" becomes a "new man," "the body of sin" becomes a "body of righteousness;" "the carnal mind" becomes a "spiritual mind."
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